OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

THIRD SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

4-5 GEORGE V., 1914

VOL. CXIII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF JANUARY TO THE TWENTIETH DAY OF FEBRUARY, INCLUSIVE



OTTAWA
PRINTED BY J. DE L. TACHÉ, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1914

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE ROBERT LAIRD BORDEN

P.C., K.C., LL.D.

AT THE OPENING OF THE

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

1914

THE CABINET

FORMED OCTOBER 10, 1911

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

NOT OF THE CABINET

Solicitor General	Hon. Arthur Meighen, B.A., K.C.

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

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Speaker ..... Hon. THOMAS SIMPSON SPROULE, M.D.
Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees.... P. E. BLONDIN, Esq.

Clerk of the House ..... THOS. B. FLINT, M.A., LL.B., D.C.L.
Sergeant-at-Arms ..... Lieut.-Col. HENRY R. SMITH, C.M.G., I.S.O., J.P., A.D.C.

Editor of Debates ..... ALBERT HORTON.
Associate Editor of Debates and Reporter ..... THOS. P. OWENS.

Reporters of Debates :—

English : A. C. Campbell, George Simpson, Robert C. Dunbar, C. S. Blue, F. W. S. Galbraith, Earl C. Young, H. E. Oliver (substitute).

French : J. O. Marceau, Alphonse Desjardins.

Secretary of Debates Branch : C. W. Boyce.

Select Committee on Official Report of Debates.

Messieurs Beattie, Burnham, Devlin, George E. Foster, Hanna, L. A. Lapointe, Lavallée, Lemieux, Marcil, Monk, Perley, Rainville, Jas. Reid, Schaffner and Taylor.

Chairman : Jas. D. Taylor, Esq.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

THIRD SESSION, TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

1914

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

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

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

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

EDWARDS, JOHN WESLEY—Frontenac.
ELLIOTT, GEORGE A.—Middlesex, N. Riding.
EMMERSON, HON. HENRY ROBERT—Westmorland.
ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR CALIXTE—Two Mountains

FISHER, JOHN HENRY—Brant.
FORGET, SIR RODOLPHE—Charlevoix & Montmorency.
FORTIER, EDMOND—Lotbinière.
FOSTER, ARTHUR DE WITT, Kings, N.S.
FOSTER, HON. GEORGE EULAS—Toronto, North.
FOWLER, GEORGE WILLIAM—Kings and Albert.
FRIPP, ALFRED ERNEST—Ottawa.

GARLAND, W. F.—Carleton, Ont.

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

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

JAMESON, CLARENCE—Digby.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SCHAFFNER, FREDERICK LAURENCE—Souris.
SEGUIN, PAUL ARTHUR—L'Assomption.
SEVIGNY, ALBERT—Dorchester.
SEXSMITH, JOHN A.—Peterborough, E. Riding.
SHARPE, SAMUEL—Ontario, N. Riding.
SHARPE, WILLIAM HENRY—Lisgar.
SHEPHERD, FRANCIS HENRY—Nanaimo.
SINCLAIR, JOHN H.—Guysborough.

* Died May 15, 1914.

SMITH, WILLIAM—Ontario, S. Riding.
SMYTH, WILLIAM ROSS—Algoma E. Riding.
SPROULE, HON. THOMAS SIMPSON—Grey, E. Riding.
STANFIELD, JOHN—Colchester.
STEELE, MICHAEL—Perth, S. Riding.
STEVENS, HENRY HERBERT—Vancouver.
STEWART, DUGALD—Lunenburg.
STEWART, THOMAS JOSEPH—Hamilton, West.
SUTHERLAND, DONALD—Oxford, S. Riding.

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

VERVILLE, ALPHONSE—Maisonneuve.

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

THIRD SESSION, TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

1914

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

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

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

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

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

FRONTENAC—John Wesley Edwards.

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

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

INVERNESS—Alexander W. Chisholm.

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

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

* Died May 15, 1914.

Labelle—Honoré Achim.
Lambton, E. Riding—Joseph E. Armstrong.
Lambton, W. Riding—Frederick Forsyth Pardee.
Lanark, N. Riding—William Thoburn.
Lanark, S. Riding—Adelbert E. Hanna.
Laprairie-Napierville—Roch Lanctôt.
L'Assomption—Paul Arthur Seguin.
Laval—Charles Avila Wilson.
Leeds—Hon. Wm. T. White.
Lennox and Addington—Wm. J. Paul.
Lévis—J. B. Bourassa.
Lincoln—Edward Arthur Lancaster.
Lisgar—William Henry Sharpe.
L'Islet—Eugène Paquet.
London—Thomas Beattie.
Lotbinière—Edmond Fortier.
Lunenburg—Dougald Stewart.

Macdonald—Alexander Morrison.
Mackenzie—E. L. Cash.
Macleod—David Warnock.
Maisonneuve—Alphonse Verville.
Marquette—Hon. William James Roche.
Maskinongé—A. Bellemare.
Medicine Hat—Wm. A. Buchanan.
Megantic—L. T. Pacaud.
Middlesex, E. Riding—S. Francis Glass.
Middlesex, N. Riding—George A. Elliott.
Middlesex, W. Riding—Duncan Campbell Ross.
Missisquoi—Wm. F. Kay.
Montcalm—David A. Lafortune.
Montmagny—D. O. Lesperance.
Montmorency—Sir Rodolphe Forget.
Montreal, St. Anne—Hon. Charles J. Doherty.
Montreal, St. Antoine—Herbert B. Ames.
Montreal, St. James—Louis A. Lapointe.
Montreal, St. Lawrence—Robert Bickerdike.
Montreal, St. Mary—Méderic Martin.
Moosejaw—William Erskine Knowles.
Muskoka—William Wright.

Nanaimo—Francis H. Shepherd.
New Westminster—James Davis Taylor.
Nicolet—Paul E. Lamarche.
Nipissing—Hon. Francis Cochrane.
Norfolk—Wm. A. Charlton.
Northumberland (N.B.)—William Stewart Loggie.
Northumberland (O.) E.R.—Henry Joseph Walker.
Northumberland (O.) W.R.—Charles A. Munson.

Ontario, N. Riding—Samuel S. Sharpe.
Ontario, S. Riding—William Smith.
Ottawa City { Alfred E. Fripp. / John Leo Chabot.
Oxford, N. Riding—Edward Walter Nesbitt.
Oxford, S. Riding—Donald Sutherland.

Parry Sound—James Arthurs.
Peel—Richard Blain.
Perth, N. Riding—H. B. Morphy.
Perth, S. Riding—Michael Steele.
Peterborough, E. Riding—John A. Sexsmith.
Peterborough, W. Riding—John H. Burnham.
Pictou—Edward Mortimer Macdónald.
Pontiac—Gerald H. Brabazon.
Portage la Prairie—Hon. Arthur Meighen.
Portneuf—Michel Siméon Delisle.
Prescott—Edmond Proulx.
Prince Albert—James McKay.
Prince, (P.E.I.)—James W. Richards.
Prince Edward—Bernard R. Hepburn.
Provencher—John Patrick Molloy.

Qu'Appelle—Levi Thomson.
Quebec, Centre—Arthur Lachance.
Quebec, East—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, P.C., G.C.M.G.
Quebec, West—William Power.
Quebec (County)—Hon. L. P. Pelletier.
Queens, (P.E.I.)— { Angus A. McLean. / Donald Nicholson.

Red Deer—Michael Clark.
Regina—William Melville Martin.
Renfrew, N. Riding—Gerald Verner White.
Renfrew, S. Riding—Hon. George Perry Graham.
Restigouche—James Reid.
Richelieu—P. J. A. Cardin.
Richmond (N.S.)—George W. Kyte.
Richmond and Wolfe (Q.)—Edmund William Tobin.
Rimouski—Herménégilde Boulay.
Rouville—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
Russell—Hon. Charles Murphy.

St. Hyacinthe—Louis J. Gauthier.
St. John (N.B.), City—Hon. Wm. Pugsley.
St. John (N.B.), City and County—Hon. J. Douglas Hazen.
St. Johns and Iberville—M. Joseph Demers.
Saltcoats—Thomas MacNutt.
Saskatoon—George Ewan McCraney.
Selkirk—George H. Bradbury.
Shefford—George Henry Boivin.
Shelburne and Queens—Fleming B. McCurdy.
Sherbrooke—Francis McCrea.
Simcoe, E. Riding—William Henry Bennett.
Simcoe, N. Riding—John Allister Currie.
Simcoe, S. Riding—W. A. Boys.
Soulanges—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, P.C., G.C.M.G.
Souris—Frederick Laurence Schaffner.
Stanstead—Charles Henry Lovell.
Stormont—Duncan O. Alguire.
Strathcona—James M. Douglas.
Sunbury and Queens (N.B.)—Hugh H. McLean.

Temiscouata—Charles Arthur Gauvreau.
Terrebonne—Hon. Wilfrid Bruno Nantel.
Three Rivers and St. Maurice—Hon. Jacques Bureau.
Thunder Bay and Rainy River—John James Carrick.
Toronto, Centre—Edmund Bristol.

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

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

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

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

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—REVISED EDITION

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Speaker: HON. THOMAS SIMPSON SPROULE.

Thursday, January 15, 1914.

The Parliament which had been prorogued from time to time to the 15th day of January, 1914, met this day at Ottawa, for the despatch of business.

The House met at three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER read a communication from the Governor General's Secretary announcing that His Royal Highness would proceed to the Senate Chamber at 3 p.m. on Thursday, the 15th instant, for the purpose of formally opening the session of the Dominion Parliament.

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

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned to the Commons Chamber:

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Hon. Mr. Justice Howell and the Hon. Mr. Justice Cameron, two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to 'The Dominion Controverted Elections Act,' a certificate and report relating to the election for the electoral district of Macdonald, by which the said election was declared void.

In conformity with chapter 7, section 70, of the Revised Statutes, 1906, I issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

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

For the electoral district of Maskinongé;
For the electoral district of Three Rivers and St. Maurice—

the election petition in each case being dismissed and the sitting member being declared duly elected.

VACANCIES.

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

Of Arthur Meighen, Esq., member for the electoral district of Portage la Prairie, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, to wit, Solicitor General;
Of Peter Elson, Esq., member for the electoral district of East Middlesex, by decease;
Of Oswald Smith Crocket, Esq., member for the electoral district of York, N.B., by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, to wit, a judge of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick.

NEW MEMBERS.

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

Of Honourable Arthur Meighen for the electoral district of Portage la Prairie;
Of James Morris, Esq., for the electoral district of Chateauguay;
Of Reuben Eldridge Truax, Esq., for the electoral district of South Bruce;
Of Samuel Francis Glass, Esq., for the electoral district of East Middlesex;

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

Of Adelbert Edward Hanna, Esq., for the electoral district of South Lanark;

Of Harry Fulton McLeod, Esq., for the electoral district of York, N.B.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Hon. Arthur Meighen, for the electoral district of Portage la Prairie; introduced by Hon. Robert Rogers and Hon. W. J. Roche.

Adelbert Edward Hanna, Esq., M.D., for the electoral district of South Lanark; introduced by Hon. W. T. White and Hon. J. D. Reid.

Harry Fulton McLeod, Esq., for the electoral district of York, N.B.; introduced by Hon. J. D. Hazen and Hon. L. P. Pelletier.

James Morris, Esq., for the electoral district of Chateauguay; introduced by Hon. George Perley and Hon. W. B. Nantel.

Samuel Francis Glass, Esq., for the electoral district of East Middlesex; introduced by Mr. J. E. Armstrong and Hon. T. W. Crothers.

Alexander Morrison, Esq., for the electoral district of Macdonald; introduced by Hon. Robert Rogers and Hon. W. J. Roche.

Reuben Eldridge Truax, Esq., for the electoral district of South Bruce; introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. W. M. German.

BILL INTRODUCED.

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

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I take this public opportunity of expressing to you all my deep sense of gratitude for the comfort and support that were afforded us at the time of the serious illness of the Duchess of Connaught, by the numerous messages of sympathy that were received from Canada, and by the knowledge, that the hearts of so many Canadians were with us during those dark days. I can only regret that my enforced absence made it impossible for me to fully exercise the duties of my high office during a considerable portion of last year.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to congratulate you upon the remarkable expansion

[Mr. Speaker].

of Canada's trade with other countries in the past fiscal year, during which our total trade far exceeded that of any preceding year.

The bountiful crops with which the Dominion has fortunately been blessed during the past season have been harvested under unusually favourable conditions, which have enabled the transportation companies to make full use of all the facilities at their disposal. Thus the difficulties, which sometimes arose in former years have not been manifest, and an unusually large proportion of the crops have been conveyed to the sea-board before the close of the season of inland navigation.

Canada has been favoured by a long series of prosperous years, and, although at the present moment business is slightly restricted by the financial stringency which prevails throughout the world, I feel convinced that this condition will be merely temporary, and that the boundless resources of this Dominion which are so fully and universally known and recognized, give us the fullest assurance of continued material prosperity and progress.

As a result of the recent decennial census the representation of the different provinces must be readjusted, as required by the British North America Act, and a Bill will be introduced for that purpose.

A Bill consolidating the Railway Act and its various amendments, as well as Bills relating to the Civil Service and to Trust and Loan Companies, will be submitted for your consideration.

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

The volume of immigration during the present fiscal year promises to be greater than that of any preceding year. It has come in greatest measure from the British Isles and from the United States, but a large stream of desirable immigration has also reached our shores from other countries.

You will be pleased to learn that satisfactory arrangements have been made with the various provinces under the Agricultural Instruction Act passed at the last session. My advisers are convinced that the co-operation between the Dominion and the provinces which is thus afforded, will accomplish excellent results, in assuring better agricultural instruction and needful improvement of existing methods of agriculture.

The work on the National Transcontinental railway has been rapidly advanced during the past year, and, notwithstanding the difficulties attending the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, and the provision of terminals, every possible progress has been made in bringing that important project nearer to completion.

In connection with the highly important subject of transportation of our products, the provision of adequate terminal facilities at our great national ports has received and is receiving the attention of my advisers.

You have doubtless learned with satisfaction that the new government terminal elevator at Port Arthur is completed, and that it has been in operation since October last. In conjunction with this, a system of interior terminal elevators has been begun, which will provide largely increased facilities for the farmers of the great grain producing provinces.

The International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, which has been in session in London for several weeks, has had under consideration questions of the highest importance, and it is hoped that its deliberations may result in more effective measures for assuring the safety of the passengers and crews of ocean-going steamships. Representatives of Canada were appointed by Order in Council and have been in attendance at all sessions of the conference.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

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

The estimates for the next fiscal year will be submitted at an early date. They have been prepared with due regard to the necessary development of the resources of the Dominion, coupled with careful attention to economical administration.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In inviting your careful consideration of the subjects to which I have called your attention, I pray that the blessings of Divine Providence may attend your deliberations.

On motion of Hon. Robert Rogers, it was ordered that the Speech of His Royal Highness the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament be taken into consideration on Monday next, and that this order have precedence over all other business except introduction of bills, until disposed of.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. ROGERS: I beg to move, seconded by Hon. J. D. Reid:

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

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

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

On motion of Mr. Rogers, House adjourned at 3.50 p.m., until Monday.

Monday, January 19, 1914.

The House met at three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Copy of Order in Council appointing commissioners under the eleventh chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, intituled An Act respecting the House of Commons.—Right Hon. R. L. Borden.

Forty-sixth Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year 1912-13 (Fisheries).—Hon. J. D. Hazen.

Report of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, for the year ended March 31, 1913.—Right Hon. R. L. Borden.

Report of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police for the year ended March 31, 1913.—Right Hon. R. L. Borden.

Report of the Department of Public Works for the year ended March 31, 1913.—Hon. Robert Rogers.

Report of the Department of Labour for the year ended March 31, 1913.—Hon. T. W. Crothers.

Report on Strikes and Lockouts for the period from 1901 to 1912.—Hon. T. W. Crothers.

Sixth Report of the Registrar of Boards of Conciliation and Investigation of the proceedings under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907, for the year ended March 31, 1913.—Hon. T. W. Crothers.

Report of the Ottawa Improvement Commission for the year ended March 31, 1913.—Hon. W. T. White.

Report of the Auditor General for the year ended March 31, 1913, volume iii.—Hon. W. T. White.

Statement of Governor General's Warrants issued since the last session of Parliament.—Hon. W. T. White.

Statement of Superannuation and Retiring Allowances in the Civil Service for the year ended December 31, 1913.—Hon. W. T. White.

Copy of Order in Council making award of pensions and gratuities to officers of the Royal Canadian Navy.—Hon. W. T. White.

List of Shareholders of Chartered Banks of the Dominion of Canada for the year ended December 31, 1912.—Hon. W. T. White.

Public Accounts of Canada for the year ended March 31, 1913.—Hon. W. T. White.

Statement of Temporary Loans since March 31, 1913.—Hon. W. T. White.

Statement of Treasury Bills discounted since March 31, 1913.—Hon. W. T. White.

Statement of Civil Service Insurance for the year ended March 31, 1913.—Hon. W. T. White.

Statement of Expenditure on account of Miscellaneous Unforeseen Expenses from April 1, 1913, to January 14, 1914, in accordance with the Appropriation Act of 1913-14.—Hon. W. T. White.

Statement of the Affairs of the Royal Society of Canada for the year ended April 30, 1913.—Hon. W. T. White.

TITLES OF HONOUR.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 3, to abolish Titles of Honour in Canada. He said: It has been rumoured that there is some danger of the spirit of democracy in Canada being compromised, perhaps not by this Government, but by the existence of conditions whi h will enable the representatives of the people, through a misconception of their duty, to create titles of honour which are contrary to the spirit of democracy in Canada. This Bill refers to the powers and jurisdiction of this Parliament, and is intended to abolish such titles of honour, and to restore things to a normal condition of democracy.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE, moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 4, to amend the Criminal Code. He said: The Bill is self-explanatory. Its purpose is to amend the Criminal Code with the view of abolishing in toto the death penalty in Canada. I feel that the death penalty is a blot on Christendom, a blight on religion and a reproach to any Christian nation allowing it to stand on its statute-books.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

HOURS OF LABOUR ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 7, respecting the hours of labour on public works. He said: The Bill which I now present to the House has been on the Order Paper for the past two sessions. Every one knows why the Bill was not reached last year, but I hope that this year we shall have time to reach it. As I said last session, I trust that the present Government will have the same disposition to accept this Bill as they had when they were on the opposition side of the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS.

PUBLIC BILLS.

Bill No. 2, to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—Mr. Burnham.

Bill No. 5, respecting the Pollution of Navigable Waters.—Mr. Bradbury.

Bill No. 6, to regulate Cold Storage.—Mr. Bradbury.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

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

Mr. H. F. McLEOD (York, N.B.) rose to move that an Address be presented to His Royal Highness the Governor General offering the humble thanks of this House to His Royal Highness for the gracious speech which he has been pleased to make to both Houses of Parliament. He said:

I appreciate the kindly reception which has been given me on rising to-day, a reception, I fancy, that is accorded to every new member who makes his initial step in this House of Commons. I may be forgiven, Sir, if I find myself a bit embarrassed when, for the first time, I rise in this Chamber to say a few words, a Chamber that has with it and in it and about it such a wondrous wealth of tradition of the days gone by, such a glory of historic memories of the men of both political parties who have shaped the destinies of this young nation. The thought that will perhaps be uppermost in the mind of any man rising to address this House for the first time, as it is in mine, is that, after all, it is worth while to sacrifice something of material advantage to enter public life, to serve, in even the most humble capacity, this young nation which we all love.

His Royal Highness, in the speech which he was pleased to deliver at the opening of this session, made reference to the comfort and support that went out from the Canadian people to himself and his family during the illness of the Duchess in the summer just gone. May I say—and I think I voice the feeling not only of this House but of the Canadian people—that from every city, hamlet and farm in this broad land there went out a genuine feeling of heartfelt sympathy not only because His Royal Highness comes here as a member of the Royal Family, not only because following a long line of illustrious predecessors in the office of the Governor General, he has fully lived up to the high tradition maintained in the past in that office, but because of the kindly courtesy and the heartfelt sympathy which the Duchess herself has shown wherever she has gone in Canada.

A word should be said in regard to the fact that in the fiscal year just closed, Canada reached the high water mark of her trade with other countries. This country to-day is no longer content to sit quietly by while other countries are gathering up the trade markets of the world. Our people and merchants are seeking every port and every country for their merchandise; and the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), not now in his place in this House, has in his portfolio and position no sinecure although it may have been created as such. No; his office is a living vital factor in the commerce and trade of this country, making for the upbuilding of Canada, so far as its trade and commerce with other countries is concerned. Canada is not doing business in any back street to-day. Canada to-day is just leaping into prominence. She is commanding now the admiration of the world and sending her products to all corners of the world; her merchants are competing on equal terms with big merchants all over the wide world. And what is the result? The result is the building up in Canada of the happy home of the labourer, the mechanic and the artisan to make this country great that we live in and that we of both political parties are here to do our best to serve.

We in Canada, in common with all the countries of the world, have felt some of the financial stress, the tightness of money and financial stringency prevailing everywhere during last year. It would be folly for any man to stand in his place here and say that Canada to-day was not feeling the touch of hard times, to assert that Canada was not touched by the tightness of money as every other country in the world was touched; but I know of no country in the world that has stood up against those hard times and that period of money tightness in the way Canada did. That is absolutely true of the Maritime Provinces, and New Brunswick especially, the province from which I come. In our province, we never had a better business or a better Christmas trade or easier money than we had in 1913. In a year when there was money tightness and financial depression all over the world, it was fortunate that we had in Western Canada—and not only in Western Canada but in Eastern Canada as well, humbler perhaps in production but none the less a producing element in this country—I say it was fortunate that we had in Western Canada the most bountiful wheat crop that this country ever knew. It was eminently fortunate also that we had transportation facilities such that the wheat crop was moved as it never was moved before in the history of this country, making the most prompt money return to the farmers of the middle West at a time when such was the best thing that could happen to them and the best thing that could happen to Canada generally. I do not know that I may claim any credit for the Government or party which I support, because of the condition of the transportation facilities. But I do know that if the crop had not been moved the people would have been hammering at the doors of this Government and worrying this Government to death because it was not moved expeditiously.

Perhaps the most important subject mentioned in the speech from the Throne is the Redistribution Bill. Certainly it is a matter of vital importance to the province from which I come, and to those other provinces down by the sea. I just wish for a moment to discuss the Redistribution Bill, not in any narrow, sectional or provincial aspect, because, Sir, I take it that when a man enters this House—or whether he does not for that matter—whether he comes from one province or another, he is a Canadian first of all. He forgets the narrow boundaries of provinces, and remembers that he is a Canadian and has regard only for the upbuilding of this nation.

I may be permitted to discuss just for a moment the question of redistribution from the point of view of a Maritime provinces man. If we follow the same principle that was followed after the census of 1891 and 1901, the representation of the Maritime provinces after the next Redistribution Bill will be: Nova Scotia, 16; New Brunswick, 11; Prince Edward Island, 3. That is, we will have 30 representatives in this Parliament where, at the time of Confederation, we had 40. I want to frankly admit to this House, and to you, Mr. Speaker, that from a legal point of view we have absolutely no status. The decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, affirmed by the Privy Council, has settled, so far as present decisions are concerned, that we cannot hold our original representation, but I submit that though we have not a strong or in fact any legal status, we have the strongest moral and equitable standing. It is undoubtedly correct that at the time of Confederation the Fathers of Confederation had no thought in their minds of a re-adjustment downward. The only thought in their minds was a re-adjustment upward. They

were optimists, that is true. They could not at that time foresee the growth of the West. Prince Edward Island, I want to frankly admit, stands in the best position of all, and it can be shown, although I do not wish to trouble the House with any citations to-day, that there was a distinct agreement at the time Prince Edward Island entered Confederation that she should have a minimum representation of six members. That was not made a part of Section 149 of the British North America Act, but I submit to this House that population is not, and should not be, the sole guide in representation. Self-governing colonies must have adequate representation. In the minds of the men who represented New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, there was no thought of a loss in representation. It could not have been in the minds of those men, sublime optimists as they were, that there would grow up in this country a great western country that they knew little of in those days. They could not foresee that there would rise up from their own firesides in those provinces down by the sea their best blood to go out into Western Canada and to make that western country great. I say this in no narrow spirit. I am as proud as any man can be of the growth of these magnificent provinces, but I do say that we should devote our best efforts to enabling our young men and our young women to build up all our great and mighty provinces under one flag of empire, the empire we love. This country owes something of equity, something of justice, to the provinces which have suffered by the marvellous growth that we all delight in of the West. Just these words to-day in regard to the matter of re-distribution; I thought I ought to say something about it.

Representing a farming community as I do, I want to say one word and to bear my tribute, honestly borne, to the gentleman who occupies the position of Minister of Agriculture in this country. Since this Government has come into power, the farmers of my province, at all events, have known that there was a Department of Agriculture. In my province—and this applies to every province in the Dominion—agricultural schools have not only been made possible, but we already have one agricultural school at Sussex just about to be opened, and another in Woodstock that will be opened in a very short time. We have realized the goal of technical education for the farmer and the son of the farmer. And in these days, when unfortunately the city does attract the boys and when the scarcity of labour is the tremendous problem that the farmer has to solve; in these days when you have to make farm life attractive to keep the boys and girls on the farm, we have provided technical education not only in the agricultural schools but we have technical education expounded throughout the summer time on the farms themselves, so that it is brought right down close to the farmer and he and his son have opportunity to become real scientific farmers, to love their work, to stay on the farm. In this way it is to be hoped the problem will be solved of bringing the people back to the land.

We are passing through in this country—I suppose it is the history of the world—a period when the drift of population is away from the land, a most unhappy condition. Women's institutes, which the present Minister of Agriculture has assisted so much, are designed to remove what some people are pleased to call the humdrum of farm life, to make cheerful and pleasant the farmer's home life in the evenings, and to cause him to be contented with his surroundings. All this must be of great advantage to our country and its people, because Canada can only maintain its position as a wealthy and growing wealthier country if the people stay on the farm so that we may be a great producing nation.

While I have said that one word in regard to farming, may I be allowed to say just another word in regard to immigration? It is predicted in the Speech from the Throne that this year's immigration will be greater than ever in the history of the country, and we trust it may be so. But, modestly, may I suggest this, that the great lesson we must learn in Canada is not to have indiscriminate immigration but to keep the breed pure, and I believe the breed can be kept pure. The great majority of the immigrants which have come to our shores in recent years have been English, Scotch, French and Irish. I want the Northern races; I want them because they are adapted to this country. The French people come from a more southern clime, it is true, but the French people in the early days of our country's history came to Canada, and, in face of hardships almost unrecountable, they helped to make this country great. We want the races I have referred to, but we do not want such immigrants as came to us in days gone by, and especially do we not want such as those which helped to

swell the population of the United States to such great number, but to the great disadvantage, in my judgment, of the people of the United States.

Reference has been made to the National Transcontinental railway and to its early completion. I regret very much to interject a harsh note into a function which is supposed to be without any harshness, but I must point out that we in the province of New Brunswick are building a railway down the valley of the St. John known as the St. John Valley Railway. It extends from a point on the National Transcontinental railway at or near Grand Falls, 220 miles down the river, to the port of St. John. The burden upon the province of New Brunswick—notwithstanding the very material assistance already received and more to be asked for from this Government—the burden entailed by this railway upon the province of New Brunswick has been tremendous. The necessity for this burden upon our Province need never have been had the National Transcontinental Railway been located by the only route sane men would have chosen. The Transcontinental railway in New Brunswick runs from Edmundston, in the county of Madawaska, across to Chipman, in the county of Queens, and on its route through that province it will not pick up one pound of local traffic; it only means the burning up of the revenue producing forests of the province. I would not be doing justice to the people I stand for in the province of New Brunswick did I not openly declare that a great wrong has been committed against them, and that line in its course through the province stands as a monument of that great wrong. There is one way, not to right the wrong, but there is one way by which it can be to some extent remedied, and that is if we could build a small branch from the divisional point of Nappodogan to connect with the Intercolonial railway at Cross Creek, getting running rights down over the railway to the port of St. John. Unless that is done —and I purpose in so far as I have power to urge it upon Parliament and upon this Government—unless that is done, the money already expended on the Transcontinental railway in New Brunswick (and I am fair in saying it has cost $100,000 per mile) is worse than wasted. I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, to have had to interject that harsh note.

I want to say, Sir, that there are two things not in the Speech this year, but which have been in the Speech in days gone by. One of these is a reference to a Bill in aid of the highways in this country. In 1911 and in 1912, as you will remember, a Bill was introduced providing for the expenditure of one million dollars on the highways of our various provinces, and providing also for the distribution of that money under the fairest and most equitable terms. That Bill caught the heart of the provinces of Canada. Nothing else could be done that would appeal more to the farming population that I represent. Nothing else could be done to make it easier for the farmer to stay on the land, because his mode of transportation to get his crop to the nearest railway station is over the roads. It meant in my province $50,000 to $60,000 in 1911-12. If the roads had been built, it would have greatly improved transportation facilities. I could hardly understand the partisanship run mad, and that again in 1912-13, when a million and a half of money was voted by the representatives of the people of this country, the Bill should again be defeated. I tell you frankly that we, in the province of New Brunswick, looked forward with the greatest anticipation to receiving that money. We needed it; other provinces needed it, and I can only regret that men found it possible, through a spirit of partisanship, to take away from their own people those things that came nearer to doing practical good to the people whence they came than any other thing could possibly do.

Before I sit down, I wish to speak with regard to another matter that is not mentioned in the Speech. I am not specifically informed as to why no reference is made to naval aid to the mother land, but I fancy that the right honourable leader of this Government (Mr. Borden) having once had the humiliating spectacle of advertising to the world that any body of men, whether responsible or otherwise, would refuse to help Canada to enter upon her duties, her privileges and her responsibilities in the matter of naval aid, did not desire to undergo a similar experience a second time. I am not going to go into sky-rockets. I simply want to say this, Mr. Speaker. For many years before Canada found her feet, before we were possessed of the buoyant revenue that we have to-day, Canada allowed the taxpayers of a little sea-girt island to put their hands into their pockets and to pay the bill. Now we have grown big. We consider ourselves quite a people. We call ourselves a nation. We have at least this, that to this country has come, as

has come to every country under the flag, to black and white, to yellow and red, to every creed and colour, the right of liberty and equal citizenship under the flag. Yet, with our buoyant revenues, with our wealth of potential greatness, we have said that we are not willing to bear our share of the defence of that nation, of which we so often say we are proud to form a part. I rather sympathize with the Government and with the right honourable Leader of the Government in the disposition which made him refrain this year from mentioning naval aid in the Speech.

I thank you, Sir, and honourable members on both sides of this House for the kindly feeling with which you have listened to the rambling remarks of a novice. I am not partisan enough to think that honourable members on both sides are not endeavouring to serve this great country and this great Empire, and I hope that with honourable members on both sides of this House I shall do my humble part in advancing the interest of this young Canada that we love.

Mr. J. O. LAVALLEE (Bellechasse) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, considering my lack of experience I should undoubtedly have shun the honour of seconding the mover of the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, had I not realized at the same time that the invitation was intended as a compliment to that community of farmers and settlers in whose midst I consider myself happy to dwell.

Moreover the compliment thus paid is presently being turned into a priceless favour, since I am permitted to express myself in that language which my fellow-countrymen appreciate so highly and which the right hon. leader of this Government, as well as the majority of his colleagues, is proud to be able to understand and to speak.

Whenever my hon. friends on the other side have an opportunity of meeting the French-Canadian electors of the province of Quebec or elsewhere, they should to my mind thank Providence for having entrusted with the management of public affairs in this country, a prime minister who understands and enjoys speaking it, though sprung from a different stock.

And in making public acknowledgment of this fact, they may be making amends for having allowed a despicable prejudice to gain currency in their interest, viz. that an English-speaking prime minister could not possibly be as well disposed towards, or as devoted to, the French-Canadian people.

On behalf of my constitutents and on my own behalf, on behalf of those pioneers of colonization who are carrying on the work started three centuries ago for a greater and more united Canada, I beg to tender to the right hon. Prime Minister the assurance of my most hearty gratitude for this kindly courtesy.

It has been stated that the twentieth century will be the century of Canada. I may add that it will be such only insomuch as agriculture and the agricultural class will have been granted their due share of influence in public affairs. It will be the century of Canada only in so much as this quarter of a century will have been the golden age of agriculture.

It was incumbent on this Government to accomplish for Canada what a Sully, under Henry the Fourth, accomplished for France in the sixteenth century. We read in history that, with a view to allaying the hard times which France had been suffering for a number of years, and with a view at the same time to improving the financial status of his government, that great statesman endeavoured to foster agriculture by having more land cleared, by building and repairing bridges, improving means of transportation, in short by doing for the farmer's benefit all that was of a nature to help him on and to improve his opportunities. 'Ploughing and pasturage, those, he was wont to say, are the real gold mines of Peru.'

Those means which ensured to France in the early seventeenth century a period of real and solid wealth and prosperity, should benefit our country to a large extent. Similar means are bound to bring about similar results.

Such is my sincere belief, Mr. Speaker, and I am satisfied that this same policy would successfully, and once for all, solve the problem of the high cost of living which has been growing on us for the last decade, and which has its starting point in the fact that agricultural production has not kept pace with the increase of population in business and industrial centres.

I say that within the last ten years the progress of agriculture, as well as of the live stock industry, has not been on a par with the growth of population. The last census contains interesting statistics in this connection. They go to show that the population of several countries in the older

provinces, instead of growing has diminished, and that business and manufacturing towns and cities have grown in proportion. Rule of thumb and slipshod methods have had the upper hand over the suggestions of a reasoned and progressive husbandry, such as would have resulted from a practical and painstaking teaching of agriculture. Accordingly we have witnessed the exodus of farmers' sons towards the cities, and the consequent scarcity of that labour with which farming cannot dispense.

So it was that on reaching power this Government had to find some immediate means of preventing an imminent crisis, by means of legislation for the encouragement of agriculture and an appropriation of ten millions towards that end.

It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that we have not yet in such short time felt the beneficial effects of such a policy. In the province of Quebec peradventure, we may have to wait longer than elsewhere for such beneficial effects; despite the safeguards taken and the agreements entered into, the Quebec local authorities do not deem it advisable to conform to the spirit of the law and the views of the Dominion Minister of Agriculture. There, more so than elsewhere, people allow themselves to be too closely inspired and guided by considerations foreign to the progress of agriculture.

I hope to be granted an opportunity later on to recur this matter and to show in what way Dominion subsidies are expended in some counties for the mere purpose of making electors believe that things in Ottawa are actually managed by the Liberal party.

Referring once more to the Address, I may say that the people of this country rejoice with His Highness the Governor General on account of the bountiful crops which Providence has bestowed on this country in the course of the year just expired.

Whoever has had an opportunity of visiting the various provinces of the Dominion in the harvesting season of last year, must have realized, indeed, the unspeakable prosperity of this great Dominion. The yield has been immense and the quality good, as a rule.

Providence has been lavish, and hon. gentlemen may possibly condescend to thank her for showing such generosity in favour of an administration whose views and principles they do not always approve. Considering how superabundant the products, some apprehension was entertained as to the possibility of carrying to their destination that wealth of the farms. Fortunately, thanks to the foresight of the Railway Department, thanks to the prompt action taken by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, that much feared congestion of traffic and grain transportation was avoided. Early in the season, and without any undue stoppage, the grain from the West was moved to the elevators and other terminals along the railway lines and canals, and in greater proportion than heretofore through our Canadian ports and state-aided railway lines.

That shows plainly, Mr. Speaker, that by continuing to develop and improve our means of transportation, by ensuring the completion of our great railway lines now in course of construction, such as the National Transcontinental, the Hudson Bay railway, and I might add, by bringing about the building of the Georgian Bay canal, as soon as the Government are in a position to start that great work, they will be not only setting the framework of Confederation on a solid basis, through a closer union of the provinces, but besides they will be giving greater stability to market conditions and prices, and fostering commercial intercourse between the East and the West for the greater advantage of the country as a whole.

The continuous carrying out of a well matured plan for the improvement of our transportation facilities will accomplish more towards allaying that crisis and that craving for new treaties with the United States to the detriment of Canada, than would reciprocity, which some people look upon as a sort of cure-all the ills with which our country may be afflicted.

We still hear at this moment the voice of two provinces, Alberta and Saskatchewan, praying for reciprocity, on account of the surplus value their products would acquire on the United States markets, and which tariff barriers prevent them from securing. But, to my mind, Mr Speaker, that appeal will become less insistent, as our transportation facilities between the eastern and western seaboards grow and reach their full development, for then these people will find it just as advantageous to sell their products here or in Europe, as to ship them to the United States, especially now that our railways are provided with proper cold storage facilities at their terminals.

It may not be irrelevant and without interest, Mr. Speaker, to recall just now an event, an epoch-making event in the an-

nals of the old city of Champlain, which has left a profound impression on the minds of its inhabitants. I refer to the visit paid during recess to Quebec and Levis by the right hon. leader of this Government in company with the hon. Minister of Public Works, the hon. Postmaster General and the hon. Minister of Marine.

They did not, as so many had done before them in later years, come in quest of laurels or encomiums; they came as promoters and builders of works, large, durable and great, in accord with their dreams of the great future they foresee for that region, heretofore practically ignored and neglected.

The days of trifling and dilly-dallying are over. Confidence is gaining ground on every hand, whether in agriculture, in finance, in business or industry. This Government, faithful to its traditions and to its national policy, guides Canada in its ascent towards its true destiny. The empire, I might say the whole of Europe, have their eyes on us, and we are in a way to secure for ourselves an enviable place among the nations of the world, under the protection of the British flag.

Is it any wonder that an ever increasing stream of imigration should be turning towards Canada? The Dominion has become as it were the centre of attraction for Latin Europe, the promised land of the empire. It is no longer that snow-bound and ice-bound country, it is the wheat granary of the world and the finest gem in the British Crown.

Accordingly the Department of the Interior has been called upon to exert itself to the utmost, in order to be able to properly look after these new arrivals and locate them on homesteads at its disposal, with a view to facilitating their first efforts as settlers on the land.

If, on the other hand, and with the object of securing work in the cities a certain proportion of those immigrants, through motives which the department is not in a position to control or cast aside, have temporarily been drawn away from the farm, the greater part have settled thereon. This is no longer the time when roving Doukhobors, satisfied that they had some divine mission to fulfil, roamed through the western country singing the praises of the powers that be.

As soon as this Government reached power, the problem of immigration and of the bringing home of our people was taken up. Commissioners were appointed to look into the conditions under which that branch of the service had been managed.

While I do not wish to anticipate, I think I am safe in stating that there was brought to light a state of things such that this Government will find itself under the necessity of bringing about important changes in the system advocated and applied by our predecessors in this connection. Some ten, fifteen or twenty years ago, large numbers of Canadians had under our eyes been induced to cross the border; and those people were unable to come back home on account of the apathy of the then Government.

Nevertheless all of them remember their native land; their manners are after our own, and they have preserved the best traditions which make hardy and energetic peoples. At heart and in mind they have remained Canadians, they are attached to our institutions and are still loyal to the British Crown, though living under the Stars and Stripes. As I have said, the overhauling of that branch of the department of immigration on a more practical, fairer and more thoroughly national basis, will, if I am not mistaken, be taken up by this Government, and our Canadians settled over there will thus be enabled once more to enjoy the bracing conditions of our Canadian clime.

True, owing to the enterprise of our pioneer parish priests, with no other resources than their self-sacrifice and fervour, which recall those of the early makers of Canada. that return home is taking in larger numbers from year to year; new churches are being built in parts heretofore unexplored. In northern Ontario as well as in the farthest west, at the foot of the Rockies, French-speaking emigrants brought back from the United States are settling down and enlarging the realm of civilization and of the Canadian fatherland. I entertain the hope that in years to come, further impetus will be given to the work of bringing back home our people, through the painstaking action taken by the Conservative government in the matter.

The hon, gentleman who has just taken his seat, aptly characterized and described the present administration from the business point of view; he gave us a thorough insight into the country's financial conditions. The conclusion is forced upon us that, notwithstanding the large amounts appropriated for public works, notwithstanding the heavy expendi-

ture incurred towards the utilization of our industrial and trade opportunities and the development of our transportation facilities on land and on water, notwithstanding the great works being carried on at Halifax, Québec, St. John and elsewhere, the hon. Minister of Finance has still in hand funds available for the cutting down of the public debt and the registering of surpluses.

That is the best of evidence that a wise government is not impoverished through the proper expenditure of public funds. What characterizes bad governments is the improper spending of the revenues left at their disposal. Such unprecedented success in the financial history of the Canadian Government is the result of the strictest economy, of an umimpeachable honesty, combined with industry and genius in the supervision of all and every department. We hear it stated in all quarters, and rightly so, that it was a business government the people put into power in 1911. That reputation has been well sustained, since after holding power for a period of only two years, without boasting or trumpery, this Government has made for itself a record which recommends it irresistibly to the confidence and respect of the Canadian people.

And should I recall the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the province of Québec, one of whose sons was honoured with the premiership of the Dominion, seemed for a while as if in a state of lethargy; but now they are awakening and taking their place along with the other provinces under the colours of the great Liberal-Conservative Party. That means the vendication of the Conservative party, the conversion of the people to the men who advocated the National Policy and laid the foundation of the Canadian nationality in America. Quebec acknowledges as her benefactors and leaders those who carried on the life work of Macdonald and Cartier.

Their names stand for honesty, perseverance, industry and patriotism. Such are the facts which entitle the representative of the province of Quebec in the Cabinet to hold in the public opinion, in the hearts and minds of the French-Canadians, the place which was held by Cartier some fifty years ago.

It may not be amiss to state right here that the Post Office department has in the person of the present Postmaster General not only a man of push and progress, but also a benefactor of the people. Not content with adjusting and increasing the salaries of hosts of underpaid civil servants, he resolved that the whole country would have the benefit of that important service, and acordingly provided for the establishment of numerous post offices, extended the rural delivery system and, particularly caused Parliament to pass that parcels post legislation from which great results are expected by the country folk.

Differently from some of his predecessors, unmindful of what it might bring to himself, he has accomplished results out of his own mind, which are of great benefit to the people. In less than two years, the Post Office Department, as well as the Public Works Department, has given results which overshadow all that had been done during the fifteen previous years. I am merely speaking aloud what the people feel and think, despite the back-sliding and slanders of a blinded press, organized and paid for the purpose.

As soon as a fairer redistribution of the constituencies will have been effected, so as to enable the electors to make known their will, this Government (there is no undue optimism in thinking so), will be sustained by a majority of them. Have we not had, during recess at different times and in various parts, expressions of the popular will?

Considering those indications of the trend of public opinion, considering the facts which proclaim the good management of this Administration, considering the advance made in so short a period, this is the time to state and repeat that, since Providence and the people are with us, you should join us also. Why should gentlemen on the other side wage war on us, now that industry, commerce and agriculture have shaken off the fetters of the past, and entered an area of progress and prosperity? Why should they wage war on us when we have the support of the people?

As I said a moment ago, dickering, dilly-dallying, encomiums are no longer in season. Canada, our common country, is in need of the co-operation of all men of good will. As representatives of the people, we are entrusted with the glorious task, I should say the privilege, of applying our energy to the building up of this country, not only into the finest colony, but into the nation to-morrow.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I may be allowed to thank my hon. colleagues in this House for having kept in mind that youth is generous, confident and enthusiastic, and for having shown indulgence on this occasion.

I wholly approve of the remarks made

by the eloquent mover of the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, and it is with infinite pleasure that I second the motion.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We have all listened with great interest and still greater pleasure to the observations with which we have been favoured by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. McLeod) and the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lavallee). I say we have all listened with interest and pleasure, though some of us, and I amongst them, cannot subscribe to many of the statements both of fact and of opinion made by these hon. gentlemen. Notwithstanding all differences, however, we on this side of the House are all happy to join with our friends on the other side in extending congratulations to both the mover and the seconder of the Address. My hon. friend from York, N.B.—if he permits me to apply that term to him—came into this House preceded by a reputation earned in another sphere; and it is only fair to him to say—and it is a great pleasure for me to say—that on this occasion he has been quite equal to his reputation. Though I differ with him in many things, as I said a moment ago, I recognize the felicitous manner in which his views were expressed. He was especially happy in the terms in which he expressed to Their Royal Highnesses the sentiments of deep sympathy which we and all the people of Canada have felt for them in the cruel ordeal through which they have passed, an ordeal which involved for the one long days and weeks of suffering almost between life and death, and for the other a long agony of suspense and anxiety. It is the simple truth, as has been said by my hon. friend from York, N.B., that there was sincere rejoicing among all classes of the community at the almost miraculous escape of Her Royal Highness, not solely on account of the high position she occupies, but still more because of the many domestic virtues and womanly graces, the many high qualities of heart and mind, of which she has given so many evidences during her short stay amongst us. All classes of Canadians have learned, and every day learn more and more, to appreciate these qualities of mind and heart, and daily the prayers from millions of Canadian homes rise fervent to Heaven for her complete recovery.

Perhaps my hon. friend will not be surprised, however, if I say that when he departed from this subject and dealt with the public business of the country, his remarks were not altogether so felicitous, at least in my opinion. He adopted toward the Administration, so far as the course of public business is concerned, a most eulogistic tone, a tone which, I believe, was not altogether in accord with the sober truth of the record. But if I say this it is not at all because I wish to take issue with my hon. friend on this point or to quarrel with him; for, remembering that once I myself was young, I know that it is always allowable to youth to be enthusiastic and even to carry enthusiasm not only to the extreme limit of exaggeration but even to the extreme limit of blind misconception.

Had my hon. friend been in this House before, I am sure he would have asked some explanations from the Government for having been so tardy in summoning Parliament together, for having allowed the months of November and December to pass without moving a finger toward the despatch of the busness of the country. My hon. friend is not aware, as you, Mr. Speaker, and I are aware, and as the Government I am sure cannot have forgotten, that it is a part of the law of this Parliament—the well-recognized though unwritten law—that Parliament ought to meet in the early fall and in any case not later than the month of November unless some great public event should interpose. Indeed, so well recognized is this law that the financial year was some years ago, changed in consequence of it, so as to run from the 1st of April to the 31st of March, instead of, as before, from the 1st of July to the 30th of June. What can be the reason why Parliament was not summoned as it should have been summoned, in the early fall? What is the public reason which can be invoked by the Government for having been so tardy and dilatory? What reason can there be except the reason which causes the insolvent debtor with a small list of assets and a long list of liabilities to put off the day when he must meet the creditors to whom he must give an account? So the Government has been putting off, and putting off, and putting off, until the very last moment when they had to meet Parliament, their creditor and their master—and meet it with a very small list of assets and a long list of liabilities.

Had my hon. friend from York, N.B., been longer in Parliament he would have noticed something new on the Treasury benches. My hon. friend from Bellechasse may well have noticed it, for he has been here for two sessions. There are two

features to which I wish to call attention, of which one is new and the other is not new. The new feature is that we have on the Treasury benches, at long last, a Solicitor General. It took a long time to fill that vacancy. The mantle remained suspended for something like two years, but at last it has fallen on the shoulders of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). My compliments to the Solicitor General. I speak my mind frankly when I state that I believe he is well qualified for the position—well qualified from the legal point of view and still better qualified from the political point of view. He has been in this House for some years. It has been my pleasure to observe him almost from the day he came here; and almost from his first appearance we have had evidences not a few that he is endowed with a very subtle mind, that he is a past master dialectician. But, if I must speak my mind fully and give my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie all the credit to which he is entitled, I must say that while he is a clever dialectician, he is a still cleverer sophist. There are few men in this House or out of it who can clothe fallacies and paradoxes with more fitting garments than can the hon. gentleman. When it comes to the task of making the worse appear the better reason, few men can do more than my hon. friend the new Solicitor General. And, if the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) were in his place, I would tell him that he had better look to his laurels, for even at his own game the Solicitor General can give him points. But the mystery to me is here: The qualifications of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie were obvious; not only we but the public—everybody—knew them. Why, then, has it taken so long for my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to discover them? I cannot imagine that my right hon. friend with his acute mind did not see that which was obvious to everybody. The mystery is why he should have allowed twelve months, twenty-four months, to elapse, without filling the portfolio which he has at last filled. Of course, the reason may have been that, while he was as well aware as others of the qualifications of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, yet that hon. member was not the only pebble on the beach. The beach was strewn with pebbles. Looking before me now, I can see one, two, three four, five, six—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes, six I can see, the friends of each of whom believed that he was entitled to occupy the position, and each one of whom believed that he was more entitled to it than his neighbour. How is it that they have been left and my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie chosen? That is where the subtle mind of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie served him. That subtle mind taught him that something more than legal ability must play a part in the choice to be made. He was not satisfied to show only his ability as a member of this House; he showed his teeth also. And when the Prime Minister saw those sharp teeth bared and ready to sink into his quivering flesh, all hesitation was gone.

You will remember that towards the end of last session the Bank Bill came back from the Senate, with some amendments. The Minister of Finance, who was in charge of the Bill, accepted the amendments, and explained them to the House. He said that they were trivial, nominal, and of no consequence; that although they were, perhaps, of some improvement to the measure, they affected in no way the principle of it. Thereupon there was a storm of indignation, or rather of pretended indignation, on the other side of the House. Some hon. gentlemen rose to protest, and the most valiant of these was the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). He attacked the amendments most violently; he said that they changed the whole tenor of the Bill; he shot at the Senate, which he could not reach, and over the heads of the Government, whom he wished not to hurt. It was more than an attack; it was a warning. The right hon. gentleman remembered a page in the parliamentary history of England upon which it is recorded that when Sir Robert Walpole was prime minister a young cavalry officer was elected to Parliament, and the moment he had spoken the Prime Minister said to his friends, 'that warhorse must be muzzled.' It is evident that when my hon. friend the Prime Minister heard the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, he said to himself that that hon. gentleman would have to be muzzled. Unfortunately, as my hon. friend has chosen the great William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, as his model, and as the Minister of Finance has gone so far as to approve the action of the Senate, my hon. friend the new Solicitor General will have to use his best ability to approve also, whatever may be his own feelings.

The other circumstance to which attention should be called, and one with which we are unfortunately commencing to be familiar, is the absence of my hon. friend the Minister of

Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). I am aware that that hon. gentleman is absent in England, and that he is attending the sittings of a commission appointed in consequence of a resolution passed by the last Imperial Conference. These duties are important, but they are in no way connected with the Department of Trade and Commerce; in fact, such duties should never have been entrusted to a Minister of the Crown. The late Government had recommended a man of great commercial ability, and of high standing in the financial world, Mr. P. C. Larkin; but this recommendation was disregarded and the appointment cancelled by the present Government when they came into office. This was, I believe, the first act in their debauchery of dismissals; the last we have not heard. The Minister of Trade and Commerce should never have taken these duties to which I have referred. He should have remembered that, according to Scripture, no man can serve two masters, for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. This is exactly what has taken place. My hon. friend has adopted his duties as commissioner and he has forgotten his duties as minister. He was absent during the greater part of last session; he may be absent the greater part of this session. It is true that last year he had the excuse, as was hinted a moment ago by the mover of the Address, that he was in search of trade for the growers and producers of Canada—a most laudable ambition. He went to China, and he went to Japan. I speak not by way of condemnation, but I may add that we have it upon good authority that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce contemplates sending bakers to China and Japan to teach the Chinese and the Japanes the superiority of a wheat diet over a rice diet. Again I say I do not condemn; I entirely approve. Let the Minister of Trade and Commerce send not only bakers, but confectioners, pastry cooks, and culinary missionaries of every description, and let their mission be to wean the celestials from their gastronomical proclivities; from swallows' nests, sharks' fins, bamboo roots and ducks' eggs two years old, and induce them to substitute for these delicacies the modern preparations of wheat flour, and anything and everything in the way of cereals, not forgetting porridge, the food of the strong and the free in this part of the world. If my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, as a result of his pilgrimages to Japan and China, will succeed in obtaining for this country the sale of one more barrel of flour than we have exported hitherto, the Government will have done more than they have so far accomplished during their four years of office.

The Speech from the Throne is remarkable for two things: first, for what it contains, and, second, for what it omits. Before I pass to what it omits, let me refer to what it contains. It has a paragraph referring to the Hudson Bay railway, about which I do not propose to say anything upon this occasion; we must have more information than is contained in the Speech from the Throne before we discuss that subject. But let me read this paragraph with regard to the Transcontinental railway:

> The work on the National Transcontinental railway has been rapidly advanced during the last year, and, notwithstanding the difficulties attending the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, and the provision of terminals, every possible progress has been made in bringing that important project nearer to completion.

If the National Transcontinental railway has been rapidly advanced, we have only the word of the Speech for it, and we are not in much of a position to discuss the whole matter. At all events, we know enough to say, without any fear of contradiction, that if the work of the Transcontinental railway has been advanced, it has not been on the section between Cochrane and Quebec city. This part of the road should be open to traffic to-day, but it is yet far from completion. On the 19th of Februarv last, in the other branch of the legislature, a question was put by Senator Casgrain with regard to the section of the railway between Cochrane and the city of Quebec, in these words:

> Q. What was the length of the gap, in miles, on the 1st of November, 1912, where the grading has not been made between Cochrane and the city of Quebec?—A. Thirty-five miles.
>
> Q. What is the distance between both ends of steel of this gap to-day??—A. Eighty-eight miles.

So at the end of the season last year there were thirty-five miles of grading and eighty-eight miles of steel to be laid on that section; not a very heavy task, and one that should have been accomplished during the summer. I believe that the thirty-five miles of grading has been done, and that the section between Cochrane and Quebec has also been graded.

But yet the road is not in operation in any way and cannot be put in operation. For what reason? For the reason that the Government of the day have completely neglected to provide terminals at the city

of Quebec. What have they done during the two years they have been in office? When we left office, in October, 1911, we had passed contracts to provide provisional terminals. We had a contract amounting to $1,000,000 for a station at the Champlain market. We had contracts ready to be given and I think they had been awarded for the building of wharfs on the front of the St. Lawrence, something like 2,000 feet in length, which were to cost something like $5,000,000. These works were absolutely necessary for the operation of the road. It is impossible to operate a railroad unless you have a station. It is impossible to connect the road with what we hope to have, an ocean service, unless you have wharfs also. What has been done about these wharfs? Not one foot of them has ever been undertaken up to the present time. What has been done at the station? Nothing at all, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) has cancelled that contract. He told us nearly two years ago, in the session of 1911-12, that he would not have the station at the Champlain market, that he was contemplating a union station elsewhere. He told us at the same time that he would have a small station at the Champlain market place. Has this small station been commenced? Not up to the present time. What has been done? The only thing done towards the provision of terminals has been the commencing of shops at St. Romuald. The late commission has laid out the shops at St. Foy; the ground had been purchased and prepared; but the new commission thought it advisable to change the site of the shops and to place them at St. Malo; that is, to transfer them from the valley of the St. Lawrence to the valley of the St. Charles. As to this I pass no judgment because we have not yet had information on this subject. But I know one thing: even if it be good policy, for engineering reasons, to have the site of those shops changed, you cannot use those shops, as has been stated by the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) himself, unless you have a tunnel from the valley of the St. Lawrence to the valley of the St. Charles. Has this work been commenced? It has not. When will it be commenced? It is impossible to say; we have no information. What time will be required for its construction? We do not know. Have the surveys been prepared? I am not aware that they have. No, nothing has been done up to the present time in order to complete the road and make it available. More than that, I understand—and we shall have to ask the information from the Minister of Railways on this point—that an arrangement has been made to have a joint station between the Canadian Pacific railway and the Transcontinental railway. I would like to know if the Grand Trunk Pacific railway has been a party to such an agreement as that. I have reason to believe, and I think I can assert—and I challenge contradiction on this point—that these changes which I have just mentioned, the removal of the shops to St. Malo and the removal of the station from the Champlain market place, have been made without the approval of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, and, under the law passed by this Parliament in 1903, the Grand Trunk Pacific railway must be a party to any such changes as these. If the Grand Trunk Pacific railway had been a party to this arrangement, Parliament, I am sure, would have been made aware of that fact long ago; but up to the present time we have received no information that it is a party. If I am in error in this I would be glad to be informed, and I hope the information will be laid before us at the earliest possible moment; in fact, I may venture to say to the Minister of Railways that he is bound at the earliest moment to place before us not only the report of the Commission of Inquiry which has been investigating the work performed by the late Administration, but all information respecting all changes that have been made by the new Transcontinental Railway Commission upon the work of the late commission.

My hon. friend the mover of the Address referred to some things that were not referred to in the Speech. Yes, there are two things not referred to. One is the Highways Bill. I was surprised to hear my hon. friend the member for York, N.B., (Mr. McLeod) tell us that the measure which was introduced was a fair measure in every particular. I say to him—and we shall have to debate this more than once in this House—that the Highways Bill which was introduced was not only unfair but was in direct violation of the constitution of Canada. It has been stated more than once that the object of this Bill was to help the provinces. I do not deny it; we never denied it; we have always affirmed the principle of the Bill, but we condemned the manner in which it was proposed to help the provinces in this Bill which was in marked contrast to another Bill introduced by the Minister of Agriculture to help the provinces in the matter of agriculture. One was passed and became law. The other was passed with

an amendment, and if it is not law to-day it is not the fault of the Opposition; it is not even the fault of the Upper Chamber; it is the fault of the Government who could not introduce a Bill in accordance with the terms of the constitution. Here is the Bill which was introduced last year with regard to helping the provinces in regard to agriculture. It became law; no objection having been taken to it. Section 4 of that Bill provides that Parliament shall appropriate a certain sum of money. Subsection 1 of section 4 provides:

> The remainder of the appropriation for each year shall be allotted and paid to the governments of the respective provinces in proportion to the populations of the said provinces respectively as determined by the latest decennial census.

Is that fair? This is fair and this is constitutional? Every year an appropriation shall be made according to the census then in force and the money shall be paid to the local Government. Are those the terms of the Highways Bill? They are not. If those had been the terms of the Highways Bill, the Highways Bill would be law to-day as the Agricultural Bill is law to-day. Here are the terms of the Highways Bill; compare them with the terms I have just read from the Agricultural Bill:

> The Governor in Council may, in any year, and upon such terms and subject to such conditions as are prescribed by Order in Council, grant to the several provinces of the Dominion in aid of the improvement of existing highways or bridges, or the construction of new highways or bridges, or for all or any such purposes, subsidies not exceeding in the whole such sum as may in such year be voted by parliament for that purpose.

The Government may, at their sweet will, not pay directly to the provinces, as provided for in the Act for aiding agriculture, but pay or not pay to the provinces, or keep for themselves if they want to do so, the money appropriated by Parliament. I ask the hon. member for York, N.B., who was not in the House last year and who perhaps has not given this legislation the attention which we who were in the House have given to it, to compare the Act with the Bill and then to tell us that he can approve of the Highways Bill. Would he not say, on the contrary, in fairness, that the only method which should have been adopted was the one adopted by the Minister of Agriculture of paying the money to the provinces and letting them expend it themselves. This is the constitution. If we admit—and that nobody can deny—that the highways are under the control of the local Legislature, why was it not done and why was the same principle not adopted in the Highways Bill as in the Agriculture Instruction Bill? Up to the present time we have not received a satisfactory answer on this point, and never shall we, because there is no explanation to be given.

The other thing which is not to be found referred to in the Speech from the Throne is the Naval Aid Bill. It was not more than three weeks ago that the correspondent in the London Times, who is supposed to be deep in the secrets of the Government, wrote to his paper, in a letter which everybody could have read if he had cared to, that the Naval Bill would be introduced again. It is not to be introduced. As to this, I have no comment to make, except that the non-introduction of the Bill to-day is the best possible justification of the attitude of the Liberal party on this question and of the amendment voted by the Senate last session.

The action of the Senate last session, on almost the last day of the last session, just before prorogation, called forth strong animadversions from the other side of the House. The Minister of Finance (Mr. White) on that occasion reviewed the action and attitude of an old friend of his and mine, Sir George Ross, now the leader of the Liberal party in the Senate. He endeavoured to be severe, and very severe to Sir George Ross. He compared him with Daniel Webster, whom he called the great apostate, and applied to him the verses which were applied to Webster:

> Walk backwards; with averted gaze
> And hide the shame.

The passion of my hon. friend has had time to cool. At all events, I tell him—and I hope he is cool enough to understand—that the strictures which he passed upon the dead were the greatest eulogy which he could pass upon the living statesman, because the strictures which were put upon Daniel Webster have not been justified by the impartial judgment of history. On the contrary, men there are to-day, and men there were in the day of Daniel Webster, to take exception to the strictures passed upon him for the action which was adverted to by my hon. friend last session. In 1850, as my hon. friend knows, the differences between the North and the South in the American Union were becoming very acute. There was a chasm which was every day growing greater, and Henry Clay, who was the greatest apostate of the Union of that time, brought in a resolution which was

destined—no, I will not say destined, because it failed of its object—but which was intended to reconcile the growing dissension between the two branches of the Union. Daniel Webster supported that legislation, and for having taken that action he was censured by some of the abolitionists of the Northern States. Among those abolitionists I must say there were some men of the highest character, such as Theodore Parker, Horace Mann and James Russell Lowell. The issue showed that even the brightest intellects could be clouded by passion, and that some well-intentioned men never can realize that any stand on a public question different from their own can be as nobile as their own, and that there are men who will never forgive those whose intellects plunge deeper into the horizon than their own. It was the good fortune of Daniel Webster to live long enough to see many of them recant their opinions, and, as I said a moment ago, the judgment of history has not confirmed the strictures upon Daniel Webster adverted to by my hon. friend. And, if my hon. friend will take the last and the best of all, he will find that the speech which was delivered by Webster, though criticised in parts, is declared by Cecil Rhodes himself to have shown statesmanship of the highest order. There is more. The whole matter has been well summed up by one of the greatest minds in the last generation. James G. Blaine, in his work entitled 'Twenty years of Congress,' says:

5 p.m.

> The thoughtful reconsideration of his severest critics must allow that Mr. Webster saw before him a divided duty, and that he chose the part which in his patriotic judgment was demanded by the supreme danger of the hour.

I commend these words to my hon. friend. The patriotic judgment of Sir George Ross showed what was the supreme danger of the hour, and it was because he saw the supreme danger of the hour that he acted as he did. Sir George Ross is well known as an intense imperialist, but upon that occasion there was a question which was uppermost: It was a question of the autonomy of this country, and by that principle he stood. My hon. friend will allow, now that the matter has passed, for the present at all events, that the Bill which was brought in last session, was not even a measure of emergency, although it was so called. It was simply a measure of expediency involving a policy of contribution, a policy which had been denounced by the very men themselves who introduced the Bill, a policy which was not justified by anything which then existed. They introduced it upon the shallow pretense of emergency. Emergency? Who speaks to-day of emergency? Twelve months have passed since my right hon. friend the Prime Minister introduced his measure. Twelve months and more have passed since that time when he saw the German peril. He saw Germany almost ready to jump at the throat of Great Britain. He saw clouds on the horizon; he saw these clouds rent by lightning; he heard the murmurs and rumbling of distant thunder. But my right hon. friend to-day may live in peace: The atmosphere is pure, the sky is clear. My right hon. friend, I think, heard the words of the Lord Chancellor, which were pronounced in this country last year, to the effect that the relations between Germany and Great Britain, were cordial and he must have read with the greatest satisfaction that not later than five weeks ago a cause of difficulty between the two nations about some territory in Africa had been amicably settled. And from that time to this moment the relations between the two countries which were cordial in the month of September last have been absolutely friendly. The light has been let in on that question, and we know now how much the country and the empire and the civilized world has been deceived upon that question of so-called emergency. We know now, we have the evidence, how the panics of which we have heard in this House more than once, are created and engineered. We have had the evidence that these panics are engineered by the armour-plate builders and by the great ship-building firms who do not hesitate to create false news in order to obtain contracts for their ships. The matter was brought up in the German Reichstag, and the following letter addressed by the firm to one of its agents in Paris was read:

> We have just wired to you asking you to await in Paris our to-day's letter. The reason for the telegram was that we should like to obtain the insertion in one of the most widely-read French journals—preferably the 'Figaro'—an article to the effect that the French military authorities have decided to accelerate considerably the re-arming of the troops with new machine guns, and to order double the quantity of the latter as against their original intention. We shall be much obliged if you could succeed in getting such an article published.

That letter was signed by two directors of what was supposed to be a respectable firm. The thing was denounced in the German Reichstag, and it could not rest

there, because it was found that army officers received bribes to promulgate this false news, and they were tried and convicted and are now serving sentences. Now we know why we have so often these recurring panics which are disturbing the peace of the world, and which, if they do not bring war, always bring fat contracts to the armament firms. Not only that, but we have the evidence—no, I will not say evidence—but it has been charged, and so far as I know the charge has not been denied, that the information which was given to us upon the German armament could not be relied upon, but was false and exaggerated. I do not speak of my own knowledge as to that, but I give as my authority an article published by Mr. A. G. Gardiner in the Daily News and Leader of London. I call attention to this paragraph in that article:

> How that is done was revealed in the case of Mr. Mulliner of the Coventry Ordnance works. It was Mr. Mulliner who was the true author and begetter of the famous panic of 1908-9. It was he who supplied Parliament and the press with the material for that memorable agitation. It was he who was quoted with such effect by Mr. Arthur Lee, Mr. Duke, Mr. Balfour and others. It was he who was finally solemnly received by the Cabinet—the British Cabinet—to tell them all about the goings-on of Krupp's, the 38,000 new workmen whom Mr. Lee said they were employing—as a matter of fact there was a decline in the number of men employed between 1907 and 1909—the acceleration in shipbuilding and the menace of that fatal year 1912 when the Germans, we were led to suppose, intended to make short work of the British Empire. Fresh from that momentous interview Mr. Asquith and Mr. McKenna told the House of Commons that Germany would have 17 dreadnoughts in 1912 instead of the projected 13; Mr. Balfour, not to be outdone, said there would be 21 and possibly 25. When in due time 1912 arrived the Germans had 12 dreadnoughts completed.

This information, which was given by Mr. Mulliner, was repeated by ministers on the floor of the House of Commons in England, and repeated also on the floor of this House by hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not charge any intention of deceit on the part of the Prime Minister in this regard, but I will charge deceit if, in the face of this evidence, we again hear of such a thing as an emergency.

The German peril has disappeared, if indeed there ever was such a thing; but we have another menace and another peril which is far more dangerous; a peril which affects not the fate of the Empire, but which is bound to bring suffering to hundreds of thousands of His Majesty's subjects in Canada. I may say that this peril has found the Government singularly

callous with respect to it. Within the last four weeks the Minister of Finance has reviewed the economic situation in Canada twice; once in Montreal at the commercial travellers' banquet, and again at Gananoque, in his riding. On both occasions he pronounced the financial condition of the country perfectly satisfactory. According to him, it has not always been satisfactory, but at the moment he was speaking it had become satisfactory again; there were no more clouds on the horizon, the storm had passed. That I may not do injustice to the Minister of Finance, I quote his words as reported in the Montreal Gazette, which authority I suppose he will accept. At Montreal, he is reported by the Gazette to have said:

> Our country has experienced its time of stress, and will come through it well. I believe the crisis has been reached, and passed in Canada, as in other countries of the world.

According to these words of the Minister of Finance, the crisis has come and passed, and once more navigation is easy and Canada is in a good position. I am not surprised at these words, in view of the fact that two years ago the gentlemen opposite were exclaiming in times of prosperity: let well enough alone. The Minister of Finance was satisfied two years ago to let well enough alone; he would not then improve the situation; he would not improve what was good in prosperous times, and now, in bad times, he and his party will not reform what is bad. We have had it from my young friend from York, N.B. (Mr. McLeod) that we have reached hard times, and the people of Canada have, I believe, come to the conclusion that, as the Government did not improve what was good in prosperous times, we are now not far away from bad times. Well, the bad times are here. When the Minister of Finance stated, as he did that the crisis was over, he had two things staring him in the face. For the first time since 1897 we hear of such a thing as non-employment in Canada. It is well known that at the present time prosperous establishments of long standing are reducing the number of their employees, that others are reducing the hours of work, that others are reducing the number of their employees and the hours of labour as well and that others have closed down. And yet, in the face of that situation, when there are to-day, in Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver, not fewer than 100,000 men asking for work, the Minister

of Finance says the crisis is over, and that we can be as confident as we were before. And at this very moment, when labour is scarce, and when the purchasing power of the people has been reduced to its lowest point, the cost of all prime necessities of life has risen abnormally. But the Minister of Finance says there is no crisis, and therefore there is nothing for the Government to do. He is not the only one of the ministry who has taken this stand; we have more instances than one to prove that the Government is singularly callous to the present condition of affairs. The Minister of Labour spoke on this subject, giving it as his view that there was absolute prosperity because the prices of commodities were so high. The Minister of Trade and Commerce also gave his opinion on this subject, as published in the Montreal Gazette of the 10th of December last. The reporter says:

Charging that Canadians were extravagant and must correct this weakness as the first step forward in reducing the high cost of living, the Hon. Geo. E. Foster made one of a number of notable speeches here in the Rideau theatre.

Then the reporter puts these words into the mouth of the Hon. George E. Foster:

Referring to the depopulation of the farming districts, Mr. Foster said he would not admit that young men were driven to the cities, but were lured there. He did not favour a commission to investigate the question. 'The Lord knows,' Mr. Foster continued, 'we have had enough commissions. They are as plentiful as blackberries. Commissions are roaming the country wasting good ink and paper preparing reports which are laid on the shelf and nothing done with them. It is not a commission that will right this matter. The action must be taken by the people themselves. Teachers and parents must not only give advice to the young people, but must instruct them to the fact that the oldest industry of agriculture is also the noblest.'

This is good advice, but it was not followed by those to whom it was given, because in a week from that day, I understand, the Government appointed a commission to investigate the high cost of living and the cause of the depopulation of the farming districts. That commission is composed of three gentlemen well known in the city of Ottawa. Mr. McDougald, Commissioner of Customs is the chairman, and in regard to him I have nothing but good to say. He is a most competent and valuable officer. I would say the same of Mr. Coats, who is the assistant Deputy Minister of Labour. Mr. James I do not know so well, but I have good reports of him also. What I want to say, however, is that if this commission is to be effective, if it is to accomplish any good, it should not be entrusted to civil servants. It should not be placed in the hands of the Commissioner of Customs, the assistant Deputy Minister of Labour and the other gentleman. It is evident that they must be restricted in their operations. There is one field into which they cannot enter. If, as many of us suppose, if, as the country supposes—I will not say more than that—the high cost of living is due to political causes, and I believe it is partly due to political causes, will these men dare to investigate that part of the subject? They will not dare to do so; they cannot do so; they are estopped from entering into that field. In appointing that commission, the Government have taken a course which will simply end in nothing. If there is to be an investigation of this kind, it should be placed in the hands of some of the members of the Cabinet—for instance, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid), the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers), the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster)—to mention these three alone—who should travel over the country from Halifax to Vancouver, and hear all classes of the community—producers, consumers, farmers, mechanics, professional men, clergymen, housewives—these last especially, because they are the most interested of all in that question. Nothing of the kind, however, has been done. The task has been entrusted to a commission which, as their report will show, can do only half the work.

We come now to the Speech from the Throne. I was not present, of course, when the Speech was prepared, but I can imagine that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) must have had a hard task when it came to preparing this part of the Speech:

Canada has been favoured by a long series of prosperous years, and, although at the present moment business is slightly restricted by the financial stringency which prevails throughout the world, I feel convinced that this condition will be merely temporary, and that the boundless resources of this Dominion, which are so fully and universally known and recognized, give us the fullest assurance of continued material prosperity and progress.

When it came to these words:

Canada has been favoured by a long series of prosperous years—

That was hard to fathom, because it was paying a pretty good compliment to the late Administration which had been in office for several years. But when it came to the other words:

Although at the present moment business is slightly restricted—

I can imagine my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), saying: I made a speech a few weeks ago saying that the crisis was over. How can I say that it still exists? He was drawing too long a bow at Montreal. The Speech only says what is in everybody's mind, and puts it very mildly and gently when it says that business is slightly restricted. But when we have the admission from the Government that business is not in a satisfactory condition, what are we to say of the conclusion which is reached by the Government? We have the admission that the economic condition of the country is not satisfactory, and a confession on the part of the Government of its impotence to deal with such a problem. When the Government stated in the Speech —a statement which I am sure they placed very reluctantly in the mouth of His Royal Highness—that the economic condition of the country was not satisfactory, all that they did was to express the highest hope that matters would rectify themselves. They say that the resources of the country are boundless. So they are, but is it the business of the Government simply to rely upon the resources of the country? Are they to do nothing themselves? Are they to be simply flies on the wheel? Are they not to take any action at all? It is very true that the resources are boundless, but it has been shown that the resources of the country do not yield their treasures to those who rely simply upon statements; they want to be tapped; they want men to use power and judgment in order to develop them. This is not what is done by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. The Government thus stands to-day convicted before the people that, while admitting that the economic condition of the country is not satisfactory, they have nothing to suggest in order to make it any better. Is this what we are to expect from the Government? Is this what the people of the country have reason to expect in view of the fact that two years ago they placed the government of the country in the hands of the gentlemen who now occupy the treasury benches? Are we to be told in this age and at this day that the Government are in power simply to enjoy the sweets of office and to take no responsibility to better such a condition of things as exists to-day? If the Government will not take any responsibility, perhaps it may be well that I should tell them that they must act. They cannot afford to remain silent. They must act in order to carry out the duties which they have to perform. What action are they to take? There are several things which they can do, which they ought to do, and which the people expect them to do.

In the first place, they must give to the country, which is a young, expanding country, as stated a moment ago by the hon. member for York, N.B., wider markets than it has at the present time. There is one thing which they can do simply by a stroke of the pen; they can give to the producer of wheat the American market. They have received delegation upon delegation asking for that. I understand that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), who told us last year that he knew how to win elections, stated, during the election in Macdonald, that, if it was in the interest of the people to have free wheat, free wheat it would be.

What more evidence does my hon. friend want? He has received a delegation from the grain growers of the western provinces asking for free wheat. In the very legislature of the province which he represents here a resolution has been passed unanimously, not moved by a Grit but moved by a Conservative, to the effect that wheat ought to be made free. There was a delegation only a few days ago of some twenty members of the Alberta Legislature asking for free wheat. How is it, then, that the Speech from the Throne does not contain the announcement that wheat will be made free? When this admission was made that the economic condition of the country was not satisfactory, we had reason to expect that some action would be taken. We have been disappointed in this. Is that all they should do? No, they ought to do that which they have been asked many times to do,—they ought to relieve the farming community of the burden of taxation which the farmers are carrying at the present time. There is one fact that is beyond doubt, a fact on which we must have more explanation before the session passes. Everyone knows that in regard to many commodities of which at one time we produced far more than we consumed we do not now produce enough to meet the home demand. Years ago we produced a surplus of butter and of meat of many kinds; at present we are importing butter, mutton and other commodities. The agricultural classes have found labour so expensive that they have been unable to carry on their operations as they desired to do. It becomes more and more evident that if you wish to stimulate the farming industries you must provide wider markets than you have provided up to the present time. By a happy circumstance for which the

present Government is not responsible, the American market has been opened to our cattle and the farmers of the western provinces have received for their cattle higher prices than they ever received before. The consequence will be that in two or three years there will be more cattle in the western provinces than there have been for many a long year. It is only by the stimulating of the activity of the farmer that he will develop his industry and lead to the whole of this country producing what it ought to produce.

One thing more we should do. At the present time the farming community of the West is suffering from a combine of the shipping interests of the Great Lakes. They have petitioned for a remedy of that grievance. It is a serious grievance, because it involves a tax upon both the producer and the consumer; and the Government will have to deal with that problem whether they wish to do so or not. The law is there to be executed, and if the law is not sufficient it ought to be amended so as to enable the Government to cope with such problems.

The Government must also take into consideration the problem of the high cost of living. I know I shall be told at once that that is not a question that affects Canada alone. I am quite aware that it affects the whole civilized world. The fact that the cost of living has risen in all civilized countries shows that there are causes which are universal and which may perhaps be beyond our control. At the same time, when we reflect that the cost of living has risen in Great Britain ten per cent and in Canada fifty per cent, it is plain that there are causes operating in Canada which do not exist in Great Britain. Now, I wish to state the question clearly; I do not pretend that the increased price of products is a thing in itself to be deplored. One cause for it I state at once: for the last ten or fifteen years the price of labour has increased all over the world; therefore it was natural that the price of agricultural labour should increase also, and this has had the effect of increasing the price of the product. This increase went on for years normally and gradually, and nobody complained. But at the present moment things are different. We see to-day that between the price paid by the consumer and the price received by the producer, there is a wide margin, and it is that margin especially which it should be the effort of this Government and this Parliament to reach and to cut down. If the price paid by the consumer were the price received by the farmer, no one could seriously object, and no one would object. But we have the right to object when the prices received by the farmer are not those which are paid by the consumer. I have seen it stated many times that the tariff is not responsible for the high cost of living. I do not pretend that the tariff is responsible for the high cost of living in its entirety, but I say to the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), who, more than any one else, must have this matter in hand, that the restrictions imposed by the tariff are used by the combines in order to promote their interests and charge those abnormal prices. And we are told that nothing is to be done. We are told that everything is satisfactory; we are told that the Government is powerless in this matter. It is not for me to give advice to the Government; if I were to offer it they would not take it from me. But I have to tell them, whether they wish it or not, that they must act; they cannot afford to lie idle. They are not free to remain still like logs; they must move. There has been stringency before in this country. We are told in the speech from the Throne that the resources of the country are boundless. So they are. So they have been at all times. So they were in 1893-4-5 and 6. But, though the resources were boundless in that way, yet the people suffered. It was only when a new Government came in that had the courage to take the matter in hand that there came an era of prosperity which terminated only when the present Government came into office.

These are some of the duties which face the Government. Whether they accept what I say or not does not matter. But I tell them frankly—no, I will not tell them, but I tell the country frankly—that if they take up these duties and perform them with courage, with energy and good judgment, the shops will be reopened, trade will revive, prices will reach an equilibrium between consumer and producer, and we shall have another era such as we had after the enactment of the tariff of 1897. But if they will not do so, there are other men who will have to take their places, men who have shown before by actual experience that they have the minds to plan and the courage to execute, men who have proven that when difficulty arose and when the time of stringency came, they were equal to the occasion. This Government may accept it from me or not, but if they do not, the people will have to pronounce between them and us.

We have been told that in taking the attitude which I have taken and again take here we have been moved only by a desire for a restoration to office. I do not pretend to be indifferent to office. If I were so to pretend I should not be worthy of my position here. But there are things which to every right-minded man are more precious than the possession of office, and one is the welfare of the country in which we were born and for whose affairs we are responsible. We have made great sacrifices for our convictions, but if our convictions are not accepted we have no fault to find with any one. This is a free country, and every man is welcome to his opinions. But, Sir, I repeat that no man should be indifferent to the conditions which exist to-day, and therefore in conclusion I beg to move that the following words be added to the Address:

We regret to have to represent to Your Royal Highness that in the gracious Speech with which you have met Parliament, whilst it is admitted that business is in a depressed condition, yet there is no indication of any intention on the part of your advisers to take any steps towards relieving such a situation.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister): I desire to associate myself with all that has been so aptly and eloquently said by my right hon. friend in extending his congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address. Both these hon. gentlemen have made admirable speeches, and while hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House cannot be expected naturally to take precisely the same view as to the conduct of public affairs as that which was expressed in those speeches, nevertheless I observed with a great deal of satisfaction that the remarks of these gentlemen did in many respects meet with the approval of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. The mover of the address, the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. McLeod), has already had a distinguished career, having attained at a very early age a high position in the public life of his province, and it was with every feeling of anticipation, I am sure, that the House awaited his observations this afternoon. I entirely concur with what has been said by the leader of the Opposition in this respect: that he amply fulfilled all the expectations which had been formed of him as a parliamentary debater. So my hon. friend from the country of Bellechasse (Mr. Lavallée), of the old historic province of Quebec, has maintained the reputation of the worthy race which he so eloquently represented on this occasion, and has delivered to the House this afternoon a speech which reflects credit not only upon himself, but upon his province as well.

I desire also particularly to associate myself with what has been said not only by my hon. friend the member for York, but by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, in expressing the great satisfaction of the Canadian people that Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Connaught has recovered from the very serious illness from which she suffered for many months, and that she has been enabled once more to accompany His Royal Highness to this country. Those who know, as all of us, I think, do know, the keen sense of duty which animates Their Royal Highnesses and the very great sympathy and interest which they have on all occasions exhibited in everything that pertains to the welfare of this country, must have been inspired by an especial satisfaction in knowing that Their Royal Highnesses have been enabled once more to undertake the important and often very onerous duties of the high position in this country to which they have been called. I voice, I am sure, the feeling of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House when I express the hope that Her Royal Highness' progress to complete health and strength, such as she enjoyed before, may be rapid and continuous, and that their Royal Highnesses may have —and I am sure they always will have— none but the happiest memories with which to look back to the years during which they were citizens of this country. I am sure also that when at some later date they do return to their home in the British Islands, Canada and Canadians will have no warmer friends and advocates on the other side of the Atlantic than will be found in Their Royal Highnesses, the Duke and Duchess of Connaught.

My right hon. friend dwelt upon a great many matters in the course of his discursive speech; to some of these, particularly those relating to controversial politics of the great neighbouring republic, I will not follow him, because his observations in that regard do not seem to call for any special reply. He has spoken in the first place of the delay in summoning Parliament, and he has asked for an explanation. If he wishes the fullest explanation, he should look around him and see among the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who come from the different parts of this Dominion, one man, if he can, who

has not thoroughly welcomed the suggestion that Parliament should meet in January instead of in November. The suggestion has been made to me over and over again during the past two years that in this Parliament we accomplish very little indeed before the Christmas vacation; that the Christmas vacation is usually a somewhat protracted period, and that the members who come from distant parts of the country, and particularly those who come from the West and have to close their homes for the winter, are left in Ottawa for two or three or four weeks with absolutely nothing to do, awaiting the convenience of those who, like my right hon. friend, live in or near the capital, and to whom it is a matter of no inconvenience whatever that the public business should be so conducted. I venture to hope that members of this House may be inspired with a desire to expedite business, and I think that my friends from the Maritime provinces, from the West, and from the distant portions of Ontario and Quebec, will welcome the innovation upon which we have embarked this year, and will justify the Government in the course it has taken in postponing the meeting of Parliament until January.

Then my right hon. friend tried to make merry at the expense of the Government and to make some more or less caustic observations at the expense of my hon. friend the Solictor General (Mr. Meighen). I am pleased to know that he considers the choice an excellent one, and I am also glad that he realizes that there is a very great number of men in the Liberal-Conservative party in this House who are capable of filling that office with honour and ability. That is absolutely true, and if all the observations of my right hon. friend were as apt and as much to the point as that particular observation I would have no fault whatever to find with him. He has referred to these gentlemen as pebbles on the beach. Fortunately we were not in the position of my right hon. friend who on five different occasions could not find any pebble on the beach on his own side of the House, because he went outside of the House to select a Minister of Justice, a Minister of Railways and Canals, a Minister of Labour, a Minister of Public Works, and last but not least a Secretary of State. Under these circumstances I am sure my right hon. friend will be disposed to congratulate the Conservative party that it is not afflicted by that unfortunate poverty of talent which was indicated by the course that the right hon. gentleman adopted on five occasions. We have an abundance of splendid material on this side of the House, and I join with my right hon. friend in congratulating the Liberal-Conservative party of this country that it does possess in this House so splendid an abundance of the most excellent material.

My right hon. friend also found fault with the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). Whatever might be the possible detriment to the public interest which would be occasioned by the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I am very much inclined to think that my right hon. friend, in his own heart, would be very glad to see him remain absent, would be very glad not to have him here during the session at all. As a matter of fact, let me either encourage or discourage my right hon. friend, as the case may be, by informing him that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is on the ocean now and that by about next Monday he will be here ready to answer my right hon. friend on that point. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is a member of a very important commission which had its origin in a resolution passed by the Imperial Conference of 1911. The right hon. leader of the Opposition thinks that a minister of the Crown for Canada ought not to be a member of that commission. I do not concur in the view which the right hon. gentleman has expressed, because I consider it exceedingly important that a man occupying the very important and responsible portfolio of Minister of Trade and Commerce, the duties of which are especially concerned with questions of trade between the various dominions of this Empire and with the resources which exist within those dominions, should be on hand in Great Britain, in Australia, in Canada and in South Africa to make a comprehensive and close study of those conditions; and I know of no man in Canada who is more thoroughly competent to undertake the duties of a member of that very important commission, representing Canada in that behalf, than is the Hon. George E. Foster.

My right hon. friend spoke on many subjects. Among other things, he dealt with the failure in the Speech from the Throne to make any reference to the Highways Bill. I desire to say in the presence of this House and of this country that the Highways Bill, as we introduced it in two successive sessions, and as it passed the House of Commons on both those occasions, was a perfectly fair Bill which conserved the interest of every province in Canada. Further than that, I am in a position to state that the majority of the pro

vinces of Canada, representing a large majority of the people of Canada, were perfectly willing and are perfectly willing to take that Bill just as we presented it. When we first introduced that Bill in Parliament the right hon. gentleman and his friends pretended to give it a half-hearted and lukewarm support. They debated it; to a certain extent they obstructed it both in the last session and in the previous session. Notwithstanding their pretended support of some features of it, at least in the first instance, they ended their career by standing up, every one of them in his place, and voting solidly against that Bill. We placed the Bill before Parliament in what we believed to be terms perfectly fair to every province in Canada. Further than that, the Minister of Railways and Canals and myself as well gave a distinct pledge, which we kept on both occasions, that when the vote was brought down for the appropriation of a certain sum of money in aid of the highways of this country, the Parliament of Canada would be asked to make that vote in accordance with the populations of the various provinces of Canada. We made that pledge. If we did not observe that pledge, it would have been perfectly competent for hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House and for their friends in the Senate, when that vote was brought down, to have taken the stand that the vote and the appropriation did not do full justice to the provinces of Canada. We had no intention then or at any other time of dealing with any of the provinces otherwise than in accordance with the pledge which we then gave; but my right hon. friend, or at all events his friends in the Senate—and I understand he takes full responsibility for their action—after he and his friends had voted to defeat that Bill, took upon themselves by their majority the still greater responsibility of inserting in that Bill an amendment which the Government had rejected a year before, and which they knew the Government would certainly reject again. Therefore, notwithstanding all the efforts of my right hon. friend to escape from the responsibility of defeating that Bill, I intend to fix that responsibility upon him and upon his friends, because I say it is due to them and to them alone that a vote of $1,000,000 in the session before last and of $1,500,000 last session, has not been made available for the improvement and maintenance of the highways of this country.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BORDEN: When the House took recess at six o'clock, I was speaking of the Highways Bill and pointing out that, as the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House had used their majority in the Senate for the purpose of defeating the Bill in two successive sessions we had decided that, until the majority of the Senate in the course of events comes in accord with the voice and will of the people of this country, it was useless and undesirable to take up the time of the House further with it; and therefore at this session we did not propose to introduce the Highways Bill.

There are at least four, and perhaps more, important measures which the Government has proposed to Parliament, and which the Liberal majority in the Senate has seen fit to reject or to encumber to such an extent with amendments that we could not accept them. I need only mention the Highways Bill, in two successive sessions, the Tariff Commission Bill in the session before last, the Branch Lines Bill, of which I shall say a few words in a moment, and the Naval Aid Bill of last year, of which I shall also speak.

The situation of this country with regard to its Upper Chamber is somewhat peculiar. Canada has less control over a majority in the Senate which puts itself in opposition to the popular will than any other dominion of the empire that I know of to-day. The colony of Newfoundland with one twenty-fifth of the population of the Dominion of Canada has infinitely more effective control over a situation of that kind than this Dominion. If friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, appointed during their tenure of office and before the will of the people was declared at the last election, are disposed to force upon us the question of the constitution of the Senate and the nature of appointments thereto—well, speaking for myself, and I think speaking for the great majority of the people of this country, we are ready to accept that issue.

The Branch Lines Bill of last year is a notable illustration of what I have just now alluded to. A resolution was introduced into this House by my colleague the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane). The resolution was very broad in its terms, and, as he and I decided after its introduction and after some criticism had been made of it, that it was too wide in its terms, I myself drafted a modified

form of resolution which I took informally across the floor of this House and submitted to hon. gentlemen on the other side. I submitted it to my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley), the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), and the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), all hon. gentlemen who had taken part in that debate, and every one of them without exception told me that the resolution in the amended terms in which I proposed it was absolutely acceptable to them. The only dissenting voice, and that only with regard to one minor feature of the Bill, was the voice of the hon. member for Westmorland, who thought that the power given by that proposed resolution to the Minister of Railways and Canals to build a line not exceeding twenty-five miles in length was too great a power. I was about to consent to modify it when another hon. gentleman on the other side, the hon. member for Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) strenuously objected to any change, and desired the resolution to remain as it was, and it did remain as it was, and the Bill founded upon it went through this House without one dissenting voice. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was in his seat, as 'Hansard' will show, when the Bill passed this House, and he did not raise his voice in opposition to it. The Liberal majority in the Senate saw fit so to mangle that Bill with changes and amendments that it became absolutely useless for the purpose for which it was intended. It came back here and I asked that those amendments should not be assented to. To my astonishment the leader of the Opposition stood up in his place and defended the action of his friends in the Senate, although the Bill in the form in which it left the House of Commons had been unanimously assented to not only by hon. members on this side but by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House as well. So the Bill failed to carry because we could not accept the Senate amendments. And so it was with the Tariff Commission Bill.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has referred to the Naval Aid Bill, and I desire to say a few words in explaining the action of the Government in that regard. Let me review the situation in a few words. Firmly convinced that the conditions disclosed in the Admiralty memorandum demanded immediate and effective aid from Canada, the Government, in accordance with its mandate from the people introduced in this Parliament on the 5th day of December, 1912, the Naval Aid Bill by resolution. That Bill provided for the construction of three battleships of the most modern and powerful type to be placed at the disposal of His Majesty for the common defence of the empire and to be subject to recall upon reasonable notice if and when the Canadian people should decide to establish one or more fleet units or other distinctive naval forces. The measure was debated at great length in this House and was persistently and defiantly obstructed. It did not pass this House until the rules had been so amended as to prevent such obstruction. Eventually the Bill was rejected in the Upper Chamber by senators appointed by the late Government previously to its defeat in 1911. The measure proposed by the Government created a profound impression not only within this empire, but throughout the world. There is little doubt that if the Bill had passed, the determination of Canada thus expressed would have constituted an important influence in bringing about a most desirable cessation in the rivalry of armaments. The partisan considerations and misguided influences which occasioned the perverse and maladroit action of the Senate were not realized or understood either within the empire or throughout the world. In certain important quarters the Senate's action was welcomed with rejoicing as a clear indication that in providing for the common defence of the empire upon the high seas the mother country must stand alone so far as Canada is concerned, and that this Dominion must be regarded not as a strength but as a weakness to the empire in time of peril. That the impression created by the Senate's action was profoundly unfortunate and mischievous is evidenced by many comments in great European journals. As an illustration one quotation must suffice, although many might be given. The quotation to which I allude is from the Hamburger Nachrichten of June 5, 1913:—

> Whatever may be decided upon later, the decision of the Canadian Senate means at any rate a heavy moral and material loss for the defence of the empire.

I heard, a moment ago, some gentlemen opposite cheering the Senate's action; Would they still cheer in face of that? Well, we are at least glad to know their appreciation of the duty of this country to the empire. (Reading):

> Whatever may be decided upon later, the actual decision of the Canadian Senate means at any rate a heavy moral and material loss for

the defence of the Empire, for Mr. Borden's promise had been foolishly enough counted on. His offer made an enormous impression in the whole world. Mr. Churchill pointed out this fact especially in the wellknown memorandum of the Admiralty. This impression will now not only be destroyed, but people will everywhere obtain the conviction that England cannot depend upon such help from her colonies. 'By rivals and enemies,' says the Morning Post to-day, 'the decision will be eagerly welcomed. By friends it will be regarded as ominous. The impression must inevitably be created that the solidarity of the Empire is a myth and that those powers which would like to see the overthrow of British naval supremacy need not be discouraged in their efforts by the thought that their challenge would be met by the united resources of the mother country and of every one of the daughter states.'

It has been avowed and declared by leaders of the Opposition and by their organs that the Bill if introduced again under present conditions would again be rejected in the Senate. We have no reason to doubt that such is the determination of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Under these circumstances we do not regard it as desirable either in the interests of the empire or of Canada that the Opposition majority in the Senate should be given another opportunity of rejecting the Bill and of again bringing discredit to this Dominion and detriment to the empire. Nevertheless we are firm in our determination that these ships shall be provided, and we adhere to the declaration which I made on the last day of the past session, and which I take the liberty of repeating:

It is the firm intention and determination of this Government, if it remains, as undoubtedly it will remain, in power, to bring down at a later date a proposal for the acquisition or construction of three battleships, as was provided in the Naval Aid Bill of 1912. In that way, before their completion, we hope to be able to say to the British government 'Canada is prepared to do now what the unworthy action of a partisan majority in the Senate prevented it from doing before.'

In this connection it is appropriate to call attention to the striking utterances of Mr. Churchill during the past year wherein he invited the nations of the world to stay the construction of these enormous engines of war. I take the liberty, therefore, of quoting from his utterances at some length. On March 18, 1912, in the British House of Commons, Mr. Churchill said:

Let me make clear, however, that any retardation or reduction in German construction will, within certain limits, be promptly followed here, as soon as it is apparent, by large and fully proportioned reductions. For instance, if Germany elected to drop out any one, or even any two, of these annual quota and to put her money into her pocket for the enjoyment of her people and the development of her own prosperity, we will at once, in the absence of any dangerous development elsewhere not now foreseen, blot out our corresponding quota, and the slowing down by Germany will be accompanied naturally on our larger scale by us. Of course both Great Britain and Germany have to consider, among other things, the building of other powers, though the lead of both these countries is at present very considerable over any other power besides each other. Take, as an instance of this proposition which I am putting forward for general consideration, the year 1913. In that year, as I apprehend, Germany will build three capital ships, and it will be necessary for us to build five in consequence. Supposing we were both to take a holiday for that year. Supposing we both introduced a blank page in the book of misunderstanding; supposing that Germany were to build no ships in that year, she would save herself between £6,000,000 and £7,000,000 sterling. But that is not all. We should not in ordinary circumstances begin our ships until she has started hers. The three ships that she did not build would therefore automatically wipe out no fewer than five British potential super-dreadnoughts, and that is more than I expect them to hope to do in a brilliant naval action. As to the indirect results, even from a single year, they simply cannot be measured, not only between our too great brother nations, but to all the world. They are results immeasurable in their hope and brightness. This, then is the position which we take up, that the Germans will be no gainers, so far as naval power is concerned, over us by any increases they may make, and no losers for the basis I have laid down by any diminution. Here then, is a perfectly plain and simple plan of arrangement whereby without diplomatic negotiations, without any bargaining, without the slightest restriction upon the sovereign freedom of either power, this keen and costly naval rivalry can be at any time abated. It is better, I am sure, to put in quite frankly, for the parliaments and peoples to judge for themselves.

Mr. Churchill, in the British House of Commons on March 26, 1913, said:

This time last year I offered, on behalf of the British Government, publicly and openly, not to build any British capital ships this year, if Germany built none, and I pointed out how advantageous such an arrangement would be to the relative strength of the German navy.

That proposal has not so far borne fruit. Since then we have had the new German Navy Law, and since then the German ships of 1913 have been sanctioned. Every event in this world brings its consequences with it. Since then all over the British Empire men's minds have been turned to this subject. Canada has come forward, the Federated Malay States have come forward, Australia and New Zealand are already acting, and South Africa is already on the move. A sustained impetus has been given to the opinions of millions of men spread all over the surface of the world. Great communities under their different conditions of sky and climate have shown themselves actuated by a common impulse. The results, so far as it can be foreseen, are that nine capital ships will be constructed on behalf of the British Empire in the year 1913. That year is settled, and there

is no going back on that. Take the year 1914. I have no reason to believe it is the desire of the German Government to postpone or cancel their programme for that year, but, if it be their desire, they have only to make it known. No one builds 'dreadnoughts' for fun, and we can see no practical difficulty in the absence of unforeseen dangers elsewhere in arriving at a good and complete arrangement for that year, not only on behalf of the British Government, but on behalf of the British Empire as a whole. As the year 1914 is one of those years when we shall be building four ships to two, a mutual cessation could clearly be no disadvantage to the relative position of the next strongest naval power.

It is clear, however, that such an arrangement would probably involve other powers besides Great Britain and Germany. The programmes of France and Russia on the one hand, and of Austria and Italy on the other, would have to be taken into consideration. I am sanguine enough not to see any insuperable difficulty in that. The influence of the British and German Governments, acting together for the peace and welfare of the world, is priceless and measureless, and, if an arrangement between them, be it only for one particular year, for the prevention of what can plainly be shown to be a wasteful, purposeless, and futile folly were to acquire a wider international scope and significance, that would be all the more cause for general rejoicing and all the more honour to those who had taken part in bringing it about. Here, again, we are in a very good position to ventilate such ideas and to advance them to the best of our ability, because we have proved in recent years, and are proving, our capacity and resolve as a people and as an empire to maintain and, as I shall presently show, to improve our naval position whatever action may be taken elsewhere. No one can accuse us of wishing to gain by negotiation or by supplication an advantage which we cannot win by sacrifice and effort. At any rate, there is the suggestion renewed again for 1914 or, if 1914 is too near, for 1915.

Addressing a Liberal meeting at Manchester on October 18, 1913, Mr. Churchill, in proposing a naval holiday, said:

The proposal which I put forward in the name of His Majesty's Government is quite simple. Apart from the Canadian ships or their equivalent, apart from anything that may be required by new developments, we should lay down four great ships to Germany's two. Now, we say, while there is plenty of time, in all friendship and sincerity, to our great neighbour, Germany: 'If you postpone beginning your two ships for twelve months, we will postpone beginning our four ships, in absolutely good faith for exactly the same period.

'That would mean a complete holiday of one year, this holiday to be as far as big ships are concerned, between Great Britain and Germany.

'That would mean a saving of nearly six millions of pounds to Germany and of nearly twelve millions to Great Britain, while the relative strength of the two countries would be absolutely unchanged.'

And again on November 12, at the Guildhall banquet he said:

The measured and unbroken development of the German navy the simultaneous building by many powers, great and small, all over the world, of modern and large modern ships of war will undoubtedly require from us expenditure and exertions greater than those we have ever made in time of peace, and next year it will be my duty, if I should be responsible for this important Department of State, to present to Parliament estimates substantially greater than the enormous sum originally voted in the present year. His Majesty's Government will embrace and will work for every opportunity of abating the competition in naval and military armaments, which is the bane and the reproach of modern Europe. But what is necessary has got to be done, and we shall not hesitate for a moment, once we are satisfied of the need, to go to Parliament boldly for those supplies of men and money which the House of Commons, whatever its party complexion, has never refused to vote in living memory for the vital services of the State.

And it is within the memory of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that on the 8th day of December last the United States House of Representatives, after a full debate, passed a resolution on the same subject by an almost unanimous vote. That resolution is in the following terms—I shall quote them in full as I think it is desirable that they should be impressed upon the attention of hon. gentlemen of this House and of the people of this country:

Resolved, that in the opinion of the House of Representatives the declaration of the First Lord of the Admiralty of Great Britain, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill, that the Government of the United Kingdom is willing and ready to co-operate with other Governments to secure for one year a suspension of naval construction programmes offers the means of immediately lessening the enormous burdens of the people and avoiding the waste of investment in war material.

That a copy of this resolution be furnished the President, with the request that, so far as he can do so, having due regard for the interests of the United States, he use his influence to consummate the agreement suggested by the Right Honourable Winston Churchill.

That resolution passed the United States House of Representatives by a majority of 317 to 11.

These declarations that have been made by the First Lord of the Admiralty invite a few considerations. No thoughtful person can fail to be impressed by the considerations which Mr. Churchill has set forth so lucidly and so eloquently; and it is most satisfactory to know that his proposals have received pronounced approval in the federal legislature of the great neighbouring nation. It is not only depressing but humiliating to realize that the progress and development of modern civilization have been accompanied by this powerful and incessant tendency of the nations to arm themselves against each other. It is not apparent that in this respect humanity has made much

progress in the past two thousand years. I trust that the day is rapidly drawing near when differences between the nations may be settled by appeal to some great tribunal established under international authority, and so constituted that its decisions will command unquestioning respect and obedience. But, until that day dawns, and while war is still the last court of appeal between the nations, we cannot forget that a great heritage has been committed to our keeping, and that we are the trustees of its safety, not for ourselves alone, but for those who are yet to be born.

The Government are naturally most desirous that the aid which we proposed last year, under conditions of urgency and need, and which we still propose to bring in due course to the common defence of the empire should be so proffered or given as not to prejudice or retard any international agreement for the cessation of battleship construction. When we are in a position to press the Naval Aid Bill to a final and satisfactory conclusion in the Senate, it will be our duty to consult with the Imperial Government respecting these grave and important considerations. If it should then appear that, by any naval arrangement entered into or about to be entered into by the great powers, a restriction or diminution of the present lamentable rivalry in armaments could be brought about, we should always be ready, until our ships have actually been begun, to review the situation so far as these proposals are concerned; and if a general cessation or temporary suspension in the building of great ships of war were at any time to be seriously entertained, Canada would gladly participate in such a desirable result. Otherwise, we should proceed in due course with the construction of the three ships, holding it to be our duty, under the conditions disclosed last year, and for reasons then elaborated with great fullness, to bring this assistance as speedily as possible to the great purpose of our common defence and security.

Our opponents, especially in the Senate, have taken the ground that our temporary proposals of last year, although not embodying a permanent policy in any respect, ought not to be undertaken without an appeal to the people, but that a permanent naval policy might properly be formulated and carried out without such an appeal. We entirely dissent from that remarkable and unjustifiable view. So far as a permanent policy of naval defence is concerned, I gave my pledge to the people, on more than one occasion previous to the last election, that it would be submitted to them at a general election before it should effectively be undertaken. That pledge still holds good, and faith will be kept with the people in that regard.

Now, my right hon. friend, in the course of his remarks, went into some matters upon which I do not desire to detain the House at any length. He spoke of the good relations between the British Empire and the German Empire. I am glad to know that they are good relations. It is my fervent hope and wish that those relations may always continue to be as satisfactory as they are at present; but, as I pointed out last year, the destinies of the world are sometimes influenced by the mere fact that predominant naval power does exist and can be utilized in one quarter or another, and I venture to think that if the right hon. gentleman will look at the observations made by the First Lord of the Admiralty in the British House of Commons on the 5th day of June, 1913, and on the 17th day of July, 1913, he will find that his view as to the necessity of maintaining and even increasing the strength of the naval forces of this empire is not borne out by the view of the British Admiralty. Mr. Churchill, in the observations which I have under my hand, but which I will not weary the House with repeating here to-night, takes it to be the duty of the British Government to make good that which was lost to the Empire by the unfortunate action of the Senate. That is the situation, so far as I understand as it exists to-day.

Just one other observation with regard to my right hon. friend. He has on various occasions during the recess urged that the people of this country should not embark on any project of aiding in the naval defence of the Empire; and he put the question of the high cost of living, I think, against dreadnoughts in the speech he made at Hamilton. He deplores, and his organs deplore, the establishment of any armament trust in Canada. Well, who was it that, last year in this Parliament, advocated the establishment of an armament trust? If I mistake not, it was the right hon. gentleman who has since made these interesting speeches in various places throughout the country. Who was it that last year desired this country to embark on a permanent naval policy which within the next ten or twelve years would have cost this

country at least $150,000,000? And who was it who desired that this should be done without giving to the people of Canada any opportunity to express their views on the subject? Why, it was my right hon. friend and his supporters on the other side, and their partisans in the Senate who desired to take that course. If there is any advocate, any strenuous advocate, of the establishment of an armament trust in Canada, that advocate is to be found in the person of my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition. But I have heard that in various parts of the country my right hon. friend was not quite so explicit as he was in his speech in this House. I did not observe that in his speeches in the county of Chateauguay he put that policy in the very forefront. If, however, I am mistaken in my appreciation of the course which he took in that campaign, I will sit down in order that he may correct me.

My right hon. friend seemed to be distressed at the condition of affairs in connection with the terminals at Quebec. I had the honour and pleasure of speaking at a banquet in the city of Quebec a few months ago, and I went into the question somewhat fully at that time. I regret that my right hon. friend is so much under a misapprehension as to some matters on which he has spoken to-day. He has taken it upon himself to say that the management of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are not in accord with this Government in regard to certain changes that have been made. I would like him to state his authority for that declaration. I am informed by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) that that statement is not stamped with the hall mark of accuracy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I did not say it was so. I said that no information has been given to show that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company had agreed to the changes.

Mr. BORDEN: I am sorry if I misunderstood my right hon. friend; I did really understand him to say what I have just stated. If it is merely a thirst for information which led the right hon. gentleman to allude to this subject, I may give him the information now, that the Grank Trunk Pacific Railway have assented to the changes. I trust that declaration will do much to relieve the inquietude from which my right hon. friend seems to be suffering in that regard. The terminals at Quebec will be ready, I am assured by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, by the time the road is completed, and the road is being advanced with all possible expedition. Unfortunately, certain delays arose out of incidents connected with the Quebec bridge under the administration of my right hon. friend which I shall not pause to consider to-night. These have put the enterprise back to a certain extent. The station at Champlain market, and the joint station to be used by the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which will be a station worthy of the city in which it is situated, and of the great railway companies which it will serve, will shortly be under construction, I am assured. The shops at St. Malo are already commenced and will be proceeded with as rapidly as possible. Further than that, we have taken a step at Quebec, which my right hon. friend might well have taken long ago, that is, we have undertaken the construction of as fine and commodious a dry-dock, for the use of the great ships using the St. Lawrence waterway, as can be found anywhere in the world. The contract has been let for that work and the work will be proceeded with as soon as the spring opens, in fact my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) informs me that it has already been begun.

My right hon. friend has summoned to his aid the cry of hard times, and he considers that the Speech from the Throne is absolutely insufficient inasmuch as it does not point out any direct or immediate remedy for hard times and for the high cost of living to which he also alludes. He confused these two subjects in the course of his remarks, as it seemed to me, and I was not sure from time to time, whether he was dealing with one or with the other. However, it may be that they are properly dealt with together. I would like to refresh the memory of my right hon. friend in one respect. He seems to think that the reference in the Speech from the Throne calls for the expression of some declaration of policy which will provide an immediate and effective remedy. He has forgotten the words which he put into the mouth of the then Governor General in 1908, words which were much more calamitous, if I may use that expression, than anything to be discovered in the Speech from the Throne on the present occasion:—

> The Dominion has been blessed by a long series of prosperous years, and though at the present moment its business is being restricted by the financial stringency which prevails throughout the world, I feel assured that this

unfavourable condition will be temporary and that the illimitable resources of Canada and the world-wide recognition of them give us ample guarantee of continued material progress.

I have examined this speech—it is very lengthy—and up to the present time I have not discovered in it a statement of any immediate or effective remedy. Perhaps, if I yielded the floor my right hon. friend would explain to the House why that omission occurred. We did not put the word 'unfavourable' into our speech on this occasion. The Government of that day seemed to take a very gloomy view of the situation. We do not take a gloomy view of the situation. We do really believe that the resources of this country are so great and so widely recognized that any slight restriction in business is not to be seriously regarded and that this country in 1914, as in 1908, will make it manifest to the world that the check, if any there be, is only for the moment.

My right hon. friend has alluded to the inquiry which the Government has directed into the increase in the cost of living. We have thought it wise to follow the British example in this regard, and to select civil servants of ability and experience to make an examination into this question. We have selected them without regard to what may be supposed to have been their political views, knowing that they are all men not only of ability and experience, but of integrity as well, and that they will bring to this important task the best that is in them, and give to the country the very best of their services in coming to a conclusion.

My right hon. friend has moved a resoluiton on this subject. He desires that the Address to His Royal Highness shall not pass in the words proposed, but that the following shall be added thereto:

We regret to have to represent to your Royal Highness that in the gracious speech with which you have met Parliament, whilst it is admitted that business is in a depressed condition, yet there is no indication of any intention on the part of your advisers to take any steps towards relieving such a situation.

When I said that my right hon. friend had forgotten the speech which he put into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General in 1908, I evidently made a mistake; he was thinking of that speech when he drafted this resolution. His Royal Highness has not stated in the Speech from the Throne that business is in a depressed condition. I would like to observe in regard to this amendment that it does not quite come up to some of the speeches which the right hon. gentleman has been making in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec; there is a remarkable difference. When my right hon. friend spoke at Hamilton on the 26th of November last he was ready with a policy. Why is it that the policy which he announced at Hamilton is not embodied in the terms of his resolution? Have some of his friends expressed the opinion that he was a little hasty? What is the reason for the marked difference? In the one case he shouted loudly; in the other case he whispers softly. My right hon. friend did not wait until the opening of Parliament to change his policy. His policy as expressed at Hamilton was this:

The policy I give you at this moment; the policy I believe every patriotic man in Canada ought now to support, and the policy I believe it to be the duty of the Government immediately to inaugurate, is a policy of absolutely freed food—food free from customs duty.

That was on the 26th of November, and on the 9th of December he reached Montreal. But in the meantime, he seemed to have received a new light and wisdom. His proposal when he reached Montreal was to have a few perambulating commissions of ministers such as he had in 1897, and in 1907, if I mistake not. That was a remarkable change, but he has not suggested either one or the other of these policies in the resolution which he has introduced to-night—a resolution of the vaguest character, which permits my right hon. friend to retire within the lines of Torres Vedras whenever he finds it convenient to do so. Let me point out to the right hon. gentleman—because he has insisted, outside of this Parliament, if not within, that the high cost of living is due to the customs tariff—that a perfectly impartial observer and writer, and one whose opinion would not be influenced by any lack of sympathy for him, has made a rather remarkable pronouncement on the tariff of 1897, which was not materially altered in 1907. In his recent work published in the latter part of 1913, Professor O. A. Skelton, in dealing with the general economic history of the Dominion, says at page 201, with regard to my right hon. friend's tariff of 1897:

Yet, with all this tinkering, the tariff remained substantially the National Policy tariff of the old régime.

I do not intend to-night, especially having regard to the fact that a commission is investigating this question at the present time, to deal at any length with the causes that have brought about the increase in the cost of living. My right hon. friend himself has admitted that the increase in the cost of

living is world-wide. In the same work from which I have just quoted, a General Economic History of the Dominion, 1867-1912, by Professor Skelton, I observe at page 272 the following:

> After 1896 the rise was rapid and almost unbroken; the index numbers prepared by the Dominion Department of Labour showed that by 1912 the average wholesale prices of the most important commodities had risen nearly thirty per cent above the average from 1890 to 1900, and the retail prices and rents had soared to still higher levels. This rise, as English railway strikes, French food riots, German Socialist victories and United States urban discontent revealed, was not peculiar to Canada; under the price-equalizing influences of international exchange, all the leading countries shared in the increase, in fairly proportionate degree.

That is the opinion of a disinterested writer who has made the study of economics his lifework. Many considerations have been put forward by economic writers as reasons for the increase in the cost of living. It has been asserted that a higher standard of living has been established throughout the world during a period of great prosperity. According to the opinions of others, it has been based, to a certain extent, upon the increase of urban population and the relative decrease of rural population. It has been urged that the large immigration to Canada of persons, many of whom locate in cities, and none of whom became producers of food within a year or eighteen months, has also had its effect. The increased cost of labour, resulting in an increase in the cost of producing and distributing food products, including the cost of delivery in cities and towns, has been put forward by others as a contributing cause. Then it has been urged that the increase is to some extent dependent upon the lack of organization among producers and consumers, and part of it has been laid at the door of waste and extravagance. Great losses occur in all civilized countries through unnecessary fires; Professor Skelton says that in the United States there is a yearly loss by fire of buildings which placed side by side would constitute a block extending from New York to Chicago. Waste, loss and extravagance of this character are urged as causes. Then other economic writers put forward the decrease in the purchasing power of money owing to the remarkable increase in gold production in the last two decades.

I do not intend to pass upon any of these causes. It may be that all of them have contributed in one way or another. But when my right hon. friend urges, as he has urged, that this increase in the cost of living is due to the tariff, I would like to point out to him that the increase has not been restricted to recent years. Taking the number 100 as representing the average prices from 1890 to 1899, the index numbers, so-called, were as follows: in 1890 it was 110.3. In 1897 it had decreased to 92.2. My right hon. friend will observe that that was under the National Policy which he had undertaken to destroy. In 1907 it had risen to 126. In 1908, during a period of financial stringency and business restriction, it fell to 120.8. In 1911 it had risen to 127.4. In 1912 it had risen to 134.4. In 1913 there was a trifling increase to 135. It is a remarkable fact that from 1890 to 1896 the cost of living in this country decreased, and an equally remarkable fact that from 1896 until the right hon. gentleman went out of power the cost of living increased in every year except one, 1907. By 1901 the cost of living in this country had reached the figure at which it stood in 1890, far above the figure of 1897. If my right hon. friend believes what he seems to believe, if one may judge by his speeches throughout the country, that this is all due to the tariff, why was it that during the fourteen years between 1897 and 1911 he took no step whatever to apply a remedy? But, if I mistake not, in the United States it is almost universally admitted that the reduction or abolition of the duties on food has had little or no effect upon prices in that country. My right hon. friend makes a comparison between the cost of living in this country and the cost of living in Great Britain. I have here a quotation, but I shall not take up the time of the House by reading it, from Mr. Coats, the statistician in the Department of Labour, who points out that although the cost of living is higher in Canada than in Great Britain, it is not by any means so much in excess as is indicated by the figures which the right hon. gentleman gave to the House this afternoon.

The abolition of duties as against the United States could hardly have the effect which the right hon. gentleman has claimed for it in his speeches outside of this House. He has declared, as I have understood his speeches, that the cost of living had been increased in Canada by the fact that the markets of the United States were taking our food products, and then, in connection with that, he suggested that the people of this country could obtain relief by abolishing the duties on food as

9 p.m.

against the United States. If the prices in the United States are so much higher than they are in Canada as to cause a flow of food products from this Dominion into the United States, how in the name of common sense are you to get relief by going to the United States and buying food products there at the high prices prevailing in that country? But, my right hon. friend may say: Let us throw down the bars altogether and open up our home market to all the nations of the world. Does he not realize the truth of what was expressed by Prof. Skelton, and what is expressed in more homely phrase in one of the United States journals which was attracted by certain utterances of my right hon. friend, that if we are going into the markets of the world to buy food products for the people of Canada, we shall meet Uncle Sam there, and the prices in the United States will, to a certain extent at least, control the situation? The markets of the world are governed by international conditions and demands.

Further, it has been pointed out by one of the foremost journals in the province of Ontario that the most obvious deduction from the speech of my right hon. friend in Hamilton would be this, that the only relief that could be brought to the people of Canada, if his theory is correct, would be to place an export duty on cattle, sheep, hogs and meats. I do not think my right hon. friend will be prepared to maintain a proposal of that kind.

He has also alleged that the high cost of living is due to trusts and combines. Well, if it is due to trusts and combines now, was it not due to trusts and combines during the fourteen years in which he saw it increase? If it was due to the causes which he suggests, why did he not apply some of those remedies which he has been putting forward to the people of this country but as to which he was absolutely silent when he rose to speak in this House? And, further, does he not think that the trusts and combines in the United States are more numerous and highly developed than in Canada, and does he not believe that if we threw down our tariff bars and exposed the home markets of every province in Canada to competition from the United States, the trusts and combines of the United States would be just as powerful in Canada and just as detrimental in Canada as they could be in the United States?

Just one thing more in that connection. I would like to point out to my right hon. friend that the difficulty is not wholly due to decreased production in Canada. Between 1901 and 1911 the population of Canada increased 34 per cent. The total production of milk increased 44 per cent. The export of dairy products decreased 11 per cent. The importation of dairy products increased 14 per cent and the total consumption increased 74 per cent. The per capita consumption in Canada during that period increased 30 per cent. Between 1900 and 1910 the production of eggs increased from 84,000,000 dozen to 143,000,000 dozen and their value increased from ten and a quarter million to twenty three and a half million dollars. During the same period the export of eggs decreased from 11,000,000 dozen to 92,000 dozen and the imports increased from 950,000 dozen to nearly two and a half million dozen. This indicates that the standard of living in Canada has increased, and the consumption in Canada, not only the actual but the per capita consumption, of a great many articles of food has very greatly increased in the meantime. What is the remedy? I say that the remedy is properly to be considered in this country and in this House, and the Government is giving it consideration. I say, in the first place, give every reasonable assistance and encouragement to maintain and increase the number of people on the land. I say, in the second place, assist the farmer with good roads, as we proposed in the Highways Bill against which the Opposition voted, and which was defeated by their friends in the Senate. Aid him with instruction in improved methods of production, as is proposed by the Agricultural Instruction Act. Thus increase the ratio of production to the labour and capital employed. Promote co-operation among the producers and the consumers and find more effective and cheaper methods of marketing. I do not say these are the only remedies that can be devised, but they are remedies that commend themselves strongly to me, and so far as is possible this Government will be prepared to act along those lines and to assist in every possible way in keeping the people upon the land, and in promoting co-operation between the producers and the consumers throughout Canada.

My right hon. friend's remedy is to abolish the protection now afforded the farmer in the home market and at the same time to subject him to a tariff protecting other industries. That seems to be a remarkable proposition. If my right hon. friend makes that proposal to

the urban population of Canada, I venture to say it will be no more effective among them than it is among the farmers of Canada. If we are to protect our industries, that of agriculture is at least entitled to the same consideration as any other. I say, however, to the labouring and urban population of Canada that if the farmers' home market is not protected, then the labouring population of the cities cannot expect that the industries which afford them employment can be protected. We believe that under present conditions in this country, Canadian industries ought to enjoy reasonable protection in order that our natural resources and raw materials can be worked up into the finished product by our own population instead of being exported to foreign countries to be employed in the support and development of their industries.

My right hon. friend has had many fiscal policies. He has had, in the first place, the policy of protection with which he started out in public life. He has had the policy of commercial union. He has advocated the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, and, among other policies, Continental free trade, free trade as it is in England, revenue tariff, restricted reciprocity, and now free food. My right hon. friend has not stood by these policies very thoroughly. He has asserted them in very energetic terms, but when it came to the final conclusion of the matter he has not lived up to the mark. I have a great many quotations from my right hon. friend's speeches, but I shall use only one or two of them. In 1894 my right hon. friend was very strong upon the theory of free trade as it is in England. He said in Winnipeg in 1894:

When the Liberal party are in power they will at once give a measure of freedom of trade and step by step they will follow it up, and if God spares our lives we shall progress steadily until we have it as full as Great Britain has it. I come before you to-night to preach to you this new gospel of free trade. I denounce to you the policy of protection as bondage, yes bondage and I refer to it as bondage in the same way as American slavery was bondage. Sir, our policy is freedom of trade such as exists in England, such as is practiced in Great Britain.

There are many similar references. In a letter written by Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Bertram less than two years afterwards, my right hon. friend did not stand very closely to that policy. He said:

Whether a policy of absolute freedom of trade would or would not be injurious to the manufacturing industries of this country, is a question which I will not stop to discuss here. There is no occasion for such a discussion as the intention of the Liberal party is not and never was to establish free trade in this country.

Under these circumstances, it would seem to me that the people could not have a great deal of confidence that my right hon. friend will persevere in the policy of free food which he advocated at Hamilton, which he partially abandoned at Montreal, and which he seems to have altogether abandoned now that he has reached this House.

My right hon. friend has also referred to unemployment. He has stated that there are 100,000 people in Canada at the present time out of employment. Has my right hon. friend any authority for that statement?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think that I am within the mark.

Mr. BORDEN: Of course, we can all have our own opinions on such subjects. I would like to point out to my right hon. friend that his somewhat despondent opinion as to conditions in this country does not seem to be shared by some of his political friends. I observed in a great Liberal organ, in its issue of January 1, a number of messages from the provincial premiers. Four of these gentlemen are friends of my right hon. friend. I shall only extract a sentence or two from each one, and I am bound to say that it is to the credit of his friends who are at the head of provincial affairs, that they do not take the same pessimistic view of conditions in Canada as that which my right hon. friend has expressed to this House. Sir James Whitney, whose illness we all so sincerely deplore, and who will, I hope, shortly be restored to health, said:

Ontario has had a year of great prosperity and can see still greater things ahead.

He was not looking at conditions in Ontario through the same spectacles that my right hon. friend uses.

Sir Lomer Gouin, Premier of Quebec, said:

The province of Quebec has every reason to be satisfied with the measure of progress and prosperity which has been vouchsafed to it in 1913.

There is no note of pessimism in that such as my right hon. friend has uttered.

Hon. G. H. Murray, Premier of Nova Scotia, said:

There was much less decline in trade in Nova Scotia than in the western and central provinces. Moreover the present indications are promising.

Hon. J. K. Flemming (N.B.):—

Notwithstanding 'tight money,' the slackening of business energy within the province dur-

the last year has been limited. We are hopeful that 1914 may prove a banner year. Our people are optimistic and better satisfied than formerly to remain and help to develop the wealth and possibilities in New Brunswick.

Hon. J. A. Matheson (P.E.I.):—

Generally speaking the year has been characterized by great corporate activity, as above referred to, and in other lines by a large and profitable trade, a fair production in the farming and fishing industries, a good measure of general prosperity, and the largest provincial revenue in our history.

Sir Rodmond Roblin (Manitoba):—

The year 1913 has been one of steady and satisfying progress along all lines for the province of Manitoba. In agriculture, in commerce, and along all industrial lines the year has been especially satisfactory.

Hon. Walter Scott (Saskatchewan):—

Saskatchewan reaches the end of the year with her farming population in better position and in better spirits than was the case a year ago.

Hon. Arthur L. Sifton (Alberta):—

Judged by every standard of the economist, Alberta exhibits a condition of prosperity. Nineteen hundred and thirteen has been one of the best years in this period.

Hon. Sir Richard McBride (B.C.).—

British Columbia has made remarkable progress in the year just ended, and there is every reason to anticipate continued growth and prosperity in 1914.

Under these circumstances my right hon. friend cannot afford to sing the doleful song he has chanted to us.

Let me tell the leader of the Opposition that if he looks abroad he will find that there are countries in the world possessing magnificent resources and which are undoubtedly looking forward with certitude to a great future, in which the conditions as to non-employment are very much worse than they are in Canada. Between November 15 and December 1, idle freight cars in the United States increased from 22,000 to 57,000.

Any observations which I purpose making as to conditions in the United States for the purpose of comparing those outlined by my right hon. friend as existing in Canada, are not made with the idea of reflecting in any way upon the future of the United States. I might point out, indeed, that

that great economic and business authority, Sir George Paish, is convinced that conditions in the United States at present are such as will lead to an early and very marked advance of prosperity and business activity in that country. I am merely pointing out that there are conditions in the United States of a temporary character which seem to me to transcend anything that my right hon. friend has been able to point to in Canada, even if we accept his statement as to non-employment at its face value. The Daily Iron Trade estimates that in the United States there are in the iron and steel industry 1,000,000 men on the idle list with a wage loss of fifty millions a month; also 270,000 miners out of work. Blast furnaces in operation declined from 306 to 183. The Daily Iron Trade also estimates that one million men have been thrown out of employment who were engaged in industries allied to the steel and iron business. In South Chicago district nearly 6,000 men were recently discharged within three weeks and a much larger number placed on half time. In Washington 227 shingle and lumber mills have been closed and 15,000 men thrown out of employment. The New York Journal of Commerce estimates that the present wage payments throughout the United States are 1,250,000 dollars per day below the normal, indicating a falling of four hundred million dollars for the year. The same journal states that out of a total of 627,000 union men employed in New York state, 101,150 are out of work, representing the highest unemployed average for many years.

Although the conditions in Great Britain are fairly satisfactory, so far as most branches of the trade are concerned, there were, during the year ending November, 1913, 38 blast furnaces (pig iron) out of 321 closed down, 28 tin plate mills out of 508 closed down, and six steel sheet mills out of 77 closed down. There are similar statistics as to loss of employment in other European countries, but I will not inflict them upon the House to-night.

I will merely add this, that when my right hon. friend asserts that there was not any non-employment in Canada from 1897 to the present year he is absolutly forgetful of the conditions which prevailed during the latter part of 1907 and the early part of 1908. If I am not mistaken the conditions as to

non-employment during that period were quite as severe as those which prevail in Canada at present. I hope the manufacturing and commercial establishments in Canada, and other large employers of labour will bear in mind that during a period of great prosperity things have been going well for them and well for the country, and if owing to a certain financial stringency which prevails throughout the world, business may be checked a little now, it is not desirable that they should be too ready to throw men out of employment. They ought rather to have a little patience and to use a certain foresight and to look forward to that recovery of business which we have every reason to believe will begin when spring opens.

I have transgressed upon the time of the House much longer than I intended to. Let me say in closing simply this. The Government have in mind and will have in mind the prevailing conditions, whether restricted to Canada or of world-wide scope, and the Government will endeavour to do their duty by the people of Canada and by this country. The Government are firmly impressed with the belief that any little check at the present time is purely temporary and that the people of this country have every right to be optimistic and to look forward to the future with confident hope that the development and progress in the years to come will be infinitely greater than any which have characterized past years.

As to the resolution which my right hon. friend has proposed: it is designed to invite the opinion of the House adversely to the Government; it is a want of confidence resolution pure and simple. Under the circumstances, in view of the paucity of argument which my right hon. friend was able to bring forward in its support; in view of the fact that we have these conditions under consideration at the present time; in view of the fact that my right hon. friend has not been able to point out in his speech one single measure which he himself would advocate at present for the purpose of relieving the conditions which he claims to exist, I ask the hon. members of this House to mete out to this resolution the treatment which it deserves and to reject it by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): I should like to be allowed to associate myself with the expressions that have been used on both sides of the House, both as to the sympathy of the people of Canada with their Royal Highnesses and as to the ability displayed by the mover and seconder of the Address. I would like to congratulate my right hon. friend the Prime Minister also on the fact that he appears to be in very good health as compared with the reports we heard about him during the recess. I am very glad he has been able to give us abundant evidence that these reports were very much exaggerated.

I have a somewhat unpleasant duty to discharge in my next sentence, and that is to take absolute sides with the leader of the Government and against my right hon. friend in one particular. I am a western man, and personally I am grateful to the Government for the time at which they have called the House together. I have good reason to know that that action of the Government was taken not without sympathy for the members of this House who live at great distances from the seat of government. I do not think that the late meeting of the House should lead to any undue lengthening of the session. I think that, if we get to work as we should do, it would rather have the effect of the business going through in a more expeditious and business-like way than sometimes it has done.

There is a great deal of purposeless talk, I think, in all parliaments. Not that I think that that applies to the talk of the Opposition last session. There was nothing purposeless about our talk. We had a very definite purpose in view and we accomplished it. Our purpose was to bring the Government and their supporters to a better frame of mind in regard to naval proposals. What that frame of mind is now, I am in a little haze about, so far as the Prime Minister's speech is concerned. I am glad, however, to recognize, in the business-like address which has been brought down, that the Government desires to shorten the session and to shorten discussions. Certainly, the programme of the Government for this session is most unambitious in its nature. I think they have introduced only one Bill, and that they are compelled to do, under the circumstances, by the last census—the Redistribution Bill. With regard to that Bill, I would only say this: that I have found a very general opinion amongst the people of this country—and an opinion which I share—that there will be two considerations, which at any rate will be present in the mind of the Prime Minister of this country in regard to that Bill. The first is that he is most unlikely to go outside the recognized constitution of the country,

and the second is that there is a widespread confidence that he would not lend his personal authority to anything like a gerrymander. I share that view, and I shall continue to share it until evidence is brought to the contrary.

Now, there are one or two points in the Speech that I think the Opposition may fairly pass. We are promised an economical administration. There is a good deal of the compulsory feature that overtook the prodigal son in that promise. The fact is that that promise would have been more useful to the country, if it had been followed by performance, if it had been made two years ago. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), in the art of dissipating a fortune, has made the prodigal son a beginner. He got a legacy of $50,000,000 of a surplus. That surplus has gone, and then he, who, I presume, is responsible for that particular paragraph of the Address, promises economy. Even deathbed or late repentances, however, are not to be discouraged in this world, and I can only express the hope that that paragraph of the Address will at any rate be carried out, and I am sure that is a hope which is shared by a very large majority of the people of this country.

My right hon. friend the Prime Minister has taken rather a peculiar course in the very lengthy speech which he has delivered to us. He has shown a distinct disposition to revive the controversies of last session, while he has dropped the Bills of last session. That is a most peculiar course. In fact, this is a very peculiar Government. Last session they gave us the Bills and they gave up the controversies. This session they have dropped the Bills, and my right hon. friend renews the controversies. Well, I can only say in regard to that that if there is a general disposition to renew the controversies of last session, we still have some physical strength and ideas left, and the challenge will be taken up at once. I am very glad to take it up in regard to the Highways Bill. There have been very numerous statements made about this Bill, and very peculiar statements. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche), who is usually a man of very moderate language, went into the west, and I think in the town of Minnedosa he said that the Senate had throttled or killed the Highways Bill. This is a fair selection of the words he used. There was some excuse for his using strong language on that occasion—I do not believe in using strong language myself—because he was accompanied by no less an exemplar than the Premier of Manitoba. The Premier of Manitoba on that occasion referred to my fellow countryman in the person of the Postmaster General of Great Britain, first as a grampus and then as a jelly-bag Englishman. Well, they say that evil communications corrupt good manners, and so I can understand the strong language of my hon. friend.

Now, against all this talk about strangling and throttling and killing and throwing out, what happened to the Highways Bill? I have never found any difficulty with any audience in this country in getting them to be absolutely enthusiastic about the Senate's action in regard to the Highways Bill, when they knew the facts. This talk of strangling and throttling must all be given up when we come to the facts. There were six clauses in the Highways Bill. The Senate passed five of them. Is it fair controversy to charge that Chamber with having killed the Bill when they absolutely passed five-sixths of it without alteration? What was the sixth clause? My hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. McLeod) talks about this Bill having reached the hearts of the people of this country. The sixth clause was devised to reach their votes, and to reach their votes by using the money, as the clause gave them power to use it when and where they liked, and we know an election was on, and for the purpose of helping Tory candidates. Now, my right hon. friend says, in the only answer he gives to this charge, that he intends to fix the responsibility for the killing of this measure upon the Senate. My right hon. friend will not have the fixing of the responsibility. The responsibility will be fixed by the people of this country when they know the facts. He says that he and my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) expressed an intention that the moneys would be spent pro rata among the whole of the inhabitants of the country. I want to put it to my right hon. friend: is it a fair manner of conducting the legislation of this country that it should depend upon the expressed intention of any minister? Is there not a possibility of binding all ministers, so long as the Act remains in force, by the simple process of putting their intentions in the Bill? This they persistently refused to do, and by persistently refusing to do it, they showed that they wanted carte blanche to spend the money when and where they liked. Now,

these are all the facts in regard to the Highways Bill.

Mr. BORDEN: Is my hon. friend referring to clause 6?

Mr. CLARK: The amendment made by the Senate provided that the money should be spent according to population, that is according to the way that my right hon. friend himself said he personally intended it should be spent. Clause 6 was cut out altogether, because the Government refused these amendments. But, with the five clauses and the Senate amendment, every cent of the money could have been spent upon the highways. No one on the other side will deny that. But the Government refused to spend it, without their precious sixth clause. The Senate threw out that clause and the Government destroyed the Bill. The action of the Government in this affair reminds me of an incident that occurred in my own professional practice. I happened to be present at the birth of a baby born with a supernumerary thumb—six digits upon one hand. With the help of the nurse and the approval of the parents I took off the extra thumb. The child looked better, and it lived and throve. What would have been thought of the parents if they had killed the child because I took its deformity away? But this Government was much more unreasonable even than these parents would have been if they had killed this child themselves, for they killed their child and then blamed the Senate for doing it.

I thought it better to take up this highways matter at once. But a number of interesting things politically have occurred since last session. My right hon. friend referred to the Chateauguay election. I wonder he mentioned it, especially in connection with the Naval Bill. I wonder if he knows what went on in that election. The Chateauguay election was won by a double appeal. The first appeal was to the cupidity of the electors—and about that I do not want to talk. I do not wish to spend my time upon it, and, to be candid, I am afraid that such appeals are all too common on the part of both political parties in Canada. The great majority of the people of this country hope that the time is soon coming when we shall have purer politics in that regard. But there was another appeal made, that to the pusillanimity of the electors, and to that I wish to refer. I am personally concerned. Words that I used last year in the naval debate were printed upon a leaflet and circulated in that constituency. I will read them to the House. I said, in the course of a few brief and imperfect remarks that from time to time I had to make last winter:

> If the storm of which Mr. Borden speaks were to break, not a drop of Canadian blood would be spilt or risked.

When I used that language, in the innocence of my heart I believed that I was pointing out a defect in the scheme of contribution which would make it stink in the nostrils of every right thinking Canadian. But here it is reproduced as a recommendation of this measure,—and then the Prime Minister comes here and makes a feeble effort to revive his flag-waving. What a lot of tame jingoes my imperialist friends become when they get into the neighbourhood of Mr. Bourassa. There was another election in the recess which was quite a good offset to what happened in Chateauguay. I make my compliments to the Government upon the win they made in Chateauguay, especially to the imperialistic section of the Government. But there was an interesting election in South Bruce. My hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) went down there. I do not know why the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) sent him. He seems to have made a very good diagnosis as to the scenes in which he himself should operate. I should like, by the way, to join my compliments, my very sincere and heartfelt compliments, to those of my right hon. friend and leader on the appointment of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). I think he knows that I am very sincere in offering them; but I noticed that when he went to that election he made the remark that the Government, everybody must admit, had been riding on a flood tide ever since they came into power. It occurred to me it was a pity he went there, he soon turned it into an ebb. It was not quite so apparent to some of us that the tide had been so strong behind them; certainly, it was not so strong as in the case of other governments that have come into power. The reason why I mentioned the South Bruce election was that the Naval Bill was an issue, a very distinct issue, in that election. I heard in Nova Scotia a most interesting instance of how it was made so. In Amherst, the Tory journalist wrote a long article—such articles were written all over the country—to the effect that this was an ideal constituency to test the naval issue. This gentleman wrote just such an article

as any Tory journalist would have written who was a prophet and saw a Government victory ahead. And when he got the result of the election, I am told, he nearly fainted. I refer to the election to say that the result of that contest in the province of Ontario has had far more to do with the dropping of the Naval Bill than even the action of the Senate itself. I cannot understand the method of discussion followed by this Government and by its right hon. leader. I should have thought that he would have admitted that there had been an enormous change in the position of naval matters since last session. The fact is that during the recess there has been a great clarifying of the empire's position in the naval issue.

My right hon. friend méntioned the memorandum of Mr. Winston Churchill, the first memorandum, and he actually defended his contribution policy in a kind of postscript by referring to that memorandum. He seems to forget that in the course of the debate his first memorandum went by the board, and Mr. Churchill sent a second. The second memorandum shifted the trouble from the North sea a thousand miles to Gibraltar rock. The right hon. leader of this House is very curious in his dealings with Mr. Churchill. First, he goes with Mr. Churchill, he bases himself on what Mr. Churchill sends him; and then, at the end of the session, he takes him up once more and makes a considerable part of his speech by reading from recent speeches of Mr. Churchill in Great Britain. The whole case of contribution was a case of emergency, and the emergency disappeared when the fleet went to Gibraltar. And if it disappeared at that time, where is the emergency to-day? My right hon. hon. friend knows, and every one of his supporters knows, that the fleet has been dispersed to the seven seas and the German fleet with it—and every lover of civilization is very glad to see that come about. And that dispersal of the fleet is the second absolute justification of all that the Opposition did last winter, whether it was in the House of Commons or in the Senate. If they required further justification for their attitude, if they required any further defense as being as good British Empire men as sit on the other side of the House, it would be found in the fact that during the recess the little colony of New Zealand has given up the policy of contribution and has taken the policy of the Liberal Opposition in this Parliament.

Now, I want to come a little nearer to the amendment and dwell upon some other aspects of the Address. I felicitate the Government on being able to announce an increase in the foreign commerce of the country. By the way, I am the only man in this House, if it be true that I am the only free trader in the House, who can thoroughly and properly rejoice in that paragraph. The contradictions of protection are most wonderful things. We have a Government which puts a paragraph in the Address rejoicing in the extension of our foreign commerce, and then lecturing me, a solitary free trader, for a year after that on the importance of a home market. I do not know what right the Government has to rejoice at the extension of foreign commerce in a protection country. However, there are some things in connection with our foreign commerce which would give students of economics good reason to pause. The fact is that our foreign trade has been largely increased by the increase in prices, and that the increase of exports is not anything like what it should be if Canada were doing her duty in the development of her resources. As a free trader, I am confronted not only with this paragraph of the Address, but with another very interesting spectacle. Under the predecessors of my hon. friends opposite we had eighteen years of what has been called the National Policy; then we had sixteen years under a Liberal Government, with what I am bound to confess were somewhat microscopic modifications of that policy; then we have had two more years of a continuation of the policy with the microscopic modifications. Now I am confronted with an amendment to the Address asking us to recognize that the Government has taken no steps to remedy the depression of trade in this country. It is a remarkable spectacle; there is something wrong with the country. The slogan ' leave well enough alone ' now appears to be supplanted on the part of this Government by the slogan ' leave ill enough alone.' I do not think that at the present moment, despite the brave show my right hon. friend puts on this matter, that he would repeat his slogan of two years ago, and tell us to ' leave well enough alone.' In the presence of this depression, which the Government sees fit to admit, what do they do? They fall back upon the boundless resources of the country. Well, the boundless resources of the country, Mr. Speaker, are not an asset peculiar to this Government; they were in existence when there was practically nothing in the country except buffaloes and Indians, but they did not make a prosperous and happy country. What is wanted by the country is

some little resource on the part of the Government, and there are a great many people who, however brave a show my right hon. friend may make about this depression not being very serious, are of the opinion that dreadnoughts at the present moment are not so important as the cost of living, and who are coming to the conclusion that in a country of boundless resources it is unfortunate to have a Government of very limited resources. I am bound to say that in that view they will be largely borne out by the Address, and by the speech of my right hon. friend in regard to the high cost of living. But hon. gentlemen opposite not only tell us about the boundless resources of the country; they tell us also that they have appointed a commission. I went down to Halifax the other night and said we had a government of dissolving views, not of strong convictions and settled policy, and we certainly have a government of dissolving views in regard to the matter of commissions. In the first session of Parliament they brought forward a Bill to establish a tariff commission, and one of the horrible misdeeds of the Senate is that they are said to have destroyed the tariff commission. They did nothing of the sort; they put in an amendment which would make the commission look after the interests of the consumer as well as the interests of the producer, and the Government would not accept the amendment, thereby showing that they were tied to the producing interests and cared nothing about the consumer. Where does the condemnation of the Senate come in? My right hon. friend says of that most experienced member of this Administration who went down to Lanark and used the language quoted by my right hon. friend this afternoon, that he is now on the sea, coming back from England. Well, personally, that does not strike an extraordinary amount of terror into my heart; I only wish he were here now. I would like to have asked him what he meant by his language in South Lanark, especially when it is considered in relation to other langauge used in regard to this very tariff commission. We have not forgotten how at the end of the first session, with finger outstretched and voice upraised, he charged my right hon. friend with having opposed the mandate of the country to appoint a tariff commission, and one would have thought he were going to carry the fiery cross through Canada. When you have a government that means business in regard to an upper chamber, then that business will be done. When Mr. George's budget was thrown out by the House of Lords, he did not hesitate about what he should do with that body—he went to the people, and for the life of me, in regard to the Naval Bill, I cannot see why my right hon. friend should not follow that example, if he feels as courageous as he seems to be. For the life of me I cannot see what my right hon. friend's quarrel with the Senate is on the Naval Bill. I did not wish to speak about this; I said so at the end of last session, but if my right hon. friend persists in charging the Senate with these things, we must see where the blame really lies. My right hon. friend came home from Europe after being there the summer before last, and, I think, on three occasions he said: 'I have consulted the Admiralty, as I said I would; I will lay my proposals before Parliament.' He did that, as he said he would, but he also said: 'If they are not accepted by Parliament, I will submit them to the people.' Now, in regard to the Naval Bill the Senate only said: 'Very well, submit it to the people.' Where is the quarrel between my right hon. friend and the Senate? That is another case of our having no fear of where the people stand once they know the cold facts in the matter. However, speaking of the tariff commission, my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce excommunicated my right hon. friend with bell, book and candle because the Senate had destroyed the Tariff Commission Bill in opposition to the mandate of the people. But he himself is the best justification of the action of the Senate, because, having heard from the people of South Bruce, he goes to the people of South Lanark and says: 'The Lord knows we have far too many commissions; they are as plentiful as the berries in Kazuabazua.' That is one of the places, I suppose, where the hon. gentleman has been seeking a market. And then he goes to England, and, after he has expressed this opinion to the people of South Lanark, the Government straightway appoints another commission. If that is not a case of dissolving views, I never saw one. The real emergency to-day is, as I think my right hon. friend has said, not a question of dreadnoughts. The German scare never was a real emergency; it was a sham emergency, and the high cost of living is the real emergency which confronts the people of this country. I do not propose keeping the House very long, and I certainly do not purpose making a budget speech upon the Address. I think that would be a highly inconvenient method of conducting public discussion in this Par-

liament. I want to show that I am rising to grace just as the Prime Minister is falling from it. I have had occasion to compliment him on short speeches before, but he will have to reform a little to get back to my good graces in that matter. I want to show that I am following his good example and not his bad one. But I do want to state this that I do not think there is any doubt whatever about the main cause of the high cost of living in protectionist countries. The Minister of Finance said last year in a somewhat light and airy way which he puts on with very great grace, that this is not a local trouble, it is all over the world—and there he left it. But we must look into this a little more closely. We are told that the high cost of living exists in Great Britain as well as in this country. It is not the case, not to anything like the same extent. The simple fact on that matter is that in the one free trade country in the world today, the one absolutely free trade country, you can get pretty well value for your money. In regard to foodstuffs the prices are high because Great Britain has to import the surplus of other nations and I think a very good argument could be set up in favour of the view that protection in other nations raises the price of foodstuffs in Great Britain, for if you talk the home market you will produce for the home market, you will have no surplus to sell and that must make a scarcity in Great Britain. But the British Board of Trade has issued a publication recently in which, taking the index number as 100, they show that the cost of living has risen since 1902 to 115 in Great Britain, while it has risen to 151 in Canada. That is a very serious question, and it will not be settled by party quips and passes as to what happened during the previous administrations. That is a very serious matter for the people of this country and a matter upon which we could have got light without the establishment of this commission of inquiry. Let me say that the cost of living in Great Britain ought to have risen far more than in Canada according to all a priori reasons. For what have you in Great Britain? You have five hundred people or nearly so to the square mile on an area, including Ireland, of one-half the province of Alberta. Here you have less than two people to the square mile upon a continent of resources. That is a most singular and significant fact. Why, we should be all well off in this country and well off at a cheap rate, if our economic arrangements were proper. Although not making a budget speech I wish to state my

conviction that in protectionist countries the high cost of living is due, in the first place, to tariff and, in the second place, to combines which arise out of the protection of the tariff. I do not have any

10 p.m.

doubt upon that subject. If I had, I think I could quote from good authority to convince hon. gentlemen opposite of both those opinions. The effect of a tariff is no mystery. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce said years ago in this House: Of course it is perfectly true that the effect of a tariff is to raise the price of the article carrying that tariff by the amount of that tariff.

There is no good economist on the face of the globe who can successfully controvert that position, and that settles all controversy on the matter. It cannot be successfully controverted. When an article costing say $100 comes to one of our ports and a tariff of 33 per cent is put on it at the port, that 33 per cent goes into the price of the article and the $100 becomes $133 and more than that, because a profit must be charged upon the tariff as well as upon the original price of the article. In regard to the effect of combines, I am going to quote an authority who ought to have more weight than even the Minister of Trade and Commerce with my hon. friends opposite—I am going to quote the Prime Minister himself. In a memorial which he put out last election in regard to the objections to the reciprocity pact, he remarked in the first place, that they are profound and abiding. After that remark he went on to enumerate those objections, and I want to call my right hon. friend's particular attention to this objection. He said: The reciprocity pact will for the most part reduce the prices which our producers will receive for their output while the control of the trusts will prevent any reduction to the consumer. That language is an admission on the part of my right hon. friend that at the last election he knew that the effect of the trusts was to raise the prices to the consumer and on that point he need not have appointed any commission now. If he will put together the opinion I have quoted from the Minister of Trade and Commerce and his own opinion he will find himself in this position that he is bound to admit from their own statements that the rise in prices in a protectionist country is due in the first place to tariff and in the second place to the combines which arise under the protection of the tariff. Confronted with the difficulty of living, what did Peel do? He attacked the tariff. What has Woodrow Wilson done in the United

States ? He has attacked the tariff, and I submit that if my right hon. leader follows the example of these hon. gentlemen and sets up serious arguments about this subject, neither his actions nor his arguments should be made the matter of jollification as they were in this House to-day. Inconsistency on the part of the right hon. gentleman only proves him to be human, but he is, at any rate, following the example of great statesmen both in Great Britain and in the United States, in the course which he has taken, and I submit that amongst all the events of the recess probably the event which most particularly affects the destiny of Canada and which will certainly affect the thoughts of Canada is the fiscal revolution which has been carried out by the President and the Democratic party in the United States. When I first came to this country and dared, I hope always respectfully, to give my opinion upon tariffs, I used to be regarded as a sort of benighted islander who had strayed somehow out of my proper path and the one recipe for my complaint was that some gentlemen on the other side of the House got up and said: Look at the great country to the south. I see the hon. member for York (Mr. McLeod) still gets lessons from that great country, because he quoted it in one particular in his speech to-night. Well, I looked to the great country to the south and I kept on looking, and now I turn to my hon. friends opposite and I say: Look at the great country to the south and what do you see ? We see a great, simple and sincere man coming into office and cutting up protection and tearing its economic fallacies and false arguments into shreds and casting them to the four winds of heaven. There is no argument by which protection has been supported anywhere that he did not expose and we see that man with the approbation apparently of the whole people, because there is one peculiar thing about this reform: both Republicans and Democrats recognize that they have a statesman who means business and they are prepared to give a fair trial to what he has introduced. My right hon. friend in discussing this subject used an argument which I did not think worthy of him. It is an argument which is being sent out, canned (probably from the Manufacturers' Association), and which is appearing in little country newspapers, proving that there has been no reduction in the price of foodstuffs in the United States since the reduction of the tariff. I put it to my right hon. friend, if forty years of the National Policy here and sixty years of high protection in the United States were needed before the people would take a fair dose of free trade, is it fair to free trade to expect it to produce a revolution in two months? A reduction in food stuffs is the very reduction which would not come at once. How could it? The moment Mr. Woodrow Wilson lowered the tariff a yearling could not become a three-year-old steer. I wish they could have. It would have been a very profitable business for me in Alberta, but it takes two years for a yearling to become a three-year-old. I could give my right hon. friend shoals of advertisement from the business men of the States showing that upon the other articles on which the tariff was reduced, prices came down immediately the tariff came into operation. Wannamaker's had a page advertisement in the New York papers mentioning the articles upon which their prices would be lowered the day the tariff came into effect. So I say the argument of my right hon. friend is scarcely worthy of him. This fiscal revolution in the United States has made it impossible for us to have reciprocity as it was proposed two years ago. I think everybody will recognize that as an absolutely necessary outcome of the change in the United States, but it does not follow that reciprocity is dead. It means that fifty per cent of it is very much alive and in operation on the other side of the line. I see the Minister of Finance making a note on that subject. I dare say he will tell us once more that reciprocity is dead. I very well remember when he first told us that. It was in his maiden speech. He said:

> As far as the province of Ontario is concerned, I may say that practically all classes were against reciprocity—farmers, manufacturers and artisans. And, sir, when a verdict is got from such a province as that, is it not the part of wisdom to accept it?

I have a conundrum for my hon. friend in connection with that quotation. When Ontario changes its verdict, what is our duty? There have been two elections in Ontario recently which have shown that they are not sure that they took the part of wisdom. They have cut down the majority in Middlesex lower than ever before, and I hope we shall hear from the member for South Bruce that reciprocity was made an issue in his county. After all it is not the name, it is the thing I care for. Reciprocity is a term applied to mutual trade arranged by governments; but while that may fall through, the cry of ' no truck or trade with the Yankees ' can never be raised again, because the trading between the two peoples has risen by hundreds of thousands of dollars since the pact was defeated.

This fiscal revolution has another bearing. While it did not kill reciprocity, it did kill in my judgment the policy of mutual preferences within the empire. May I remind the Government that one of the things they did last year was to pass the West Indian treaty. What has happened to that treaty as a result of the fiscal changes in the United States? The Minister of Trade and Commerce said to the delegates from the West Indies: We will help you by giving you one-fifth advantage on sugar over the rest of the world. President Wilson comes along and says: Little Canada away to the north is going to give you one-fifth advantage on sugar. I will do more than that for you, I will give you a ninety million market, fifty per cent off, and free sugar within three years. What becomes of your preference then, and the charge against the Opposition that we wasted time last session? That West Indian treaty is a piece of waste paper to-day. Their sugar will naturally go into the United States. Take the case of wool. What preference can we offer to Australia upon her wool, which is her staple product? The fact is mutual preferences within the empire are only possible so long as the other countries of the world remain protectionist and Britain stands for free trade. Great Britain shows no sign of deserting free trade, but the moment the other countries of the world desert protection there is no possibility of mutual preferences within the empire. And the fact that my right hon. friend advocates mutual preferences within the empire, shows that in his trade outlook he is a benighted protectionist.

I want to say a word or two in regard to another matter which is of vital and immediate moment to the people in the part of the country come from, and through them to the whole of Canada, a question which is raised in an acute form by the rearrangement of the United States tariff. I refer to the question of free wheat. If I wanted to impress upon them the importance of it, I should call their attention to the fact that the Argentine Republic has already availed itself of the United States' offer, and this I take to be a most vital matter for the Government of this country. I am surprised that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister had nothing to say upon this subject. If we want to increase the prosperity of this country we cannot do it by putting a paragraph in the Address referring to our boundless resources. As my right hon. leader said: you have to develop these resources and you will only develop them if you show yourselves acute enough business men to contend with your competitors in the Argentine and elsewhere for the markets of the world. I put it to the Government that the Argentine Government have already shown that they know the value of the offer of the United States and have availed themselves of it. What is the position of the Government of Canada? Echo answers, What? I wonder if they know their own position on this matter. The fact is that they have two positions. They had one in Manitoba six weeks ago; there is no doubt about that. Mr. Harvey Simpson, the Conservative member of the Legislature, was no doubt in communication with the most prominent member of this Government before he dared to put that resolution in favour of free wheat upon the table of the Manitoba House. That resolution has been carried by the political friends of the Government and carried unanimously in a Conservative House.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: Did Roblin vote for it?

Mr. CLARK: Presumably, Sir Rodmond Roblin must have voted for it, because it was carried unanimously. There are some other friends of my hon. friends opposite who came down from Alberta, and there is no possibility of them successfully denying the fact that they came also voicing the opinions of Western Conservatives as well as Western Liberals, to ask for free wheat. But this Government is a government of dissolving views; not only a government of dissolving views, it is a government of double views because the same Minister of Public Works who said to the Manitoba Conservative legislators: ask for free wheat; he apparently said to the legislators from Alberta: don't ask for free wheat. In the presence of such a peculiar spectacle I am surprised that the Prime Minister did not give us some light upon this subject, and I certainly think we ought to hear from the Government and hear from the Government at once: whether in this country we have not statesmen as acute-minded, or at any rate as resolute as the statesmen of the Argentine Republic. Personally I cannot understand the Government hesitating a moment in this matter; that is to say, if they are actuated purely by a desire to do what is best for Canada. Many arguments that were used in regard to the reciprocity pact of two years ago do not apply to this matter at all. This question is not now part of a large general agreement; it cannot be argued that it interferes with our fiscal independence. We simply have to take the

tariff off wheat, which would be no sacrifice whatever, and we get entry into the United States market for our wheat. I want to remind the ministers that they know as well as I know that Western grain growers do not fear competition from the United States or anywhere else. In fact, one of the peculiarities of this Government, as distinguished from the Opposition, is that they have no faith in their own country. They tell us we must not trade with the United States or we should be annexed; they told us last year we could not build ships in this country, and now they are afraid apparently that our wheat in the West can be successfully competed against from abroad. I want to tell my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who no doubt is seriously considering this question, that we in the West have confidence in our country, that we have confidence in our wheat, and that we believe that no wheat anywhere can compete with it because we produce the best in the world. That is the kind of Canada we believe in and that is the kind of Canadianism we believe in. There was another argument used two years ago that need not frighten my hon. friends opposite now. They told us: there is no market to the south of us. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in that wonderful four hour speech, used the famous illustration of the jack knife. He said: why, you cannot do any business with the United States because they produce the same materials that we do; it would be like two men trying to make themselves richer by exchanging jack knives. But, let me call the attention of the minister to the enlightenment which they no doubt have already got as to the substantial nature of the exchanges that are going on between us and the United States. The tariff on cattle has been removed entirely. In the year 1912, 7,600 head of cattle all told went from Canada to the United States, and it is admitted that since the Woodrow Wilson tariff went into operation 100,000 head of cattle have gone below the line. So, our friends opposite need not tell us any more that we cannot do business with the United States. I never argue this question on the ground of price, but I am pleased to inform the Government and their supporters that those who argued that reciprocity would bring us higher prices have been fully borne out by events, because it is a fact that the cattle raisers of Alberta have received one dollar per hundred pounds more for cattle last year that they have ever received during the time I have been in this country. The result of the Woodrow Wilson tariff has been that there is an enormous increase in the sale of Canadian cattle. The tariff on oats has been reduced, and what has been the result? It is established that in the year 1912 we sold the magnificent quantity of 183,000 bushels of oats to the United States, whereas since the Woodrow Wilson tariff came into operation we have sold something in the neighbourhood of twenty million bushels in a couple of months. There is no question any longer as to whether there is a market for us in the United States; we know now we have a market there. And, Sir, I want to point out what would be the result of these dealings with the United States. The result must inevitably be increased production of cattle and oats in the western provinces. Increased production will lead to increased settlement; increased settlement will lead to increased immigration, increased immigration will bring in increased capital, which will benefit every portion of the Dominion. That is what we lost by the rejection of the reciprocity pact.

I want to go a little further into an examination of this free wheat project. It is a very peculiar spectacle which presents itself to us in the matter of the grain growers and farmers of the West coming to the Government and seeking the abolition of the tariff upon their own product. I call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that usually when an interest comes to the Government in connection with the tariff it is to request that the tariff be increased upon their products, or that it may be allowed to remain without reduction. And, curiously enough, in a protectionist country like this, and with a protectionist Government like this, these people get an extraordinary amount of consideration. Now, representing the farmers of the West, I want to ask the Government why it is they do not give the same consideration to the men engaged in the industry of agriculture when they come to ask that the tariff upon wheat should be abolished—and that is all they are asking for—that they give to the manufacturers of this country who come to them with respect to the tariff on their products. Have the farmers not the right to speak for their own industry? What is sacrosanct or holy about manufacturers so called that they should receive very much attention from the Government and that no heed should be paid to the plea of the

farmers who are engaged in the most important industry of all. I contend it is the right of the wheat growers to be the judges in this matter. They go on the prairies and they face the hardships of pioneer life, which I have shared with them in another branch of industry for twelve years, and when they come to this Government and say, we understand our industry and we want the tariff on wheat removed. The Government sits passive and lets the Argentine Republic get into the United States markets in front of them. The Government's treatment of the farmers is not fair to the agricultural industry as compared with their treatment of other industries which come to them. Why is it that the Government did not attend to this matter? Have the millers had anything to do with it? Have they had representations from the millers? I am afraid the Government has paid too much attention to the millers. Well, what about the millers? What about the milling industry? Sir John Simon, speaking in Birmingham, England, the other night, said: I do not suppose, at this moment, there is any industry in Britain which is more flourishing than the milling industry under free trade? That opinion is well worth weighing by the Government when the millers come to it. That is the opinion of Sir John Simon in regard to the milling industry of Great Britain, where they have to import their raw material; but here our millers are in the midst of the finest raw material in the world for their business, in the midst of an overwhelming abundance of that raw material. I say that if they cannot mill in Canada, they are not meant to mill; they should come out beside me and take up homesteads. They should certainly not be allowed to prevent the farmers from getting this market, if it is to be of any good to them. The millers say they would be put out of business. They are not afraid of being put out of business. What they are afraid of is that they will have to accept the same price for flour in Canada as they do in Great Britain. I believe they get higher prices for flour in Canada than they can secure in Great Britain. Their fear is that they will have to take the same prices in Canada as in Great Britain, and I do not think that a fear of that kind should be allowed to interfere with the Government in this matter.

This is not a western question. It is a Canadian question. I have just indicated how it is a Canadian question. Everybody knows—my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie, the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) knows, and will not deny, that the development of Canada in the last half generation, the great prosperity of Canada has been due to the development of western Canada, not that there has not been a development of industries here; but, if you place more farmers on the land of the west, you benefit every industry in western Canada.

Just compare the methods of freedom in this matter with the methods of protection. Compare the steel bounties' policy which has been supported by both Governments in this country with the method I propose of giving our wheat a free exit into the United States market. Protection begins at the wrong end. I was in Nova Scotia lately, and I looked over the Steel Works in Sydney. Very good works they are; but, while being shown over them, I came to two mills that were standing idle. I said to the manager, a courteous fellow countryman of mine: What is the matter with these mills? He said; We have got no orders. Now, what amount of tariff or what amount of bounty will send orders into those mills? If you gave them a million dollars a day, it would not give orders to those mills. All it would do would be to pay interest on the capital invested in the works. But, if you begin at the other end and develop your farm lands and develop western Canada, you will develop your transportation. You cannot do that without steel and you will, therefore, develop the steel works at Sydney and in other parts of the country. I bring that before the Government as an important consideration in connection with this matter of free wheat. A far-seeing statesmanship—and it does not require a very long sight—would give free wheat at once to the western farmers; and with it, if the Government wanted to do a wise act to cure the present depression, they should take the duty off agricultural implements. I trust my hon. friend the Solicitor General got a guarantee upon that subject before he entered the Government. It would be customary in Britain for him to have got such a guarantee. When any gentleman, in the position of my hon. friend in the old country, has spoken as strongly as he has in regard to the reduction of duty on agricultural implements, he ought not to have taken his seat in that Government unless he has got a guarantee that his views will prevail there. He must be true to himself

and to his constituents. I have considerable confidence, however, that he has looked into this matter. The two things together would be a splendid start in dealing with the tariff, in the way statesmen have done in other countries, and would have a bearing upon the development of Canada, the relief from the high cost of living, and from the depression in trade from which the speech acknowledged we are suffering.

The Government, so far from providing any means of relief from the conditions under which we are suffering at the present time, rejoice in certain things which are calculated to aggravate our distress. Until we provide more markets for the sale of our agricultural produce, until we alter our economic system, no Government in this country ought to rejoice, as the Address rejoices, in the increase in immigration. Where is our immigration going? I very much fear it is not going on to the land. It is going into the towns. It is increasing the number of unemployed in the towns. A great many people in the cities of the West, who are unemployed at the present time, were working at harvest time and have gone into the towns. I contend that no Government has any right to go on promoting unlimited immigration unless it takes proper means to get the people onto the land. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) tells us that what we are suffering from at the present time is too little production. We shall not increase our production by adding to the unemployed in the towns. The only way in which we shall increase our production is by adding to our rural population. There is something that is wrong with the economic condition of Canada. This question has a bearing not only upon the question of immigration but upon the question of rural depopulation, upon the question of the prosperity of the whole country.

I just want to tell my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and his supporters that this extra price for cattle has not in the slightest degree affected the loyalty of any cattle raiser in the province of Alberta. Personally, I want to give my right hon. friend the assurance that, although I have received, myself, a dollar a head more for cattle this fall than I ever received before, so far as I can search my heart and conscience I am as loyal to the Old Country as ever I was. I am glad to give that assurance, and I want to enter into a similar guarantee on the part of the wheat producers. I am perfectly sure, if they did take their wheat to the United States and sold it there, it would not interfere with their loyalty. I do not think we shall fight a campaign again when that cry will be raised. It gained a few votes, but it was an extremely foolish cry, because, after all, men are not disloyal on account of thriving under a flag; men are disloyal when they fail to thrive under a flag. Make men poor; make them discontented, and then you will increase their disloyalty. That is the condition that we have as to poverty and unemployment at the present time. The responsibility of the Government is great in this matter. I trust they will not be deterred from doing what is right by any consideration of their own consistency. I trust they will look at this matter from the point of view of the interest of Canada and their duty to the people of this country. The fact of the matter is, there are large numbers of people in Canada, both Conservatives and Liberals, who think that we have had just a little too much attention paid to the great imperial matters upon which my right hon. friend spent so much time to-night, and too little attention paid to the affairs of our own country.

The Government has duties to Canada, and Canada is looking for them to discharge those duties. And if the Government wish to see how those duties should be discharged, they must follow the advice they give to me and look to the great country to the south of us. My right hon. friend says there is unemployment, there are distressed conditions, in the United States as well as here. It is extraordinary to hear that, because his friends the Tariff Reformers of Great Britain have been proclaiming that Great Britain was the only place where you had unemployment, and that that unemployment was due to Free Trade. But you have only to take up a paper published here in Ottawa this evening to see the headline, 'The Old Country cannot see any slackening in trade.' The one country in the world which was a commercial miracle in the year 1913, the country which has the smallest rate of unemployment in the world, the country which has the largest business in the world, is this country of forty-five millions of people living in a territory half the size of Alberta. And against this, we have this admission, this proclamation, of unemployment in the United States and Canada. Look to the great country to the south of us and you get ideas on this subject—for there is one kind of commerce that is not prevented by a tariff, and that is the commerce in thought. I see a market where my right hon. friend does not

see it. That market is there. The Government have a great responsibility with regard to this matter, and we all trust that they will face that responsibility in the interest of the country. If they do not, then I am sure of this—that so far as Western Canada is concerned, they will go down to an inglorious defeat, unwept, unhonoured and unsung.

Mr. JOHN H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): I am sure it will be a cause of astonishment that I rise at this juncture, but it is not altogether my fault. It arises, I presume, from a desire on the part of some people to take advantage of this late hour of the evening to take a nap. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, in opening, that I should like to join my humble voice in the congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address for the manner in which they carried out that pleasant duty. The strength of argument, the breadth of view, the fluency and finish of their diction, excited general admiration. It is a great pleasure to see that the Government benches can do something of which the Opposition approve. We all wish to join our voices also in the universal praise of the pluck displayed by Her Excellency after her severe ordeal of illness in returning to preside in Canada. It is very gratifying to us to find that the Opposition unite with us in discerning the good qualities, the very brilliant qualities of the new Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen.)

I cannot understand why so much time is wasted by the Opposition in denouncing the statements made by their own provincial Prime Ministers. We are told that, through the inaction or mistaken action, the ignorance or otherwise, of the Conservative Government, Canada has failed to measure up to the standard as she should have done; and yet in the face of that, in the face of the great problem which a young country like this has before it, we have the universal testimony of the provincial Prime Ministers, that Canada is exceedingly prosperous. Logically what justification can there be for taking a fling at the conditions in this country at the present time? I think I may safely say, without being considered impertinent, that it is not only illogical and inconsistent, but distinctly improper to fly in the face of the provincial Prime Minister who is the best exponent of local conditions. Are we to suppose for one moment that the Prime Minister of Alberta, or the Prime Minister of Saskatchewan, is anxious to place a feather in the cap of the Conservative Government of Ottawa? We know that he is more likely—being human and a Liberal—to minimize the conditions in Alberta and Saskatchewan than to magnify them. We must surely be allowed to rely upon the statements made by these men, and we do rely upon them more than upon the statements of those whose duty it is to find fault and to endeavour to resume their places on the treasury benches where they committed homicide by misadventure in 1911.

It must be remembered that the Naval or Imperial policy of the Conservative party springs from the fact that first and foremost—first, last and all the time—they desire to remain within the British Empire. The weakness of the Conservative position unquestionably is—admittedly is—that $35,000,000 or thereabouts will be expended, to a certain extent outside the country. It is admitted that half of that, even under the divine management of the Liberals, would have to be spent out of the country, because they simply could not build all portions of their navy here. I confess that is the weakness of our position; we do not say—or I presume we do not say— that our position at all points is invincibly strong; we do say that, in comparison with anything else that has been devised or suggested, our position is incomparably strong. But, who wants to embark upon a great military policy such as the Liberal policy is? Who wants to unfurl the Canadian flag of practical, if not nominal, independence, and sail the seas provoking conflict and disaster? The Liberals are either sincere or insincere. If they are insincere, we do not wish to have anything more to do with them, nor does the country. But if they are sincere, then they propose to develop a policy which would place us alongside of such nations as Germany and France, who are now making a mad rush to complete a naval policy such as will be suitable to their station. I am told that Canada must do likewise. Now there is no force in the argument of building a little tin-pot navy. There is no such idea on the part of Liberals Their desire is to build and develop a great naval force. I am free to acknowledge that while that is an exceedingly extravagant and unwise proposition, I am sufficiently imperialistic and sufficiently loyal to wish to adopt that plan rather than do nothing at all. But we find no reciprocity of spirit exhibited by our friends. They will not have the Conservative policy, and, not having that policy, they will throw down

their arms and wreck the whole scheme; they will sneer at emergencies, and let everything, to use a common phrase, go to the devil. We are not like that. If these gentlemen were on the Treasury benches we might disapprove of their policy and say we had a much better one, but we are not so narrow, so stupid, so unloyal, if I may not use the word disloyal—so unloyal, so entirely anti-imperialistic as to decline to do anything to help the empire which we are supposed to adorn, if we cannot have our own way. It is well to talk about sheep and cattle, but we had better see if we cannot develop some sort of a manly spirit as well. What kind of an education did they give in Newcastle to the Leviathan of Alberta? Is it absolutely impossible for us to develop an independent spirit, a loftiness of conception, along with the material advantages of the world? Has the hon. gentleman never heard of Athens? Does he not know that twenty-five hundred years ago there was developed the spirit of freedom, of independence, of philosophy and of science the like of which the world has never seen? The whole history of Athens simply teems with the spirit displayed by her people. Many and many a time she might have sacrificed herself to material advantage, but she preferred to bequeath to posterity a noble name and a noble example. This we should never forget. Canada is in danger of becoming very materialistic. From one end of this country to the other we hear talk about free food, about dear food, about the high cost of living, and about the tango. That is all that is going on in the country now. Theories of government are not being worked out; they are not working themselves out, and the Liberal politicians will not allow them to be worked out. The hon. member for Red Deer is deluded by baits; he sees a fish flashing by, with sparkling scales, straightway, makes a bite at it. He would say: 'Why do you seek fish in the South Sea when you can get them right here? He has no broad conception of things. The evolution of government has brought us to the time when the freedom of the people allows them and prompts them to manage their own business, but, strange to say, there are so many anomalies in the twentieth century, and we are now confronted with a vicious paradox. Over-supply produces scarcity; over-production produces starvation, and surplus of material produces stringency. It would be difficult indeed to unearth anything more absurd than this illogical fact. Why is it that we do not set ourselves to find out why these things are so? Is it that we must devote ourselves to something sentimental; to some esoteric theory such as the free trade which exists only in the imagination of the hon. member for Red Deer, the gentleman who voted for bounties? He despises tariffs; yet he overlooked the tariff which collects money for the public treasury and voted for bounties that put money into the private pockets of individuals.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I rise to a point of order. If my hon. friend is stating this as a fact, I may say that I have never consciously voted for the imposition of a tariff or the payment of a bounty. I do not think my hon. friend has the information as to when I gave such a vote.

Mr. BURNHAM: I do not wish to be in the slightest degree inaccurate, and I was particular to make my assertion when the hon. member was present. I refused to vote for the lead bounty last year, but the hon. gentleman, on one occasion at least, I think, voted for it. If, however, he did not vote for it, if I am not misinformed, he certainly spoke in favour of it.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I rise again to correct my hon. friend. I made as good a speech as ever I could against it.

Mr. BURNHAM: All I have to say, then, is that I am utterly unable to understand the English language as spoken by the hon. member for Red Deer. I could a tale unfold, but I will not unfold it. However, as the hon. gentleman said in the course of his fine speech that he has a conscience, I will leave the matter with that conscience.

No branch of industry—and I must be excused for being, perhaps, a little irrelevant—could possibly thrive if it were not given proper attention; if the stock were not taken and a balance struck; if there were not some intimate control and supervision exercised in regard to it. And yet, notwithstanding the fact that this House and the people generally are concerned most intimately with everything that takes place in this country, they are reproached in the most scathing language by the hon. member for Red Deer for failing to know all about the conditions of industry in Canada. He reproaches us with our ignorance, but would not allow us a commission which would find out why we do not know these things. And yet he says we are inconsistent. There are some very striking passages in the hon. gentleman's

address, but I would direct your attention, Mr. Speaker, to this fact, that whilst government ownership and government control, that is to say, public ownership and public control, are spreading the world over, there seems to be a disposition to leave them in a haphazard condition here, so that they are neither one thing nor the other, and we are confronted with the extraordinary fact that we decline to provide a decent living wage for the working man, and yet demand that he shall live in a decent manner. We also decline to deal with the problem of unemployment and wonder that a starving man is inclined to strike. The injustice is done on both sides. We fail to regulate and provide for the employer those peaceful conditions which would enable him to develop his industry and we decline to provide conditions which only a government can provide for employees which will enable them to provide for the present and for the future in some respectable and certain manner. These things of course are extremely obvious. Books galore have been written upon them. Every president of every university in the world has written a book this last year or two upon that subject. Every man of prominence in every government has dealt with the question. Commissions have found out causes and commissions have failed to find out causes, and yet here we are in Canada, industrious as we are, painstaking as we are, capable as we are—and I think I may be forgiven for saying so—and yet we are not endeavouring to bend our energy to the solution of the most obvious and the most pressing of problems. It is useless to say that free trade is a powerful or effectual buttress against such a thing as the unduly high cost of living. It is admitted by the very speaker who lauds free trade in this connection that it has not had the effect of lowering or preserving the cost of living in Great Britain. That cost has risen by fifteen per cent or thereabouts. Well, all we can say about that is that it is not a question between free trade and protection. It is a question of the comparative effect of economic policies under the conditions that exist. It is idle to suppose or to assert that the logical conclusion is that one is right and the other is wrong because they are diametrically opposed when, as a matter of fact, they both run in the same groove. We must be consistent. There is no use listening to great statesmen and the enunciation of tremendous principles if those propositions and the enunciation of them do not bear out the conclusions.

I would like to deal just for a moment with one or two statements made by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). He scoffed at an emergency. Are we to understand that there is no emergency in the British Government at this minute over the navy question? I do not wish to meddle in other people's affairs, but the cables all tell us that at this present moment Great Britain is convulsed with an emergency and yet, because the hon. member for Red Deer has not had it proved to him in black and white so that everybody would laugh at him if he did not admit it, he will not provide for an emergency, he will do nothing, he will throw his arms down and let it all go. He follows only too well the motto of the free traders, laissez faire, let everything go, let well enough alone, that is what that means. There are 4,500 millionaires by the last census in Great Britain, and who has the audacity to tell us there is no poverty there? Why are people fleeing from Great Britain? If the people were leaving this country as they are leaving Great Britain wages would be high and there would be no unemployed; but the fact is they are leaving Great Britain in such tremendous numbers that they themselves consider it a reproach that the people should leave Great Britain for another country under the conditions. It is not fair to argue in that way, it is inaccurate.

11p.m.

One half of the magnificent speech of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) referred to the very bad business of the Prime Minister in calling the House on the 15th of January instead of the 15th of October. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) knocked that all on the head in one minute but all I can say is that if the Opposition are going on like this, fighting each other in mortal combat, we will have to put a ring around them and charge an admission fee. Strange to say in criticising the Highways Bill the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), admitted that five-sixths of that Bill was perfect, five clauses out of six were all right, the Senate admitted that. The sixth clause, which refers to the administration of funds under the Bill being apparently the key to the position and referring to what the hon. member considered possibly a political advantage, was so distasteful to him and to the Senate that they decided to throw it out. That is to say, rather than forego a political advantage they would throw the material advantages of the people of this country to the four winds of Heaven. Are

they aware that this Government is not responsible to the Senate? This is not oligarchical government, notwithstanding the fact that they are trying to make it so; we have still popular government in Canada, and if the Government passes a Bill against which the Opposition think it their duty to make a protest let them make a protest and preserve their position without prejudice if they like; then, when this Government go to the country on their record, if the people disapprove they will turn the Government out. But the hon. gentlemen opposite knew that the people would not disapprove and that is the reason why they burked that Bill. If that Bill meant that the Government were committing suicide, does anybody tell me that the hon. gentlemen opposite would not have provided a halter? Not at all, they would have said: certainly we disapprove of the Bill, go to the country; go further if you like, that is where you will end. But they did not do that, for they knew that with that Bill and other Bills of first importance and advantage to this country, they were not only out of the Treasury benches but hopelessly out, and that they might never see them again in their lifetime. That is what affected them, and that is why the Senate was called upon to be so judicial

Let me say one thing which convinces me, although it may not convince hon. gentlemen opposite. Living is cheapest in this world in that country which has the highest measure of protection, namely, France. Of all the countries on the face of the earth the country that is the cheapest to live in is France. She, two years ago, so approved of the policy of protection that she raised her whole system of protection by 20 per cent. If that is not a direct argument in flat contradiction of the statement of the hon. member for Red Deer I do not know what is—and it is not borrowed from theory but from practice and fact. I was very much upset,—although I may recover—by a statement of the same hon. gentleman about free wool from Australia. Why, Australia is a protected country the same as Canada. Why does he not treat the question in a logical way and treat free wheat from Canada the same as Australians do their wool from Australia? But that unfortunately is generally his failing. He is very quick, very picturesque, very defiant and very polite, but as to being cogent we must confess to having our reservations. He said the price of Canadian flour was higher in Canada than in Great Britain. Is he aware that quality for quality it is not so? Flour is flour, he thinks. Well, I can tell him it is not. There are several brands of flour and that makes all the difference in the world. If he wants an analogy, a small one it is true, let him take the case of the old country tailor who sends his goods out to this country, pays the tariff and yet sells them at the same price he charges in England. How does that happen? I do not buy these clothes myself, I make my own, but if we are to have these monstrosities of trade brought up before us all the time, why are they not dealt with in a fair manner? There can be no question that the Conservative party has made mistakes in the past and has profited by them. It is admitted that different conditions are suitable to different countries and to argue at large as if Canada were Britain and Britain were Canada but shows the ineptitude of the hon. gentleman on these questions. However, I fancy that a due regard to patriotism and a certain virility which we have inherited from our ancestors both Gaelic and British, will enable us to weather the storm. I know that the Americans do not start to howl as if everything had gone to the bowwows. When they get into a bit of a slough, they set to work to get out of it, and they have set an example to the whole world. They cannot be excelled for strength of mind, and body and character, and surely we are not going to throw our doors open and howl as if the country was something we should be ashamed of. Let us bend our energies together. Let us find out by commission and cease to draw our illustrations from impossible and irrelevant conditions. Let us face the facts in a scientific manner and deal with them accordingly, and then we shall be much more edified than by a tissue of sarcasms, and, I am afraid, absurdities.

On motion of Mr. A. K. Maclean the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Borden the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Tuesday, January 20, 1914.

The House met at three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. H. F. McLeod for an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Sir Wil-

frid Laurier, resumed from Monday, January 19.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): In rising to address the House in this debate, there are one or two matters to which I wish in the first place to refer very briefly. The announcement in the Speech from the Throne that the estimates for the next fiscal year will be submitted to Parliament at a very early date is gratifying, not only to Parliament, but also to the country. Last year we voted approximately $200,000,000, which included some very large appropriations, and these being submitted to us during the last days of the session they did not receive from this House the consideration which their importance deserved. I do not approach this matter in a censorious or partisan spirit, and indeed I think it might be said that the system I am now disapproving of has been followed by all governments in Canada. It may be fairly said that many millions of dollars of the estimates we voted last year were unproductive expenditure, and represented an absolute waste of public money. Many of these expenditures were proposed, not for the welfare of Canada, but rather to meet parochial and partisan demands throughout the country. It is very obvious indeed that expenditures of this character must have a tremendously evil effect upon the political morality of the people, and make for waste, inefficiency, and corruption in the various public services. I am glad, therefore, to learn that these estimates will be submitted to Parliament at a very early date, and I trust that the Government will not expect the House to vote them without ample time being given for their proper consideration. Might I express the further hope that in the consideration of the estimates the Government will see that from time to time during each week of the session we shall have an opportunity of dealing with the estimates, and that Parliament shall not be asked to approve of them en bloc in the dying hours of the session.

Just a word as to the promised redistribution legislation, made necessary after the last decennial census, under the provisions of the British North America Act. I trust that when that measure is presented to Parliament, it will bear evidence of a desire on the part of the Government to make a fair redistribution of the constituencies, and that a spirit of fair play will be exhibited in the measure. If the Government should make their proposal in that spirit they will have for it, I am sure, the cordial support of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

There is not a great deal in the Speech from the Throne which should occasion very much discussion. The hon. gentleman from York, N.B. (Mr. McLeod), who spoke yesterday, readily saw that the Speech was more remarkable for what it did not contain than for what it contained, and so he dealt with matters which were not included in the Speech. It is very evident from the statement made by the Prime Minister yesterday, that it is the intention of the Government to abandon all their pre-election promises and programmes and to engage in a campaign against the Senate. If an attack on the Senate is to be the political programme of the Government for the future, then I would suggest that the gauntlet should be thrown down at once, and that the conflict alleged to exist between the Government and the Senate should be submitted to the people and settled by them at the very earliest date possible.

The omission of any reference in the Speech from the Throne to the so-called naval issue, cannot but occasion astonishment throughout Canada and the Empire. At the last session it precipitated the greatest parliamentary contest known to the political history of Canada. It was naturally expected that that issue in some form or other would be again before us this session, and surely it is indicative of cowardice or incapacity or both on the part of the Government that it has not again in some form brought this issue forward. It is hard for one to believe that the Government or the advisers of the Crown are so indifferent to their obligations and to their mighty professions as to treat this very important issue with silent contempt, as they evidently propose doing. It was only four years ago that Parliament, after calm deliberation, unanimously concluded to embark upon a naval policy in the direction of the construction of a Canadian navy, which it was believed would be a proper discharge of our duty in the burden of the defence of the empire. For purposes which were purely political and in order to obtain the good offices of a political party in the province of Quebec, the present Government abandoned that policy, and they have never yet been bold enough to return to it. After a year or more of sleep upon this policy, doubtlessly disturbed by many nightmares, there was presented to Parliament last session a measure providing for the expenditure of $35,000,000 for the construction of three battleships and

the presentation of the same to the British Admiralty. This policy was urged upon the ground that Britain's supremacy was imperilled and that a great conflict was imminent between two great European powers. Tokens and signs, we were told, were not wanting; there were pealings of thunder and flashes of lightning, premonitions of this terrible naval conflict between two great naval powers. And upon this ground we were urged, cajoled and threatened to support this measure of the Government. We were told it was purely an emergency policy; that the Government had in mind the adoption of a permanent policy which they would shortly present to Parliament. Several months at least have passed since then. The evidence of the emergency conditions and of the European Armageddon has vanished. Time has vindicated the position which hon. gentlemen on this side of the House took upon that occasion. The relations between Great Britain and Germany have improved immensely since then; better still, there is not wanting very impressive evidence that among the peoples of these two great countries there is rising a storm against the ever-increasing expenditures for naval purposes; and to-day in this country, in this House or out of it, is anybody to be found bold enough to say that emergency conditions now prevail? Therefore the reasons given by the Government last session for their naval policy being now non-existent, I ask what explanation can be given by the Administration for their silence upon this subject. Is the Postmaster General the impediment in the way of the adoption of a permanent naval policy? Is Mr. Henri Bourassa as powerful in the counsels of the Government to-day as he was in 1911 and 1912? Is Mr. Armand Lavergne as powerful with the Ministry to-day as he was in 1911, wnen he selected the Quebec representation in the cabinet? Is any valid reason to come from the Government? Is any valid reason possible for their silence upon this occasion—a silence which we are told will prevail for a very considerable time. The Prime Minister told us yesterday that he was awaiting the political transformation of the Senate ere he re-introduced the legislation of last session. This is postponing our naval programme with a vengeance. It does violence also to intelligence, because it predicates collusion between Providence and an organization of political opportunists upon this question. Again, it does honour to the Senate, to even the most vainglorious member of that body, that European hostilities can be conveniently postponed so as to synchronize with the death of members of the Canadian Senate and the appointment of other Canadians to that House. If the European emergency condition is so accommodating as to be pleasing indeed, in all these circumstances, I say that the Government is in honour bound to declare its permanent policy upon the naval question. They have virtually repealed, without parliamentary authority, the Canadian Naval Service Act; they have by their acts impliedly repealed it; and I say they are in honour bound to replace it by something else, or to put it again into operation. The country to-day expects a declaration of policy upon this issue from the Government; and, if they cannot ascertain their own views, if they are incapable of framing a policy as promised, then I submit it is their duty to appeal to the people, as indeed they have often threatened and promised to do if the legislation which they submitted to Parliament was not approved. It speaks ill for the political institutions of this country, or for the intelligence of the Canadian electorate, if, in all the circumstances, it is possible for a Government successfully to maintain a policy of silence upon this issue, and at the same time disregard their own professions and the natural inclinations of the Canadian people.

The hon. member for York (Mr. McLeod) yesterday said that this country was to be saved a further humiliation by the reintroduction of the naval policy of last year. It was quite evident to hon. gentlemen sitting upon this side of the House and observing the hon. member for York while making that statement, that he was speaking facetiously and not seriously. Canada has been humiliated in this respect by hon. gentlemen opposite. Canada was humiliated when, without cause, they abandoned the unanimous policy of Parliament declared in 1900 upon this issue. Canada was humiliated when, in the last session, they asked the approval of Parliament, on alleged grounds which were false, namely, the existence of an emergency, of their naval policy. We are to be further humiliated this session by a policy of cowardice and silence on the part of the Ministry, and if so I suppose this humiliation will continue until the Ministry itself has been extinguished, which, doubtless, will occur when first they appeal to the people of the country. I anticipate that we never shall again hear from hon. gentlemen opposite a word concerning an emergency naval policy. I do not believe it is their intention again

to return to that policy. From the statement made by the Right Hon. Prime Minister last evening, one would gather that he is already preparing the ground upon which he may fall, and preparing the justifications which he may give to this country for not re-introducing the naval measure of last year. Speaking last evening, he said:

> It has been avowed and declared by leaders of the Opposition and by their organs that the Bill if introduced again under present conditions would again be rejected in the Senate.

There is no authority whatever for this statement. The emergency not now prevailing, one would anticipate that if they introduced any measure at all it would have reference to a permanent naval policy, and I say that they would not be justified in anticipating the defeat of such a measure by the Senate. He proceeds:

> We have no reason to doubt that such is the determination of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Under these circumstances—

The paragraph which I particularly wished to quote from was another and not that which I was reading. Let me read again. The Prime Minister said:

> The Government are naturally mast desirous that the aid which we proposed last year, under conditions of urgency and need, and which we still propose to bring in the due course—

Whether urgency now prevails and obtains or not

> —to the common defence of the empire should be so proffered or given as not to prejudice or retard any international agreement for the cessation of battleship construction. When we are in a position to press the Naval Aid Bill to a final and satisfactory conclusion in the Senate, it will be our duty to consult with the Imperial Government respecting these grave and important considerations. If it should then appear that, by any naval arrangement entered into or about to be entered into by the great powers a restriction or diminution of the present lamentable rivalry in armaments could be brought about, we should always be ready, until our ships have actually been begun, to review the situation so far as these proposals are concerned.

That, Mr. Speaker, I take as an express intimation to this country—at least we on this side of the House may be justified in accepting it as such—that never again will we hear of the naval aid measure of last year, and that the reason which the Government propose giving to the country for this will be that the emergency conditions have passed away, and that there is an expressed desire among the nations of the world to lessen the expenditures of public money for naval purposes. I think that the threats made by the Prime Minister and hon. gentlemen opposite yesterday against the Senate are both puerile and absurd. It is simply an attempt to cover their own nakedness by the fig leaves of useless threats against one of the legislative bodies of this Parliament, and I believe that the people of this country will pay little heed to these threats.

There is another matter upon which the Government propose to conduct a policy of silence, or of awaiting a change in the political colouring of the Senate. I refer to the Highways Bill. Again the Government's views smack of absurdity when they prophesy as to the expectation of the life of fellow-legislators and their own tenure of office. Do they not know that they are already considered in Canada as a one-term government? Their own supporters so prophesy; it is predicted openly in the market-place even. Their own record of incapacity makes this almost an accepted fact even to their own supporters, and one may even postulate the fact that this Administration is a one-term Government. If they propose to distinguish themselves by placing upon the statute books any legislation respecting highways, this is their opportunity, for it will not likely come to them again. They say that the Senate has prevented the execution of their policy with respect to highways. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is but a figment of political fancy or an innocent fabrication on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. The Senate has never, as far as I can recollect, done anything to negative any principle involved in any government measure in the past, unless it be in connection with the naval measure of last session. We may expect to hear during this session, and during the remainder of this Parliament, as an excuse for the non-fulfilment and implementing of Government policies, that the Senate has prevented the same. That apparently will be the defence of the Administration from now until the time when they receive their deserved rebuke from the Canadian electorate at the next election.

It might be worth while to ascertain if the Senate has been an impediment in the way of the non-fulfilment of several matters of policy promised by this Government since their advent to power and prior to that time. It may be worth while to ascertain what these policies were, and to inquire if they have been delayed by the action of the Canadian Senate, and if so to what degree. I hold in my hand a

publication entitled the Liberal-Conservative Handbook of 1911, which sets forth a declaration of matters of policy of the Government party. I find there a declaration of the tariff policy of the Government, as follows:

> A fiscal policy which will promote the production within Canada of all useful articles and commodities that can be advantageously produced or manufactured from or by means of her natural resources, having due regard to the interests of the consumer as well as to the just claims of our wage-earning population.

That was the promise of the Administration in the direction of the adoption of a new tariff policy. In 1911, they promised many of their supporters the adoption of some new tariff or fiscal policy. Many of their friends and supporters paid for the adoption of an amended fiscal policy. Has there been any effort on the part of the Administration to implement that policy? Has the Senate of Canada in any respect interfered or been an impediment?

For many years, we heard of the great necessity of adequate protection in this country. Why, Sir, since hon. gentlemen went upon the Treasury benches, we have never yet had even a definition of adequate protection, let alone any legislative effort to put it in concrete form. When did the Government endeavour to enact tariff legislation which was in the interest of the consumer? When did the Senate interpose any obstacle? I would say that this is the year; this is the session; this is the time and the place for hon. gentlemen opposite to give us some tariff legislation which is in the interest of the consumer.

They also promised us tariff legislation which would meet the best claims of our wage-earning population. This is the time and the opportunity to implement that particular promise.

We were also promised some preference in tariffs within the empire. Their policy in this respect was set forth in the publication from which I am reading. It is as follows:

> The promotion by negotiation, legislation and constitutional means of a system of mutual preferential trade within the empire.

Has any effort ever been made by hon. gentlemen opposite to implement this promise to secure imperial preferential tariff relations between the various portions of the empire? Has the Senate of Canada interposed any obstacles in this respect?

Again, we were promised the appointment of a tariff commission which would obviate many inconsistencies and difficulties in connection with tariff making and tariff legislation in this country. Has the Government made any serious effort to fulfil that promise? It is true that in the first session of this Parliament a Bill providing for the establishment of a tariff commission was introduced and passed through this House, but I say that it was defeated in principle by the Government itself and not by the Senate of Canada. If the Government were sincere with respect to this measure, they certainly would reintroduce that Bill in the following session. It is a well known fact that, although the Tariff Commission Bill received the assent of hon. gentlemen opposite, it did not meet with their personal favour, and that members of the Government were personally told by many hon. gentlemen opposite that it was not a wise measure, and that having once failed of approval in the Senate of Canada, it should not be reintroduced for our consideration. I believe that to be a fact, and still hon. gentlemen opposite will tell us that this part of the ministerial programme was frustrated by the Senate of Canada.

We were promised further by hon. gentlemen opposite a restoration to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan of their natural resources. Did the Senate of Canada place any obstacle in the way of the fulfilment of this part of the Government programme, or did the Opposition come from friends of the ministry in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan? Will hon. gentlemen opposite tell us what recommendations were made to the Government a few days ago when they were visited by a delegation of friendly politicians from the province of Alberta? Will they tell us what policy was recommended to them to pursue by Mr. Michener, I think, the leader of the Conservative party in the legislature of Alberta? Has the Senate of Canada prevented the fulfilment of this policy, or is the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) responsible for this particular failure? Surely the Minister of Public Works, the especially assigned guardian of ministerial interests in the prairie provinces, could have secured such necessary legislation as would give to these provinces their natural resources, as was promised them by hon. gentlemen opposite before they came upon the treasury benches. Surely this was not a task too great for the Minister of Public Works. He is said to be very agile and adept in every respect, even afoot. I heard it said of him by a friend that he could walk on a row of eggs from the Red River to the Ottawa river without breaking a shell. If he could successfully perform a feat of that character, surely he was strong

enough and powerful enough to prevail upon his fellow members in the Cabinet to fulfil this number of their pre-election programme.

We were also promised by hon. gentlemen opposite the nationalization of public telegraphs and telephones. We have had no legislation from the Government in respect to this policy since they entered into power. They surely cannot blame the Senate for the non-fulfilment of this particular programme.

Further, we had a promise of the reform of the very body which they have now been attacking for many years and upon many occasions. Where are the Senate reformers within the Conservative party to-day? Where is the great exponent upon the question of Senate reform, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster)? This is now the third session of the present Parliament, and that hon. gentleman has been as dumb as the mummies in the tombs of the Pharoahs. His voice is stilled absolutely, and you cannot get one hon. gentleman opposite to advocate Senate reform in this House to-day. Has the appointment of Mr. Donnelly, or Mr. Taylor, or Mr. Smith, or Mr. Gordon, the friend of Mr. Bourassa, reformed the Senate? Will the appointment of many hon. gentlemen opposite, who are now billed, and ticketed, and routed for the Senate, reform it according to the views of hon. gentlemen opposite in days gone by?

We had a definition of what Senate reform meant to hon. gentlemen opposite, as expounded by themselves. The hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), whose powers of exposition are ample and lucid, once defined what the Government party meant by Senate reform.

He was asked by the present leader of the Opposition what this actually meant, and he read from the platform of the Conservative party in respect to Senate reform, and after reading it, said this:

> That is fairly explicit. Does the right hon. gentleman think that in enunciating a platform the leader of the Opposition is bound to draw up a Bill such as he will introduce? All he can do is to place before the people of the country the principles upon which he will act. But my right hon. friend says, I don't want any 'ifs' and 'ands' about it, I want to know just what you are going to do. Well, I might give the answer that my hon. friend gave once. Do you want to know how we will do it? Well, then just let us over to that side of the House and we will show you. That is the reply I have heard the right hon. gentleman give before this. It is sufficient for us to show the principles upon which the party means to act.

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite, in days gone by, promised to reform this particular body which they are now attacking. But they have made no efforts in that direction. In fact pretty nearly every hon. gentleman has his eye upon that body and would like to hear the voice that shall call him yonder. If you, Mr. Speaker, were to read a command from His Excellency in this Chamber summoning to the other Chamber one member, with the name left blank, I imagine that nearly every hon. gentleman opposite would think himself mentioned and there would be a general stampede to that Chamber. It would be almost as bad as an alarm of fire in a crowded theatre; and we should find many dead bodies of patriot statesmen who had been crushed in the aisles between this Chamber and the other. They tell us that the Senate has interposed impediments to the carrying out of their policy, but surely none have been interposed by the Senate in this particular matter at least.

There is another promise of the Government which has not yet been fulfilled, nor any effort whatever made in that direction. I refer to the promise respecting honest election laws. I think I should read this although it may take a few moments of time. It is as follows:

> More effective provisions to punish bribery and fraud at elections, to ensure thorough publicity as to expenditures by political organizations, to prevent the accumulation of campaign funds for corrupt purposes and to prohibit contributions thereto by corporations, contractors and promoters, to expedite the hearing of election petitions—

As is now going on in the courts of the province of Quebec with respect to the election petition of Chateauguay.

> —to provide for a thorough investigation of corrupt practices, and if necessary to appoint an independent prosecuting officer charged with that duty, to simplify the procedure therefor and to enforce the laws so amended.

Now, have the Government up to this moment observed even the spirit of that declaration of policy respecting honest election? If they have, I am sure the Minister of Public Works with his corrupting hordes would not have been heard of in the constituency of Macdonald and in the province of Quebec. Has the Senate, directly or indirectly intimated to the Administration that if they attempted the legislative fulfilment of that policy such legislation would meet with opposition there? We had a very strong illustration of what were the views of the present Minister of Trade and Commerce respecting the urgency and scope of legislation regarding elections. On January the 22nd, 1907, a Bill was before the House, and to

this Bill the present Minister of Trade and Commerce moved an amendment. I call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this in order to refresh their memory concerning it so that possibly they may endeavour to enact in some form and at some time the legislation which the Minister of Trade and Commerce had in mind. He said:

> On July 16, 1904, I had the pleasure of moving the following resolution:
>
> That the Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of amending the said Bill so as to provide punishment by fine or imprisonment for any minister of the Crown or other person who as an inducement to any voters or class of voters in any election in any electoral district to vote for any candidate promises to procure or threatens to withhold the expenditure of any public moneys of Canada or the undertaking of any public works within such electoral district.

That is a very commendable suggestion with respect to our electoral law. It is very desirable indeed that we should have such legislation on our statute books at this time. If we had had it a few months ago we should not have had the Minister of Public Works in the county of Chateauguay. I am told he was not there personally, but he was there by proxy, represented, as we are assured by the responsible representative of a reputable Toronto journal, by persons numbering two hundred who trod the shores of the St. Lawrence, shod in rubber boots, not for penance, but for corrupting purposes. I may safely assure hon. gentlemen opposite that if they would undertake to amend our laws relating to elections in the direction suggested by the Minister of Trade and Commerce they would find no obstacle interposed by the Senate.

The people of this country were promised very many other things by hon. gentlemen opposite, but up to this date we have had no evidence whatever of their intention to fulfil the same. Down in my province, in the election of 1911, the fishermen were promised free medical aid and free medicine if hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. But since that day we have heard absolutely nothing whatever about the matter; and so ignorant were some of the colleagues of the Prime Minister about this particular policy that in the session of 1912 the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) denied that there had ever been any such declaration of policy by the Prime Minister, and he later expressed his surprise that such a promise should have been made by the right hon. gentleman when informed it was a fact. Still, there is no evidence of any attempt on the part of the Government to fulfil this particular promise. So, we have had promises without number with respect to matters of public

4 p.m.

policy from hon. gentlemen opposite, and still we have had, as I say, no evidence of their intention to fulfil those promises. I suppose we never shall have such fulfilment and the reason which they will assign for this will be that it was purposeless to attempt fulfilment by legislation because the Senate of Canada was so hostile to the present ministry that they could not hope for the approval of that body.

Now, let me refer for a moment to the Highways Bill. Did the Senate of Canada prevent the enactment of the principle of the Highway measure as promised us by hon. gentlemen opposite? I say no, and I do not think it possible for hon. gentlemen opposite or any of their supporters fairly to deny the correctness of my position. Was the Senate of Canada justified in amending that particular Bill as they did? I say, yes, and I believe the people of this country are of the opinion that the amendment made by the Senate was a fair and just amendment. Members of the Government have repeatedly stated that the principle contained in the Senate amendment was their policy, and if that be true, I would like to know how in the name of common sense and reason hon. gentlemen opposite protest against concurrence of the Senate amendment and why they so loudly protest to-day against that amendment of the Senate. The Prime Minister told us last evening that he and the Minister of Railways particularly promised that the distribution of money to be expended under the Highways Act should be according to the population of the several provinces. If that be true, then why did not the Government concur in the Senate amendment? Why should we be asked, in relation to the manner of distribution, to take the word of the Prime Minister of Canada or of any of his colleagues whether the Government be Conservative or Liberal? This country is not governed by Cabinet Ministers, but by Parliament. The will of this Parliament should be crystallized into statutory form; It is the enunciation of a new principle altogether to state that the word of the Prime Minister or of his colleagues must be accepted instead of express legislative enactment. The principle involved in the Senate amendment was invoked in the Agricultural Bill, it was invoked in the British North America Act, in that part of it which deals with provincial

subsidies. In essence, the Highways Bill was a measure to supplement limited provincial revenues in respect of a public service which under the Constitution comes absolutely within the jurisdiction and purview of the local legislatures. I say that the view that these supplementary revenues should be distributed according to population was absolutely sound; and I cannot but believe that hon. gentlemen opposite believe this, as do the people of this country generally. That being so, I say that the principle involved in the Senate amendment is one which was absolutely fair. Now, one should naturally ask himself, as I am sure the people of Canada do, whether the Government seriously endeavoured to carry out their Highways policy as announced to the public in 1911. I doubt it; I go further and deny it. I say there is absolutely no evidence of their sincerity in this respect. They have not spent a moment of time nor a dollar of money conferring with the provincial governments in respect to this proposed expenditure, nor in devising a policy upon which to spend the money should the Highways Bill become law. They have taken no preliminary steps whatever, prior to requesting Parliament to pass such legislation and to vote the money, to formulate a policy of expenditure or a policy of maintenance, which policy, after all, was of more importance than the policy of expenditure. If Parliament had voted last year the money for expenditure on our public highways which the Government asked, would a single dollar of it have been expended in 1913? I say it would have been utterly impossible to have expended one single dollar of it. If they had attempted any expenditure it could not have but resulted in a woeful waste of public money. I say this Government have failed, miserably failed, to carry out their policy with respect to highways. They themselves killed their highways measure, and they now seek to attach the blame to the Senate of Canada. I believe that no fair-minded man in this country will concur in the view taken by the Government. They have exhibited no desire whatever to implement their promises respecting highways. The people of this country are not worrying with respect to the action of the Senate on this measure. Their interest rather is in the conduct, the cruel conduct, of the parents of the Highways Bill who purposely and deliberately destroyed it. I have had occasion, as, I suppose, have most hon. members of this House, to discuss with many persons the action of the Senate. I have yet to meet a single political friend of hon. gentlemen opposite who, having heard a fair, honest explanation of the facts and the effect of the Senate amendment, did not readily concede that that amendment was eminently fair and businesslike. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot conceal or cover their duplicity and insincerity with respect to that highways legislation by making empty, and futile threats against the Senate.

Now, I desire to say a few words respecting one or two other features of the Address. The Address states that there has been and is a restriction of trade owing to financial stringency. But we are told that we are likely to readily recover from that condition, owing to the boundless resources of this country. We upon this side of the House hope that these conditions are not permanent. In common with hon. gentlemen opposite, we have faith in the future of this country. We have no desire to exaggerate the depressed trade and monetary conditions prevailing to-day, nor are we inclined to take a pessimistic view of the future. However, the conditions now prevailing are worthy of a moment's consideration. We find, in the first place, that to-day trade depression and financial stringency exist concurrently; but this is not always the case, for in the past it has happened that we have had a financial stringency with trade conditions normal, or perhaps better than normal. We find that imports and exports are gradually declining, and I imagine that this will be even more marked during 1914 than it was in 1913. We have a contraction, quite noticeable, in industrial operations, and generally there is a most pronounced contraction in Canadian productions of every kind. We have also a very large number of unemployed people in the country, which is very regrettable indeed. We have a diminution—I was going to say an almost absolute cessation—of borrowings of foreign capital. We have a falling revenue. I do not say that some of these conditions may not have a very corrective effect upon the country, and prove of great value. They will prevent, for a time at least, the rampant speculation which has prevailed in Canada for some years, and enforce a return to sound fundamental economic laws. These conditions had a depressing effect upon the Prime Minister himself, because he has ransacked the papers of Great Britain and the United States to show that the conditions in those countries are very much worse than they are in Canada. It is quite

obvious, of course, the trade depression being world-wide, that the number of the unemployed, for instance, should be greater in large and populous countries like the United States or Great Britain than in Canada. These being the conditions, what has the Government done to remedy them, or to minimize their disastrous effects? This, I think, is a fair inquiry; it was a fair assertion on the part of the leader of the Opposition that we should have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite in respect of this matter, but unfortunately they are still further pursuing their policy of silence.

We have not been promised any remission of taxation, which would be quite a natural and desirable thing at this stage of our financial and commercial history. The well-recognized high cost of the necessaries of life is a subject which compels and is compelling the attention of everybody in this country. It presses hard upon the wage-earner, and particularly hard upon those who at the present time are unable to obtain employment. It produces social unrest; it is the hardest test and the severest strain to which democracy can be put. Therefore it is quite natural that we on this side of the House should expect to hear from hon. gentlemen opposite in this matter. Then, as the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) pointed out last night, might we not have expected to have from the Government notice of their intention to afford to Canadian wheat producers the benefit of the additional market for their products which is openly offered to them, and the securing of the benefits of which requires only the definite action of the Government of this country? What possible objection can be urged against giving to the Canadian wheat growers the market which is now offered to them? Surely we might have expected some intimation from the Government of their intention to do something, be it ever so little, towards relieving the effects of the depressed commercial conditions which now prevail in this country. We might have expected an announcement of the temporary remission of tariff duties upon foodstuffs and other articles of ordinary necessity. We have had during the days of the present ministry a temporary remission of duties upon cement and steel rails, and if the policy of remission of duties was justifiable in respect to these two particular articles, surely a remission, even though temporary, of the taxation upon many other articles of necessity, the prices of which are extremely high to-day, would be justifiable in the extreme.

Have hon. gentlemen opposite been recently devoting their efforts towards securing wider markets for the exports of this country, so that there may be no recession in the volume and value of our exports, which are so invaluable and so necessary in a new country—a country which is a great borrower of foreign money? In the campaign of 1911 the people were promised by hon. gentlemen opposite that, if they were placed upon the Treasury benches, they would receive for their products a market fully as good, if not better, than the markets we were to secure under reciprocity. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has returned from Australia without having made any trade arrangements with that country. En route he had a conference with the statesmen of the Celestial Empire and of Japan; and we were told by him that in these countries were to be found great markets for Canadian produce, but evidently nothing can be found in the commonwealth of Australia. We were told by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in Halifax in 1911 that there was a splendid market in South America for Canadian produce. I suppose that when the Minister of Trade and Commerce returns to Ottawa and is permitted to extend his New Year's greetings to his colleagues he will be bidden to depart to South America. Apparently his colleagues have no desire for his company in Ottawa, during the session of Parliament at least, and possibly there might be opportunities in that great country, South America, for him to secure markets for the Canadian people.

We have a trade depression in Canada; our revenues are falling. Has the Minister of Finance appealed to the god of adequate protection for relief? Has he appealed to the idol of preferential tariffs? Where is the tariff commission that was to do so much for Canadian trade? What has become of the doctrine of protection, and its healing powers? We were told that in sunshine and in shower it would impartially bestow its blessings upon the capitalist and the wage-earner, upon the consumer and the producer at the same time. Where has the god of protection of hon. gentlemen opposite gone? Has he gone on a long journey? Is he not accessible? We were told that a high tariff was a good thing for this country, and we assume that a higher tariff would be better still. Well, then, in the present circumstances, would it not be well for hon. gentlemen to give to this country the benefit of an experiment in higher tariffs, and let us see whether the people

will accept it? If hon. gentlemen opposite did this, they would only be fulfilling a promise which they have often made to the country, and which they made to many friends at the last election.

Hon. gentlemen opposite will say that in the appointment of a commission to inquire into the high cost of living in this country they have done something to minimize the seriousness of the conditions now prevailing in Canada. But I doubt whether hon. gentlemen really have any belief in the efficiency of the work which may be done by this commission. I assert, Mr. Speaker, that no good purpose whatever will be served by the appointment of that commission. In the first place, respecting the personnel of it, the gentlemen composing it will not have the opportunity of engaging in such a thorough investigation as will be of any benefit to the country. They are men who are already engaged in the public service and naturally they must devote some of their time to the discharge of such duties. Further, when that commission was appointed we were told by the press that they were to be under the direction and control of three ministers, which would seem to indicate that the members of the commission were never intended to be endowed with the scope of investigation and report, which they should have if their work was to be of any value whatever. I further say that it is not possible for this commission to report any additional reasons for the prevailing high cost of living than have already been furnished to the world by commissions appointed in other countries. There is not a condition stated in the text book of Professor Skelton, as quoted from by the Prime Minister yesterday, that was not known to students of the problems years and years ago, and you can find the same enumeration of the causes in a host of publications dealing with the subject. Of course, the enumeration of the causes will afford no remedy whatever, and what the people want is a remedy, and what they expected to be announced in the Speech from the Throne was that some remedy would be provided. The Minister of Labour himself can have very little faith in this commission. He visited my province last autumn, and he told the people that he desired his department to be known as the Department of Play and he himself as the Minister of Play rather than as the Minister of Labour. There are of course many reasons why that department might be called a Department of Play and the Minister a Minister of Play. The Minister of Labour announced in Halifax that the reason for the prevailing high cost of living in this country was, that while we had prosperous times prices were bound to be high. But at the present moment we have not prosperous times as hon. gentlemen opposite admit. Therefore, we find ourselves confronted by the situation that we have times that are not prosperous while at the same time we have high prices prevailing. Therefore, conditions are doubly bad at present. But, if in order to secure a reduction in the high cost of living it is necessary to have even harder times than exist, then heaven help Canada and the Canadian people. We can hope for very little enlightenment or for anything of value from the inquiry proposed.

A word or two as to the effect of commercial conditions upon matters of government finance, and revenue. The conditions of trade have a very pronounced effect of course upon the revenues of the country. I find that for the nine months ending September 30 our revenues from Customs are nearly $3,000,000 less than for the corresponding nine months of the previous year, and strange to say while there has been a reduction in our revenues there has been an increase in our expenditures, because during the first nine months of the present fiscal year consolidated fund expenditure, over the corresponding nine months of the previous year, amounts to nearly $9,000,000. I find that our capital expenditure for the same period is greater by $18,000,000 and I find that the combined capital and Consolidated Fund expenditure for the first nine months of this fiscal year are greater than for the corresponding nine months of last year, by the very large sum of $27,000,000. I find further that the combined capital and consolidated expenditure for this nine months period is only less than our total revenue by $2,000,000. That is a condition of affairs which calls for comment and explanation on the part of the Minister of Finance. The Appropriation Act of last session authorized a huge expenditure, and when one considers the well known capacity of some of the colleagues of the Minister of Finance, to indulge in lavish extravagance, one cannot be surprised at the very great increase in our expenditures in this fiscal year as compared with the last fiscal year. It is not surprising to find that the expenditures have almost absorbed

our entire revenue and that the predictions of the Minister of Finance at the last session of Parliament are not likely to be fulfilled. Delivering his Budget Speech last year, the Minister of Finance in estimating the revenue and expenditure said:

> Without attempting to forecast with any degree of accuracy, I feel confident that the revenues of the year will not only prove adequate to meet the current expenditure, but to meet possibly the whole and certainly the greater portion of capital and special expenditure for the year.

This estimate of the Minister of Finance will hardly be fulfilled; every indication is that the revenues will not meet the expenditures as anticipated by him when he made his Budget Speech last session.

The amount which the Government has required to borrow this year has been a matter of great astonishment to the people of this country and to the money lenders of Great Britain who are asked to supply the same. Without pretending to be strictly accurate as to the amount of borrowings by the Government during the year, I believe that two permanent loans aggregating $35,000,000 in round figures have been made; two temporary loans aggregating $18,500,000 have also been made, making a total borrowing of about $53,000,000. It was but a few months ago that the Minister of Finance told us that he expected to meet all consolidated fund expenditures and all capital and special expenditures out of revenue. If his expectations had been fulfilled, or approximately so, surely it would not have been necessary to have borrowed to the extent of $53,000,000? It is only fair to say that there has been a refunding of debt amounting to nearly $10,000,000. One cannot object to that. The only special expenditures that I know of that could possibly have been made during the year, or are likely to be made during the balance of the fiscal year, would be the purchase of the Grant Trunk implementing bonds, which would amount to $1,000,000 a month since the 1st of April, and the payment of special railway subsidies to the Canadian Northern Railway. But, taking into consideration these special expenditures, and the refunding of loans which matured during the year, I think some explanation is due Parliament and the country as to the necessity for these very extensive borrowings. It was unfortunate, indeed, that Canada had, during the past calendar year, to engage in such borrowings. The market was unfavourable during the whole year. The interest rate and other charges in connection with these loans were unusually heavy. These borrowings met with a protest from the lending public in Great Britain. Further, they affected adversely the borrowing powers of other interests all over the country, and it is almost as important to conserve the borrowing powers of individuals and corporations in this country, as it is those of the Government. These borrowings have more or less disastrously affected Canadian credit in the British money market.

Just a word or two in reference to the expenditures during the year, which were, I assume, the cause and the necessity of a very considerable portion of the moneys borrowed during the year. As I said before, the Government asked authority at the last session of Parliament for the expenditure of an unusually large amount of money, aggregating nearly two hundred million dollars. Last year the signals of distress were out. The Minister of Finance himself intimated that he could hardly expect to see the revenues maintain their strength throughout the year. The expenditures authorized were in many respects absolutely unnecessary, particularly for this year, and could have been very well postponed until a more convenient period. The facts of hon. gentlemen opposite were very censorious against previous Administrations for their heavy expenditures during a year of falling revenue, and nobody was ever more censorious than the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). Unfortunately I have never been able so far to have the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce in Parliament when referring to such matters. I think it would be very pleasing and instructive to the House to have the statements of the Minister of Trade and Commerce harmonized with or distinguished from the practices of the present Minister of Finance. Similar conditions respecting revenue prevailed in this country in 1909. I want to read for the edification and instruction of the Minister of Finance the statements made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the year 1909, and I trust they will give him at least a very correct idea of what his colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce thinks of his administration of finance during the past few months. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, on April 20, 1909, was

criticising the expenditure of the then Minister of Finance for the preceding year, and he spoke as follows:

> But I, and I think others on either side of the House, could not fail to ask ourselves why he as Finance Minister, in 1907, when every third-rate man in a bank, not to speak of the managers and directors of banks, knew that the stress of weather was coming on, felt the forebodings and set themselves by every possible means to strengthen themselves financially for the blast, took no precaution at all. He crowded on all sail, and in that, the worst year in our experience for fifteen years, authorized and carried out his largest, most lavish and most wasteful expenditures.

How applicable that is to the past few months of the present fiscal year respecting financial affairs?

> It would have seemed befitting in a Finance Minister who was careful and prudent to have made his provision when the danger was coming, to have drawn in his sail when the storm was about to burst. My hon. friend did not do that—why? Because sound principles of finance were against such a course? By no means. All sound principles of finance and every consideration of good business were in favour of that course.

I thought it might not be objected to by the House nor by my friend the Minister of Finance if I gave him what was the opinion of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in 1909, respecting conditions which then prevailed, and which in some respects are very similar to those prevailing this year, only perhaps conditions this year are far worse. And I do hope that if the Minister of Trade and Commerce is ever seen in Parliament again during the lifetime of the Government, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will urge upon his esteemed colleague the necessity and propriety of telling us whether the opinions he entertained in years gone by respecting the administration of finance are or are not applicable to present day affairs.

I have seen it stated in the press that the Government considered it was pursuing a wise financial policy in making extensive borrowings by reason of the depressed commercial conditions in this country; that is, they consider it sound finance to manufacture prosperity by increasing public expenses for the balance of the fiscal year and for the next fiscal year. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the intention of the Government. I am told that the late Minister of Public Works, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), in a letter which appeared in some newspapers in the province of Quebec, recommended increasing the public expenses from a quarter of a billion dollars to half a billion dollars and more for the next fiscal year. If that is true, it is a good thing for Canada that that hon. gentleman left the Government. It is bad enough to make such a wicked suggestion made to the present Minister of Public Works, but it would have been far worse to have a minister presiding over that department who believed it sound policy to endeavour to manufacture prosperity by increasing public expenditure without regard to whether those expenditures were productive or not. There can be no distinction between public and private expenditure. You can attach no more special significance to national expenditure than you can to what is termed international trade. There is really no such thing as international trade because that which we call international trade is after all but the trade of individuals within the nation and there is no distinction between borrowing money for the construction of a railway by a Canadian railway corporation and borrowing money for the construction of a railway by the Government. The wisdom of borrowing money and the expenditure of the same for public purposes are altogether dependable upon whether such expenditures are necessary and whether they will be productive and in the interests of the country.

I have seen it frequently stated in newspapers friendly to the Administration that it was a wise and sound economic policy to borrow lavishly this year because business conditions were not in as prosperous a state as we would wish them to be. I can hardly believe that this country will regard that as sound finance and sound policy. If great national public undertakings were desirable and necessary, and, if we were compelled in any event at some time to borrow for the same, and if these moneys could in the present year have been borrowed at favourable rates, then possibly it would have been sound business for the Government to engage in such borrowings, but such a condition respecting the borrowing of money did not prevail this year. Interest rates were high, money was dear and it would be only under the most favourable and pressing conditions that the Government would have been justified this year in borrowing money even for national undertakings, when money was not cheap but was very dear indeed.

On the whole, I think that hon. gentlemen in this House, on both sides of you, Sir,

and people outside in the country, will be disposed to think with us that the Speech from the Throne has been exceedingly disappointing in every respect. The deliberate abandonment of the Naval Aid Bill and the Highways Bill by the Government must astonish this country. Their declaration that they propose pursuing a policy of absolute silence respecting these two great public measures must be a matter of great astonishment to the entire country. It must be a matter of surprise and regret that we have had no promise of tariff reform or reduction of taxation, no promise of the accomplishment of a preferential trade arrangement such as was promised, no promise of Civil Service reform, no promise of Senate reform, no promise of the fulfilment of the many promises of public policy which hon. gentlemen made frequently in this country, no promise of any action on their part to minimize if possible the effects of our trade depression, no promise of any substantial effort to meet the difficulties of the high cost of living, no promise on their part to give to the producers and exporters of wheat the additional market which they might have had, no promise of anything substantial or expected, but of empty and vain threats against the Senate of this country and their ghoulish suggestion that the implementing of their promises must be deferred until by death or Act of Parliament the personnel of one of the legislative bodies of this Parliament has been changed. Well might the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. McLeod) say yesterday that these conditions are humiliating in this country. Humiliating indeed they are, I say, but the only ray of hope is that within the very near future, or at least within a limited time there will come to the country an opportunity to remove from the Treasury Benches a Government that has frequently proved its incapacity to administer public affairs.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance): I have listened with close attention to my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). I am sorry that I am not able to compliment him upon that moderation which sometimes, but not always, characterizes his utterances. Nor has he fulfilled the promise which he made at the outset of his remarks that he would deal with the matters that he proposed to bring before the House in a non-partisan manner. However, I may say to my hon. friend that I am not disappointed because, frankly, I did not expect too much. My hon. friend has gone over a great deal of ground and with respect to most of the matters with which he has dealt I do not propose to follow him. He expressed as his conclusion the pious wish that an opportunity might be given at an early day for the people to put themselves on record against the incompetents who now occupy the Treasury benches. Well, let me say this, Mr. Speaker, that since this House prorogued there have been seven by-elections and that six members from various sections of Canada out of the seven elected have taken their places upon this side of the House. If there is any comfort for hon. gentlemen opposite in that statement they are welcome to it. In my opinion it represents the view of Canada upon their performances and ours since October, 1911.

My hon. friend has spoken of the naval issue and has stated that the abandonment—that was the word he used—abandonment of our naval policy has been a matter of astonishment in Canada and throughout the Empire. Let me say, Sir, that that astonishment was of a much earlier date. The astonishment has been that a branch of this legislature could be so partisan and perverse, not to say unpatriotic, as to reject the Naval Aid Bill brought forward by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden). My hon. friend has spoken of cowardice on the part of the Government. I do not intend here and now to go over the ground so fully covered by the discussion of last session nor to renew that bitter and, in my view, deplorable controversy which raged throughout its length. What I have to say on the matter of the navy can be said within very small compass indeed. I do not propose here and now to discuss what my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did or did not do during the period of his administration. I simply desire to say this, and it seems to me to be the great, central and outstanding fact in this matter, that if the Naval Aid Bill introduced by the Prime Minister last year had been enacted into law by the Senate of Canada, there would have been now under construction, at the expense of Canada, three powerful ships of war ready to take their places in 1916 in the British line of defence for the purpose of the maintenance of Great Britain's supremacy at sea and representing the loyal contribution of this country to the world-wide defence of the British Empire. The aid that would have been given would have been practical and effectual, and would have been so recognized in Canada,

in the empire, and throughout the world. I believe it would have clinched the question of Great Britain's invincibility at sea, and I believe it would have been a decisive factor in bringing about a cessation of armaments, which seems to be the world's desire to-day. The Naval Aid Bill, so fruitful of peaceful results, was defeated in the Senate, I believe at the instigation of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and upon him and upon hon. gentlemen opposite must rest the blame and the responsibility for its rejection. My right hon. friend says that it is cowardly upon the part of the Government not to re-introduce the measure. What would be the use of doing so? It would meet with precisely the same fate as it met with last year. We do not propose to plough the sands. We do not propose to winnow chaff. We shall simply have to wait the slow processes of time and of mortality, until the Senate of Canada is brought into accord with the popular will.

My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) referred to the estimates. He desired to know if they were ready for presentation to Parliament. They are ready; they are in print and they will be presented immediately after this debate is concluded. My hon. friend referred to the amount of this year's Estimates, $200,000,000. He said that many of the items were dubious in their character. Let me ask my hon. friend, here and now, what member of the Opposition during last session of Parliament raised any question as to the amount of the Estimates? What attack was made upon this Government in respect to the Estimates brought down to Parliament last year? What item was challenged? The attitude of my hon. friend reminds me of the story of Oliver Twist, who wanted more. That was the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the Estimates. My hon. friend from Halifax, instead of attacking the Estimates, repeatedly put forward his request that branch lines should be acquired for the Intercolonial railway, and it was the same with all hon. gentlemen opposite. Some wanted drill halls; others, armouries; others, post offices. As I say, it was like Oliver Twist; they all wanted more. There was no criticism of the amount of the Estimates.

My hon. friend has raised the question of Estimates and Expenditures; and I am very glad he has done so, because it gives me an opportunity of replying to criticisms that have been made by the Liberal press of this country of the expenditures and of the borrowings of this Government, since we have come into power and especially during the past year. It has been charged that we have increased expenditures. It has been charged that we have been extravagant and improvident. My right hon. friend has likened me to the spendthrift heir who has come into the possession of a splendid estate; and I think, in the tour conducted by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), who I am sorry to say is not in the House, my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), referring to that large expenditure, represented me as the prodigal son. No doubt he spoke more in sorrow than in anger.

I propose to compare, or rather to contrast—for "contrast" is the better word—the record of this Government with the record of hon. gentlemen opposite, in the matter of expenditures and in the matter of borrowings referred to by my hon. friend from Halifax. In 1908, the Liberal expenditure was $112,000,000, and in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1912, the year in which we adopted the Estimates of hon. gentlemen opposite, which Estimates by the way exceeded $155,000,000, the expenditure was $137,000,000. That is to say, the expenditure of Canada had increased, during a period of four years, from $112,000,000 to $137,000,000, or an increase of $25,000,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What was it in 1910?

Mr. WHITE: In 1910-11 $122 000,000.

I desire to call the attention of this House to the fact that, although expenditures have been increasing, revenues have also been increasing. Where my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) makes the mistake in dealing with the administration of this Government is this, that he imagines that because he has ceased governing, Canada has ceased growing. That is the fundamental error made by hon. gentlemen opposite. Of course, our expenditures will increase, because the country is growing. The revenue has been expanding. The first year we came into power the revenue was $137,000,000. This year it will be about $170,000,000, about the same as last year. Immigration has been increasing up to a thousand to twelve hundred a day. Our trade has been expanding. The year before we came into power, the trade of Canada was $750,000,000. The next year it was $850,000,000. Last year it reached the total of $1,000,000,000, and this year, notwithstanding the financial stringency, notwith-

standing the scarcity of money, the trade of Canada, so far as we can judge at the present time, will exceed the highwater-mark trade of $1,000,000,000 of last year.

It has been charged against us that we have increased the debt of Canada, as if that were a new experience for Canada. In Liberal papers, because I read all the newspapers, I have found ominous headlines to the effect that the debt of Canada is being increased, as if such a thing had never happened before. I do not claim to be what is called a 'Heaven-born financier.' I am just a plain, everyday, and, I hope, common-sense financier. For the higher flights for the aeroplane finance of my predecessor I confess I have not the genius. With the consent of the House I propose to put on record something as to the borrowings of hon. gentlemen opposite, both directly and indirectly, during the period they were in power. In literature sent out from here under the authority of the Liberal organization, it has been stated that, whereas we are increasing the national debt, our friends opposite were engaged in the reduction of the national debt. What are the facts? For the four years preceding 1911, the increase in the national debt of Canada under the Liberal Administration was no less a sum than $76,000,000. In 1909 alone, the net debt of Canada was increased by $46,000,000. Nor is that all. That was in a year in which there were many maturities; and I myself could scarcely believe the figures when I looked up the record. What were the borrowings in the year 1908 and the early part of the year 1909? My predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, from the 11th day of December, 1907—and I desire you to note the year because that was the year of the money stringency—to the 23rd day of January, 1909, a period of thirteen months, borrowed the staggering—I had almost said the appalling total of £20,500,000, or over $100,000,000. Of that money £5,000,000 was borrowed in June, 1908, £5,000,000 in October, 1908, and £6,000,000 in January, 1909—£16,000,000 within a period of seven months. My predecessor, Mr. Fielding, is not in the House at the present time; I understand he is the editor of the Montreal 'Daily Telegraph.' I only wish he were here, because I am going to read to the House an editorial published in a recent issue of the Montreal 'Daily Telegraph.' In this article the writer is referring to the loans of £3,000,000 and £4,000,000 which was put on the London market, £2,000,000 of which were required to meet maturities. This article was cabled to England and published in the 'Daily Chronicle' of December 20, 1913, under the caption 'Frenzied Finance in Canada.' I am sorry to say that there is a great deal of news matter of decidedly partisan origin going from this country to England. Whilst Canada has been borrowing money in the London market, despatches have been sent from this country that should never have been sent, and this is one of them:

It is here—

Referring to my loans of £3,000,000 and £4,000,000:

—that the financial interests rise in indignant protest. They say that already, owing to the finanical extravagant borrowings in the London market, no one else, whether banker, railway man or manufacturer, can sell his securities.

This was written by or under the direction of my predecessor, the ex-Minister of Finance, who in the year 1908, within a period of thirteen months, borrowed no less a sum than $100,000,000.

5 p.m. £16,000,000 within seven months. from July to January, 1909.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: How much of this was to meet maturities?

Mr. WHITE: I can only tell my right hon. friend that the national debt was increased by $46,000,000, and although a process of subtraction would not give the precise sum, it would represent substantially, I should think, the maturities that had to be met. My predecessor knew very well that these maturities had to be met, and the point is that notwithstanding this fact he increased the national debt in the year 1908 by no less a sum than $46,000,000. I do not know that I should have been on my feet here criticising him for that were it not because the cry of extravagance has been unjustly raised against me and against this Administration. My hon. friend talks about borrowing. As a matter of fact, this Government, in the two years during which it has been in office, has borrowed, apart from the sums required to meet maturities, the amount that he mentioned—except that he added $53,000,000 instead of $43,000,000. Of that $43,000,000, $10,000—£2,000,000—were required for the purpose of meeting maturities in October and November last. As to the balance, I shall explain in a moment the necessity that compelled our borrowing.

The charges made against this Government of extravagant administration and of wasteful borrowing are founded upon anything but fact. I asked my deputy to prepare a statement as to the net debt of

Canada on October 11, 1911, the date on which this Government came into power. The net debt of Canada on that day was $321,000,000, and the same statement gives the net debt, on December 31, 1913, as $303,000,000. That is to say, the net debt of Canada on December 31, 1913, was $18,000,000 less than it was when this Government took office. I will go further, and say that at the end of the fiscal year 1914 the net debt of Canada will be less than it was on October 11, 1911.

As yet, Mr. Speaker, only the half has been told. I have spoken of direct borrowing. In 1896, when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, there was no borrowing by way of guarantee. There were no outstanding Dominion guarantees, so far as I know or can ascertain. What did the Government, presided over by my right hon. friend, inaugurate in the way of guarantees? The guarantee was a new principle; the parent of that principle was the late Government. The Government became contingently liable for vast sums of money, and the issue of the securities guaranteed had an effect, of course, on the money market from which the Government draws its loans. Let me now call the attention of my right hon. friend to the guarantees given by the late Government. The Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Railway Company received guarantees under the late Government of a sum in excess of $55,000,000, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company received guarantees to the amount of $70,000,000. So that the guarantees, that is to say the contingent liabilities incurred by the Dominion during the administration of my right hon. friend amounted to a sum in access of $125,000,000.

My right hon. friend has spoken of the estate which the spendthrift heir inherited. What was the character of that estate? During the session before we came into power my right hon. friend gave guarantees to the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company of $35,000,000. None of these securities were sold; they were overhanging the London market, and millions of dollars had been spent in anticipation of their sale. Of the $70,000,000 of guarantees given to the Grand Trunk Pacific, £7,200,000 had been sold, but £6,800,000 remained unsold. I desire to say, with regard to the guarantee of £14,000,000 that was given to the Grand Trunk Pacific, that no more unwise thing could have been done. In anticipation of a railway construction that would extend over a period of years, to fix a three per cent rate upon those bonds was one of the most grotesque pieces of financing that has ever come to my attention. What was the result? The bonds were first put out at ninety-two, and before my right hon. friend went out of power they had fallen to eighty. My hon. friend at an earlier date had been compelled to bring in legislation whereby he agreed to implement to the par value the selling price of these bonds, and one of my first transactions as Finance Minister of the new Government was to pay a sum not less than $5,000,000, without receiving any consideration in return to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in respect of implementing upon those bonds. Further, what was I confronted with? £6,800,000 to be thrown on the market. During the year 1912—a year in which money was almost as scarce as it has been during the past year, I was confronted with the alternative of placing those bonds on the market in the seventies and paying the amount of implementing, which, with the $5,000,000 which had been paid, would have totaled about $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 for which the Government of Canada would receive absolutely nothing or of purchasing the bonds. And what did I do?

I took the sensible course; I took a course approved of by every financial man either in Canada or London, who knows anything about the transaction. I brought in the Grand Trunk Pacific Bond Purchase Act, and under the provisions of that Act during the last two years, instead of wasting our surplus, we have devoted it to the purchase of these bonds. And what is the result? I have repaired the loss that would have taken place by reason of the financial bungling of 1905; I have purchased no less than twenty-two millions of the Grand Trunk Pacific bonds guaranteed by the Dominion. Of course they are absolutely good; the money put into the purchase of these bonds is not lost money; but I have saved the implementing and I have prevented these bonds from being thrown upon the London market. That is what I have done with the surplus of 1912. It may be said: you had a surplus in 1912 of $25,000,000 and so we had; our revenues were $168,000,000 and our expenditures $143,000,000. That is to say, we had a real surplus of $25,000,000 in 1912 that we did not spend. That money was not devoted to paying off the national debt in London; most of that money went into the

construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific because it represented the proceeds of these bonds we bought, and as construction proceeded that money was paid out by the Receiver General under the provisions of the statute authorizing the issue of the bonds determining the disposition of their proceeds. When I think of the record of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to expenditure; when I consider that they constructed the National Transcontinental railway from Moncton to Winnipeg and that my predecessor, Mr. Fielding, estimated that it would cost $60,000,000, and the right hon. leader of the Opposition said it would only cost $13,000,000—to be fair to him I should say that that represented the interest during the seven years the Grand Trunk Pacific was to have the road free of interest, but the hon. gentleman based that estimate of interest upon a cost of $60,000,000 as announced by Mr. Fielding—and when I consider that the National Transcontinental railway from Moncton to Winnipeg, instead of costing $60,000,000, as was said by the Finance Minister of the Liberal Administration, cost over $200,000,000 in cold cash, I am astonished that hon. gentlemen opposite can have the boldness to speak as they do now. And when I consider the borrowings to which I have drawn the attention of the House, when I consider that my predecessors borrowed in one year $100,000,000—and personally I would have hardly believed that to be possible—when I consider all these things, and when I consider further the guarantees which were given by the former Government, amounting to over $125,000,000, I cannot help but think that Satan reproving sin would be consistency itself compared with hon. gentlemen opposite denouncing our expenditures. I have spoken about the estate we inherited, and I hope that I will not hear very much more about it, because if I have to describe it—although I do not wish to injure the standing or credit of the country—I would describe it as an hereditas damnosa.

We have had unusual borrowing this year, and I am always glad to give the House details of our borrowing. If I had had to deal only with the estimates of $205,000,000 and the expenditures made under these estimates, I should have been able to finish this year, I believe, showing a surplus. But, at the end of the last session we know that a larger programme was taken on. My hon. friend (Mr. Graham) in the late Government inaugurated by his guarantees the Canadian Northern line between Montreal and Port Arthur, and I have explained how my hon. friend gave the guarantees of the Government of Canada to the amount of $70,000,000 to the Grand Trunk Pacific. During the Administration of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, it was understood that the Grand Trunk Pacific would receive a loan—at least, so I was told by the late General Manager and President of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, Mr. Hays—of $15.000,000.

So, then, what has been my programme for the year? I have had to take care of an expenditure under the estimates of $205,000,000; I have had to take care of subsidies to the extent of $12,000,000 or $14,000,000; I have had to pay one-half the Grand Trunk Pacific loan; because the arrangement was that I should pay one-half this year and one-half next year, during the period of the completion of the line. And, in addition, we avoided the loss which would have been sustained by preventing these bonds being thrown upon the London market; we have bought not less than $22,000,000 of the Grand Trunk Pacific bonds guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada. Of course, I have had to borrow some money. My hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) says I borrowed £3,000,000 in September, and that is correct. I had £2,000,000 of matured indebtedness in October and November. I made an issue of £4,000,000 in December, and treasury bills to the amount my hon. friend has mentioned are outstanding and will be taken up in due course. But the total of borrowings in the year was not $53,000,000, but $43,000,000, as my hon. friend will find out if he casts up his figures again. However, this is not the time to discuss this matter to a finality, and I only deal with it because of the criticism made by my hon. friend from Halifax.

I purpose, Mr. Speaker, to devote a little time to the amendment proposed by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, which reads:

> We regret to have to represent to Your Royal Highness that in the gracious speech with which you have met Parliament, whilst it is admitted that business is in a depressed condition, yet there is no indication of any intention on the part of your advisers to take any steps towards relieving such a situation.

My right hon. friend occasionally speaks outside of Ottawa; he always speaks well, but sometimes possibly not discreetly. On this occasion, however, I do not say he was indiscreet, but I desire to read a portion of his speech made in the city of Mont-

real upon the subject referred to in his amendment. The right hon. gentleman said:

A new condition has arisen at the present time. For the first time since the year 1896 men are seeking work and are not finding work. For the first time since 1896 there is such a thing as unemployment in this country. The mayor of Winnipeg stated yesterday according to press reports, that there were three thousand unemployed in the city of Winnipeg. He also said that three years ago he would have blessed heaven that there was not a single unemployed person in the city. To-day, as we know, in Montreal, in Toronto, in all of the large cities of Canada men are seeking employment and not finding it. The most powerful industries, those the longest established and the best known for their strength, are decreasing the number of men in their employ or the number of days employment that is given to them. Some just as strong are decreasing both the number of men and the hours of work.

My right hon. friend has certain delusions. One of his delusions, and I say it with all possible respect, is that the fifteen years of his administration were a sort of halcyon period in which prosperity was continuous, in which trade was always buoyant, in which revenues were always expanding, and in which there was no unemployment. Now, my right hon. friend has a memory to which I have before directed attention. It is one of the most marvellous memories that has ever been brought under my observation. It is what one may call a collapsible memory: my right hon. friend can draw it out and to the uttermost detail it responds truly to his call. On the other hand, when he so desires he can close it up and it becomes mute, voiceless, and utterly forgetful. The amnesia, to give it its technical name, may be total or partial, but there is no doubt about it—he is able to summon it at any time. My right hon. friend has moved this amendment as if nothing in the nature of a financial stringency or money scarcity had ever been brought to his attention during all his public life. He has entirely overlooked the financial stringency of 1907 and the trade slackening of 1908. He says there is a slackening of trade at present for which the Government is not finding any remedy. I desire to read to my right hon. friend and to place upon 'Hansard' some extracts from the budget speech of his Finance Minister in 1908, Mr. Fielding, immediately after the financial stringency in 1907, which was very similar to the present, only not so prolonged and not so severe.

Turning now to the fiscal year 1908-1909 upon which we shall soon enter, I think I am correct when I say that the general feeling of our business men is one of hopeful confidence

united with much caution. We are just emerging from a period of world wide financial stringency. Financial systems and institutions of all countries have been severely tried. It should be a gratification to us all that none have stood the test better than those of Canada.

Then he made some reference to the banks, and went on:

Business has received a check, but I do not look for a continued period of depression. Conditions should improve in the early summer.

My right hon. friend in his Montreal speech said that for the first time since 1896 men were seeking work and not finding it. I put it down to that amnesia which I say characterizes my right hon. friend, because I do not believe he would make a deliberate misstatement. If I should appear a little tedious in the quotations I am about to give, it is only with a desire to refresh the memory of my right hon. friend. I tried to get some information that was authentic, that he would not controvert. I knew it was not much use going to the Canadian Annual Review, because he might challenge the correctness of the statements therein contained, but there was a publication that I knew my right hon. friend would not contradict. I have it here. It is the Labour Gazette for 1908, and bears the superscription of the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, Minister, and of W. L. Mackenzie King, Deputy Minister. I knew, Sir, that whatever I found in that publication would bear the hall mark of the living truth. I am going to read a few extracts from this Labour Gazette, which I am satisfied is entirely acceptable to my right hon. friend. It reviews the industrial and labour conditions for the month of December, 1907, and the various correspondents write in as follows. Philips Thompson reported:

With the setting in of the winter season and the general cessation of most outdoor occupations conditions are duller than those of last month with large numbers of both skilled and unskilled workers out of employment. The continuance of the financial stringency has induced a slackening of activity in nearly all lines and the problem of providing for the unemployed has become serious.

London, Ont.—A marked depression in the labour market occurred this month especially in the building trades which were almost at a standstill. A large number of foreigners have left for their homes. As an indication of the number of unemployed the military school here which for the past five years has only had 75 men has now recruited up to 288 and more were coming in every day.

Vancouver.—There were more men out of work during the month than in the previous history of the city, there being fully 5,000 men idle. The building trade was practically at a standstill.

In the issue of January, 1909, I find the following:

In British Columbia the year opened with most of the mills, both coast and mountain, shut down and with heavy stocks on hand. These conditions continued throughout the season, production and sales falling far below those of 1907.

Under the caption, Canadian Trade and Revenue, I find:

The world-wide commercial depression which set in during the latter half of 1907 and which continued during 1908 was reflected in the trade and revenue returns of Canada for the past year which showed a considerable falling off compared with those of 1907. Total foreign trade declined by about $70,000,000, the decline being almost wholly in imports in which the chief gains had been shown in the past two years.

Simply history repeating itself, due to the same cause—a world-wide and acute financial stringency. I read further:

Niagara Falls.—There are idle men in practically every class of labour.

London.—There are more unemployed men and women in this city at present than for years past and there is not a factory or a foundry but has a reduced staff.

Brantford.—The general opinion is that there is more unemployment at present than is usual at this season and also those that are unemployed are in a worse condition (owing to a poorer season) than last year.

Montreal.—Last year was a hard one for Montreal, poverty being more apparent than for a number of years back. This fall there have been a great many out of employment as many factories and shops had been forced to reduce their staffs owing to lack of orders, but in the past three months there has been a general industrial revival in the city and the number of workers who are walking the streets is now but very little if any larger than is usual at this season.

Then it goes on to describe the commercial failures in Canada, and it shows that the public revenue of the Dominion, which in 1907 reached the highest level recorded, declined by upwards of $11,000,000 in 1908. It was during that very period of decline that my predecessor, the Minister of Finance, borrowed on the London markets the colossal sum of £20,500,000. It says:

Declines show largely in receipts from customs duties.

And then it goes on to describe in general terms the conditions in Canada. It says that in Kingston the consensus of opinion is that there was more unemployment existing than there had been in any corresponding period for years.

It is a deplorable fact that at times—such times as we have under review and the present time—through no fault of individuals or of governments, there is unemployment in the land and unemployment throughout the world. The point I am making is that there is nothing exceptional or peculiar about the present situation. It is history repeating itself, and the future will see it repeated again when the causation is the same. We find an industrial slackening in the United States and in Great Britain, as was pointed out by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister yesterday. In the United States we are told that industrial works are closed or are running part time, and we are informed by press despatches that one million men in the iron and steel trades are out of employment, and that a hundred thousand men in the one city of Chicago are looking for work. I refer to this, as did my right hon. friend yesterday, not for the purpose of specially calling attention to it as being a condition existing in the United States, but simply to show that the condition complained of and referred to in this amendment to the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne is a universal condition, a condition found everywhere, and due, as I have said, to the selfsame cause, namely, financial stringency, which has curtailed and limited the credit and commitments of commercial and industrial people throughout the world.

My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) spoke last evening of the condition in Great Britain, and I should like to read and place on record for his information an extract from a speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, for whom, I am sure, he has a great admiration. The right hon. Mr. Lloyd George, speaking in his constituency on December 23, 1913, said:

The trade of this country has been doing better during the last few years than it has ever done before .

Just as has been the case here.

It shows signs now of wanting a rest for a while after a great effort of exertion and strain But as soon as it recuperates, no one doubts that it will be stronger than ever.

What is the position of Canada as far as its industrial conditions are concerned today? We have passed through a very trying period. There has been a monetary stringency, I believe, unparalleled and unprecedented in the experience of any one in this House, in its length and severity because it has covered practically a period of two years, and it is very seldom indeed that a period of financial stringency extends for so long a time. The banks a year and a

half ago foresaw what was coming, and they did what they were bound to do; they warned their clients to limit their commitments so that while they might extend to them the same credit, or in some cases curtail their credit, they were not furnished with funds for the extension of their enterprises. That was quite the proper course for the banks to adopt. Any other course would have led to catastrophe. The effect of the curtailment of credit and of the curb that was put upon real estate speculation throughout Canada is now being felt. It is felt in the slackening of trade. I mentioned in my budget speech of last year that it could not be expected that in view of the financial stringency business could continue because usually following financial restriction trade slackens. We are in a period at the present time of trade slackening. I believe, as stated in the Speech from the Throne, that the check is temporary only, and I would repeat almost the words of my predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, that if the spring opens up well and crop prospects are good, because I am happy to say that the money conditions are easing off in all the great international markets, Canada will again go ahead as she has in the past following similar periods of financial stringency and trade cessation and restriction.

My right hon. friend said that in Montreal I had stated that the crisis had been reached and passed. He quoted me correctly, but I was referring to the financial crisis. I think that was in December, and I believe it is a fact that the financial crisis just about that time was reached and was passed. As evidence of it I may state that in the London market, and in the other markets of the world, money is easier, the bank rate has come down, and it will probably come down further, which means that more capital will be available for the enterprises of the world, and this, of course, will almost at once ameliorate and alleviate the situation because, with the exception of Great Britain and France, nearly all the nations of the world are borrowing nations dependent for their supplies of capital upon these two great nations—Great Britain and France.

Our revenues, I expect, will show some decline. Our customs revenues have shown decline, as was pointed out by the hon. junior member for Halifax, but as I have stated, the revenues for 1908 showed a decline of over $10,000,000 following the stringency of 1907. With the good harvest of 1908 matters began at once to improve, and Canada went ahead again in 1909, 1910, 1911 and 1912 upon her career of prosperity. History will repeat itself in that respect. What is required is confidence and, as I have said, the prospect for a good harvest in Canada. Money conditions are undoubtedly improving.

Mr. MACDONALD: If you do not have the prospect again of a good harvest, what are you going to do?

Mr. WHITE: Well, I think that in Canada we will have the prospect of a good harvest. I am sorry to see that even such a big, outstanding man as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is, particularly in a military uniform, has become a pessimist on Canada. He has become a bear on Canada. We drove the bears out of Ontario years ago, I do not believe there are any in Nova Scotia and I do not believe that in his heart of hearts the hon. gentleman is a bear. I do not see how he can be pessimistic. Optimism is the only thing for Canada at the present time. When I listened to my right hon. friend the other day, and when I listened to the hon. junior member for Halifax to-day, I could not help but think —it is probably a misfortune that I have a fairly good memory for verse—even blank verse—of lines in King Richard the Second. My right hon. friend was describing the conditions in Canada. He said that there were a hundred thousand men out of work. I think that he greatly overstated it and that it was just my right hon. friend's estimate. I do not say that he wilfully or deliberately mis-stated it, but I think that my right hon. friend's estimate was too great.

Mr. MACDONALD: How many are there?

Mr. WHITE: I have not the information before me from which to make an estimate, and consequently I decline to make one. I like information; I like the facts before me before I commit myself to an estimate, especially one which may damage the country. When I listened to my right hon. friend dealing with the question of the unemployed, and when I heard him moving this resolution with regard to the cessation of trade, and when to-day I listened to my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) painting a gloomy picture of conditions in Canada, I thought of those lines in Richard II:

> Of comfort no man speak;
> Let's talk of graves, of worms, of epitaphs;
> Make dust our paper, and with rainy eyes
> Write sorrow on the bosom of the earth.

That seems to be the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite to-day. In sharp contra-

distinction to that, let me read an extract from the address of a bank president, taken just at haphazard from the reports presented to the shareholders of the chartered banks of Canada. It is a report of the speech of Mr. Pease, who is a very level-headed financier, one of the out-standing bankers of Canada, an exceedingly well-informed gentleman, and one who would have no motive for misrepresenting the situation. I desire to place it on 'Hansard':

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What date?

Mr. WHITE: Within the last two weeks it was presented at the meeting of the shareholders of the Royal Bank of Canada:

Regarding the general situation in Canada, the dominating influence at the beginning of the past year was the money market crisis in Europe, resulting from the Balkan war and the fear of a general conflict. Although the banks were alive to the necessity for extreme caution and retrenchment in Canada, it was impossible to call an immediate halt. The momentum of trade following several years of prosperity required that commitments be taken care of. During the first eight months there was no diminution of the volume of mercantile business or curtailment of railway and other general construction work, for which foreign capital continued to be freely supplied. In that period the commercial loans of the chartered banks increased $30,000,000, while deposits decreased $20,000,000. Fortunately, however, our excellent crops rapidly marketed, liquidated debts and brought about a reversal of the financial situation. Commercial loans on the 30th of November last compared with August last showed a decrease of $24,000,000, while deposits in the same time increased $38,000,000. We could offer no better evidence of the vitality and wealth of the country.

I cannot help but contrast that with the doleful utterances of my right hon. friend and my hon. friend who spoke this afternoon. I am sincerely sorry that my right hon. friend is becoming a pessimist on Canada. The Prime Minister read in his speech last evening the messages sent from the prime ministers of all the provinces of Canada, and I thought how unfortunate it was that when in all that chorus the most eloquent voice of all might have been that of my right hon. friend, he is now using it for the purpose of discord and disharmony, proclaiming that conditions in Canada are precarious, and pursuing a course which I cannot help but think will reflect upon the credit and standing of the Dominion. I think I need not point out to my right hon. friend that he owes a good deal to patriotism, and that he should not, unless on the strongest grounds, disparage Canadian conditions and take a course which may have the effect of depreciating the credit of the country.

I come now to the new fiscal policy that has been put forward by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I was amazed last night to hear my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) mention the variety of fiscal policies to which my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has given adherence in the past.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: So was I.

Mr. WHITE: In 1893—I think my own memory will serve me correctly—my right hon. friend proclaimed himself in favour, ultimately at all events, of free trade as it existed in England. My hon. friend has been a free trader. He has been in favour of reciprocity, restricted and unrestricted. He has been, I think, a commercial unionist.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: You think so?

Mr. WHITE: Well, if my right hon. friend denies it, I will withdraw it at once. Then, my hon. friend—and the Prime Minister omitted to mention this—is reputed to be the possessor of a Cobden medal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That goes with free trade.

Mr. WHITE: Precisely, as in England. Then, in 1897, he came into power and adopted the National Policy. I confess to a degree of admiration for a statesman who can wear such a variety of fiscal clothes, and come through so long a public life as my right hon. friend.

Mr. MACDONALD: Did you not follow him down to two years ago on that?

Mr. WHITE: Well, I did not know. My right hon. friend's personality is the strongest and most outstanding feature about him. No man could give adherence to all these policies without being regarded as a sort of fiscal chameleon. My right hon. friend, from the tariff standpoint, has been everything by turns and nothing long. In fact, he was longest a protectionist, because he was fifteen years in power, and during that time he followed the National Policy. My hon. friend has now embarked upon a new policy and characteristically of him, he has not attempted to define it. At Hamilton, he came out in the most unequivocal fashion—because I took a clipping from the Toronto Globe—and we all know what an accurate publication that is. My right hon. friend spoke as follows—and this was featured on the first page of that great journal:

The policy I give you at this moment—

Notice the qualification:

At this moment—
The policy I give you at this moment, the policy I believe every patriot of Canada ought to support, and the policy I believe to be the duty of the Government to immediately inaugurate is a policy of absolutely free food, food free from customs duty.

That is the new policy of my right hon. friend, and the amazing thing to me is that he did not refer to it more strongly than he did in his speech yesterday. It almost seems to me as if the announcement of that policy at Hamilton had thrown consternation into the ranks of some of his followers, because, as I shall show, free food means a great deal. Free food, in the first place, means that butter, eggs, livestock, all the products of the farm are to be put on the free list, and my right hon. friend might possibly hear from some of his followers in the mixed farming provinces with regard to that. In addition to that, free food means that the policy of my right hon. friend affects in Canada, according to the statistics of the Year Book, 6,985 establishments with a capital of $133,000,000, employing 52,000 men on wages, paying $14,000,000 in wages every year, using material to the amount of $175,000,000, and with an output of $245,000,000.

Now, I am not quite sure that my right hon. friend realized, when he said, 'free from customs duty,' that this would affect such a large body of our citizens—all our farmers and also the manufacturers of food products to the number I have mentioned. Let us see what our products in these manufactures of food are. In the first place, we have bread, biscuits and confectionery. I wonder what my right hon. friend's friend, the former Minister of Customs, Hon. William Paterson, would have said to him had he proposed to take the customs duties off bread, biscuits and confectionery. Then, there is cheese, one of the most important industries of Canada. The output of cheese in Canada for the last fiscal year amounted to $37,232,969. There were 3,625 establishments, and they employed men to the number of 6,147. Yet, the right hon. gentleman proposes to take the duty off cheese. Probably some of the representatives of rural constituencies whose people are engaged in that industry may have something to say about that. I omit those industries in which only a moderate capital is invested. We have in the fish-preserving business an output of $12,309,237; in flour and gristmill products, $82,494,826; in fruit and the vegetable canning, 5,971,082; in slaughtering and meat packing $41,000,000, and in sugar refining $21,260,011. These establishments afford employment to thousands and tens of thousands of men, but my right hon. friend lightly said to his audience in Hamilton, 'a new policy I give you for the moment.' I am glad he said 'for the moment,' because if by chance he should come into power and be tempted to carry out such a policy I should be afraid for the consequences to this country. But as he said it was only 'for the moment,' that leaves him free to say—that it was only for the moment.

Now we come to this question of the high cost of living. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister has dealt with that question generally, and I shall not traverse the ground covered by him. But I recognize to the full the importance of the high cost of living and what it means to the average family. I take second place to no man in my sympathy for those who have to provide for their families and are confronted with the high cost of living—the increasing cost of living. Having said that, I do not necessarily jump to the conclusion that the tariff has brought this about. I examine the situation, I investigate the conditions, and try to come to a rational conclusion as to what is the cause of the high cost of living—the higher cost of living.

This phenomenon of the increasing cost of living is a world-wide phenomenon. It is not confined to protectionist countries or to free trade countries; it affects all countries at the present time, and has done so for fifteen or twenty years. It has been made the subject of many reports; it has been reported on by commissions; by special committees of legislature, by officials, by consuls and others. I have read an immense number of publications on this question, and so feel that I can emphasize what I have said—that this phenomenon is not confined to any one country. We find, for example that in Belgium, in 1912 as compared with 1900, the cost of living increased 32 per cent; in France 28 per cent; in Germany, 28 per cent; in Japan, 28 per cent, and in the United States, 43 per cent. I will deal with Canada's increase in a moment. This report goes into the details of the various causes put forward academically by both theoretical and practical men. I desire to call attention also to the report of the Massachusetts Commission in 1910; for, although I do not wish in any way to influence the deliberations of our commission at present sitting upon this question, yet the Massachusetts Commission of 1910 seems to me to epitomize two or three of the

principal causes at any rate that enter into this problem of the high cost of living. They mention these causes:

Increase in gold supply.

For myself, I do not take that factor as seriously as economists generally seem to do. Gold has been increasing, but the trade of the world also has been increasing, and the gold is used increasingly in the arts and is hoarded increasingly in India and other parts of the world. The Commission says further that:

The main factors in restricting supply and enhancing the cost of commodities are the drain of population from the land, exhaustion of natural resources and uneconomic methods of production and distribution, especially the latter. The chief influence on the side of demand, the growing concentration of population in great cities, increasing the proportion of non-producing food consumers, the general advance in standard of living, the national habit of extravagance which has further extended and diversified the demands for comforts and luxuries.

And they find this also:

With regard to the tariff, the trusts and the unions the commission finds that none of these factors can be regarded as a direct and active cause of the increase in prices.

Now, we have had in Canada this situation. The most outstanding and striking fact in the census returns of 1911 was that the rural population of Canada increased only 17 per cent, while the urban population increased 62 per cent. In Ontario and the Maritime provinces, there was an actual falling off in rural population. There has been also, as pointed out by the Prime Minister last night, an increased consumption per capita. I think it is a fair statement to make that production has not kept pace with consumption, or to put it the other way, consumption has increased more rapidly than has production. There has been a higher standard of living in Canada, and there has been much greater waste. My hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) spoke the other day at a place called Atwood, I presume in his own constituency. He is reported—misreported I have no doubt—as saying in reference to our commission of investigation, that the establishment of this commission is a 'rotten farce.' For my own part, I say, I do not believe the hon. gentleman used that expression. I think the newspaper correspondent was aiming at a sensational or lurid effect. What the hon. gentleman probably said was, that, in his opinion, the commission would be ineffectual, or that its appointment would hardly be an adequate solution of a very difficult question. But he did say this—and I attach a great deal of weight to what the hon. gentleman says, because he has a sound, strong, practical mind—that the trouble was that we are not producing enough in Canada.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. W. T. WHITE: When the House rose at six o'clock I was referring to the speech of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) at Atwood, in which he was reported to have given it as his view that the chief factor in the high cost of living was under-production, and in that view I was disposed largely to agree. The matter has been one of very considerable interest to me, and in the course of some investigations I recently made I looked into the matter of the raising of live stock in Canada, in Australia and in New Zealand. I found that in Canada the number of cattle per head was a fraction of one, and that the same may be said with regard to sheep and swine. In other words, the number of cattle, or of sheep or of swine in this country is only a fraction of the population. Turning to Australia and New Zealand, I found that in respect of cattle the number was two per head of population; of sheep, over twenty per head of population. It is apparent, therefore, that both Canada and the United States—because I have ascertained that the United States is in a similar position to Canada—we are not raising a sufficient number of cattle, swine, or sheep.

Mr. NESBITT: Where did my hon. friend get the statistics with regard to Canada?

Mr. WHITE: I am unable just at the moment to answer my hon. friend, but I will supply him with the information later. Coming to the question of the increased cost of living, which has been dealt with by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition both in this House, and in speeches at Hamilton and Montreal, I desire to call attention to what my right hon. friend said at Montreal. The Daily Telegraph which, I assume, would give a fairly accurate report of what my right hon. friend said, reports him as saying that:

During the fifteen years of our administration you never heard a word against the cost of living.

If I take the opportunity of reading a number of quotations which I have here it

will be only for the purpose of refreshing the memory of my right hon. friend in connection with this matter, as I did this afternoon in regard to the question of employment and trade slackening following the money stringency. I quote from the Labour Gazette of January, 1909, published during the regime of my right hon. friend and under the immediate direction of Hon. Mr. Lemieux, then Minister of Labour, and Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King. I assume, therefore, that what I shall read is authentic:

> The advance in retail prices which has been so pronounced during the past five years was continued during 1907. Milk, butter, eggs, potatoes, canned fish and vegetables, cereals and other staple articles of consumption were higher in price than in the experience of present householders. A special and detailed investigation conducted by the Civil Service Association at Ottawa, Ontario, into local price tendencies during the past ten years showed that expenditures on necessaries by a family of five living on an income of $750 per year had increased thirty-four per cent during the decade. The investigagation was conducted in June prior to a pronounced advance in fuel, breadstuffs and dairy produce which was maintained to the close of the year.

So much for the summary of the Labour Gazette for the year 1907. Now we come to the Labour Gazette of January, 1909, and I shall read just one extract:

> On the whole the rapid advance in general cost of living which has been so pronounced since the beginning of the century received a check, and the general situation was one of stationary or easier conditions.

That is precisely what I should expect. After a period of trade slackening, such as we have at the present time, and such as we had in 1908; after the stringency through which we have been passing in 1913, and through which the people of Canada passed in 1907, I should expect a fall, if only a slight one, in the cost of living. I do not desire to pose as a prophet, but I would hazard the prediction that the upward trend of prices will show a decline before the end of the year 1914. I may be entirely wrong, but I venture that prediction.

Let me now call attention to the facts referred to by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister last evening as to the upward trend of prices during the whole course of the administration of the right hon. gentleman opposite. I shall quote from the reports of the Labour Department. The House understands that the prices are measured by index numbers based upon the average prices of from 230 to 272 commodities selected during the period from 1890 to 1899. That is to say, a period of ten years is taken as 100 and the index number of the succeeding years has relation to that number, so that if the average cost increased by ten or fifteen per cent, the index number of the year in question would be 110 or 115. In 1890 the index number was 110; it fell steadily until 1896, when it reached 92. In other words, the cost of living was lowest in Canada in 1896. From that date forward —and I do not charge this to my right hon. friend—the cost of living has steadily advanced. In 1900 it, the index number, had grown from 92 to 108; in 1907 it had reached 126, and it then receded to 121. In 1911 it had reached 127, in 1912 it was 134, and in 1913 about 135. I may say with regard to the index number of 151, which appears in the report of the Board of Trade of Great Britain, it is perfectly clear that the comparison was not made upon precisely the same basis with regard to the several countries referred to.

In the case of Canada the prices were wholesale; in the case of the other countries the prices were retail, and the relation of a particular year, 1913 let us say, of the ten-year period between 1890 and 1899 would therefore be unfair as a comparison to Canada. These figures as given show a general increase with respect to these two or three hundred commodities, but so far as the cost of living is concerned the increase has principally taken place in animals and their products. The figures are very striking with regard to the rise in the prices of these products between the year 1906 and the year 1912. For example, in animal and meats—that is, taking them by groups—we find that while the index number in 1896 was 82, in 1900 it had reached 103, and in 1912 it had reached 160. The same statement will apply to dairy products; the index figure with respect to them has risen from 90 in 1896 to 131 in 1907 and to 159 in 1912. And with respect to 'other foods,' in 1896 at the beginning of the administration of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the index number was 102 and by 1912 it had risen to 126. In other words, from 1890 to 1897 the movement was consistently downward, while from 1896 to 1912 the movement was consistently upward, with the exception of the year 1908 in which there was a slackening or recession of trade following the financial stringency of 1907. I think the reason the index number lowers in a year like that is that there is a curb set upon extravagance, and consumption is not so great as in years of so-called abounding prosperity.

I have shown that this is not a new question, but that on the contrary it has

been very much discussed privately and publicly for many years past. I doubt if there is any question before the public to-day that has been more widely discussed throughout the world than this very question of the high cost of living. I desire to point out to my right hon. friend that not only is the question not new, but that it has been actually brought before Parliament and dealt with by his Government. Let me again recall the words used by my right hon. friend in Montreal. He said:

During the fifteen years of our administration you never heard a word against the cost of living.

I will refresh the memory of my right hon. friend by calling his attention to the fact that the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King when introducing the Combines Investigation Bill in the year 1910, as reported in 'Hansard,' referred to this very matter. I desire to point out to my right hon. friend that this question of the high cost of living was before the public at that time and was deemed of sufficient importance to warrant legislation on the part of his Government. The Hon. Mackenzie King, in introducing the Combines Investigation Bill, said:

Perhaps there is no question to-day which has attracted so much attention in this country, and particularly in the United States, as the question of the cost of living for the mass of the people of the country. We have during the last few years experienced a very serious and considerable rise in prices. This increase in the cost of living has not been confined to any one class, rich and poor alike have had some experience of it, but it has a very serious effect upon men of limited incomes, upon the wage-earning classes, upon those whose salaries are fixed and those who do not receive very much in the way of remuneration. It is this question of the cost of living which has helped to make the question of combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers and the possible effect they may have on prices, so important. In the popular mind there has come to be a gradual association between these two phenomena.

That is almost the same statement as my right hon. friend made in his speech in Hamilton. Mr. Mackenzie King continues:

Just taking a casual glance at them one observes that in the past 20 years prices have, broadly speaking, increased something like from 30 per cent to 40 per cent in most of the commodities which are in the nature of the produce of the farm and the field. Manufactured articles have not increased to quite the same extent, but there has been a very perceptible upward lift during the last ten years over what was the average rate between 1890 and 1900. As a matter of fact prices were at their lowest ebb in 1896 and 1897. Since that time they have gone up very steadily, and if we look at the movement from 1896 to the present time, we will see that in some commodities prices have increased as much as nearly 70 per cent or 80 per cent over what was the average in the years 1890-1900.

And yet my right hon. friend in his Montreal speech said that no one ever heard of this issue of the high cost of living during all the years of his administration. The Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King went on to read a table showing the increase in wholesale prices by groups of commodities, and the figures given there are very startling. It shows that animals and meats, fourteen commodities, as compared with the decade from 1890 to 1899 increased in price by forty-eight per cent and as compared with 1896, which was the last year of the Conservative Administration, by eighty per cent. In fish, the increase compared with the decade from 1890 to 1899 was thirty-four per cent, and as compared with 1896, thirty-one per cent. In other foods—thirty-seven commodities were taken—the increase was seven per cent compared with the decade from 1890 to 1899 and twenty-two per cent as compared with 1896. It seems perfectly clear then that, upon the figures given by the Labour Gazette, confirmed as they are by this statement filed by the Minister of Labour in Sir Wilfrid Laurier's Government, during the years of the Liberal Administration this was a live question, discussed publicly and privately, and considered to be a worthy subject of legislation in this House. The Hon. Mr. King continued:

Throughout the Dominion the steady increase in the cost of living, especially since the beginning of the present century, has been the subject of repeated comment, and, in almost every city or centre of employment, of more or less careful examination. In 1906 the Ontario Educational Association went carefully into the whole matter, in connection with the arrangement of teachers' salaries, with the result that an increase amounting to thirty per cent in ten years was shown. In 1907 an estimate made by the Synod of the Church of England in the city of Quebec placed the increase within the decade at a much higher rate.

The House will observe that all these bodies were considering this question.

In the city of Toronto, an investigation conducted with care and minuteness during 1907, by the Department of Political Economy of the University of Toronto, also showed a higher rate of increase. These examples could be multiplied.

All show upward movement since 1896; 30 to 35 per cent higher average, 1890-99; 40 to 45 per cent higher average, 1896-97.

The cost of living has increased from 30 to 40 per cent. in the case of incomes ranging from $2,000 down to $500. That is a fact

which has impressed itself upon all classes of the community. We find the increase in the cost of living going on simultaneously with the organization of capital on a large scale, the formation of trusts, mergers and combines of one kind or another.

Let me point out, therefore, to my right hon. friend that this question, far from never having been raised during the fifteen years of his administration, was a live issue and was made the subject of legislation by his own Government. It was on account of the high cost of living that his minister was introducing the Combines Investigation Bill as a sovereign remedy. That was the remedy of my right hon. friend, not the abolition of customs duties. That was never suggested by my right hon. friend when the debate took place in the House. Many members on that occasion participated in the debate, among others the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). He was not sure about this Combines Investigation legislation. He raised doubts about it, as appears from the report of his speech in 'Hansard.' So far as I know, there was only one man in the House who was true to the traditions of free trade and who raised his voice and stated that the high cost of living was due to the tariff. That was the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark). He was true to his free trade principles. It is true, he has not always been consistent. He apostatized last session on the Naval Bill when he wanted the ships built here instead of at Glasgow. He denied the free trade policy on that occasion; but it is not on record that, like Peter, he went out and wept bitterly. On the contrary, he rather gloried in it.

I have pointed out that my right hon. friend never suggested at that time that the tariff was the cause of the increased cost of living. Of course he could not do so. His Finance Minister would not have let him. Let me illustrate what I mean for the benefit of my right hon. friend, who is going to abolish all duties on all foods—not only on farm products but manufactured articles as well. How can my right hon. friend argue that the tariff is the cause of the increased cost of living when the tariff upon the natural products of Canada has remained stationary for about twenty years? I have taken the trouble to look up the rates of duty on foodstuffs since 1890. I am not going to weary the House by reading this table, but it shows clearly that on butter the tariff has remained stationary or been slightly reduced under the British preferential, at four cents a pound until the revision of the tariff by the Finance Minister of my right hon. friend at the time the Labour Gazette was pointing out the high cost of living. The same remark applies to cheese, the duty on which was three cents a pound in 1890 and lower in 1907 under the customs tariff of to-day. The duty on eggs in 1894 was five cents a dozen and in 1907 three cents a dozen, and so on down the line. I make the statement that upon all these items that enter largely into the question of the high cost of living the tariff has remained constant for twenty years. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that the tariff is not the cause of the increased cost of living.

We come now to a rather perplexing problem. As my right hon. friend has offered no explanation, we must do a little guessing. What is the explanation of the new fiscal policy put forth by my right hon. friend, not in the House of Commons, although he referred to it yesterday, but put forward at Hamilton as the policy which he gave the people for the present? Why this sudden interest on his part in the consumer? I think the explanation lies in the attitude that my right hon. friend took on the question of reciprocity. I had hoped that I should not have again to discuss this question in the House, but it appears from what my hon. friend from Red Deer said last night that there is a grave difference of opinion between himself and his leader as to the condition of reciprocity at the present time. My right hon. friend in his Hamilton speech said, speaking of reciprocity: Let the dead past bury its dead. My hon. friend from Red Deer dropped a rather cryptic utterance last night. He said: Reciprocity in its old form will not be with us again, but it is not dead. My hon. friend from Red Deer must be a political Buddhist, believing in reincarnation. He evidently believes in the transmigration, not of souls, but of reciprocity pacts. Now, I regard my hon. friend as not only a very able debater but as a physician of some distinction. I am beginning to entertain some doubts of his capacity as a physician, because it has taken him two years to find out what is the undoubted fact—and he has not even found it out yet—that reciprocity is dead. My hon. friend said last night that reciprocity was now 50 per cent. in operation. I think we shall find in that statement the explanation of the free food policy of my right hon. friend. He desires that the other 50 per cent. shall come into operation. My right hon. friend will remember that when the reciprocity treaty

was under consideration in this House, there was no suggestion, so far as I have been able to learn from his speeches, that any benefit would inure to the consumer. Let me read to my right hon. friend what he said in the House of Commons on that occasion. He said:

> One object to-day is to open the door of a nation of 90,000,000 which has been closed to us.....I stated a moment ago that the agreement we made, is simply to get better prices for the product of the Canadian farmers. This is a proposition so obvious that I am surprised it should have received the treatment it has received on the part of our friends opposite.

The point I wish to make is that my right hon. friend had not the consumer in mind at all at that time. To clinch that argument, let us see what my right hon. friend did. It was pointed out that the farmer would not get as much benefit as appeared upon the surface, and that by reason of the operation of the most favoured nation treaties the markets of Canada would be opened to the farm products of the thirteen most favoured nations. That argument was put forward, it had some weight, and my right hon. friend thought it worth while to meet it. At the Imperial Conference in June, 1911, my right hon. friend presented the following resolution, which was adopted:

> That His Majesty's Government be requested to open negotiations with the several Foreign Governments having treaties which apply to the Overseas Dominions with a view to securing libetry for any of those Dominions which may so desire to withdraw from the operation of the treaty without impairing the treaty in respect of the rest of the empire.

What objection had my right hon. friend at that time, in view of the high cost of living that prevailed then—and if he had any objection, is it consistent with his course now? —to these thirteen most favoured nations having access to the markets of Canada in the interest of the consumer? His position at the present time, in view of this agitation as to the high cost of living, and in view of the Combines Investigation Bill, introduced as a sovereign remedy by his minister, is not consistent with his position then. It is not consistent that at the present time he should advocate the abolition of duties when at that time he was bending all his energies not only against the abolition of duties but to prevent the most favoured nations from having free entry to the markets of Canada in the interests of the consumer. I just leave my right hon. friend to think it over as to why he did that.

During the process of that campaign an argument was developed that, as far as I know, had never been heard before, in order to catch the city and town vote. It was put forward that under reciprocity the farmer would get more for his products and the city dweller would pay less; that is to say, that a farmer living ten or twelve miles out of Ottawa would receive more for his butter and eggs and that a citizen of Ottawa, buying his butter and eggs, would pay less. That puzzled a great number of people in Canada, but it was put forward as an argument, and I do not see how the Liberal party can refuse to continue to argue that. As the tariff can have absolutely no bearing whatever upon the increased cost of living, one possible explanation of the fiscal policy of my right hon. friend is that he desires to bring the other half of reciprocity into operation. He hopes that by his persistency he may ultimately bring it about that we shall have reciprocity between Canada and the United States. We pointed out in that campaign that the farmer in Canada would retain his home markets, which are his steady and stable markets, and his best markets, and that he would, in the process of time, get access to the markets of the United States. To a large extent that position has been confirmed. The Underwood Tariff Bill does open the market of the United States to a very great number of the products of Canada, and the farmers of Canada at the same time have their home market, which they showed by their votes in 1911 they so much appreciated and valued.

Let us see what a free food policy means. My own view is that free food means free trade. I believe that, carried out to its logical conclusion, it is a reversal of the policy under which, during the time of my right hon. friend and of preceding governments, this country has prospered for the last forty years. I believe that it involves a reversal of that policy. A quotation given by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister last night showed that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition had referred to the protection policy as bondage. Well, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, if it is bondage, I do not believe that the people will consent to be half bond and half free. This Government believes in that reasonable protection where required—believes in a reasonable protection for the industries of Canada in order that her industries may be developed and her home market built up. We believe in protection, and a reasonable pro-

tective policy is one that we feel should include not only the industries of Canada, so called—that is to say, the manufacturing industries—but that it should, in so far as may be necessary, include also the farmers. That has been the policy ever since 1878 and that was the policy in the United States until this year. We are fond of making comparisons between Canada and the United States, but we forget that the United States has has almost a century's start of us, that she has a hundred million of population, that specialized industries have been built up for generations and that it is not fair to compare these two countries as if they were on all fours. Because a certain policy is satisfactory to the United States and suits the people of the United States, it does not necessarily follow that that policy would suit the people of Canada with our population and at our stage of development. I think that very often men with the best of intentions make a mistake in jumping to the conclusion that whatever policy is adopted in the United States is necessarily good for Canada.

Now I come to the end of this discussion as far as I am concerned, as to the increased cost of living. What is the remedy for it? It is perfectly clear that the abolition of customs duties is not the remedy. That is not going to change the trend upward of the cost of living, because, as I pointed out at the beginning of my remarks, this phenomenon is not confined to Canada. We find it in protectionist countries, we find it in free trade countries, we find it on the continent of America, on the continent of Europe, in Great Britain—it is a universal phenomenon. The solution is not in the abolition of customs duties. What is the solution? I pointed out to the House that, according to comparative statistics between this country and New Zealand and Australia, we were not raising sufficient cattle, sheep and swine in Canada. The most practical way to meet this question of the high cost of living—because it is involved with the consideration mentioned by the hon. member for North Oxford more than any other and with the trend cityward—the two are involved together—is to increase the production in Canada. That is the solution of the high cost of living problem—increased production. In Canada for many years we have been in this position that the trend cityward has been such that in the last decade between 1901 and 1911 the urban population increased sixty per cent and rural Canada increased only seventeen per cent, with a decline in Ontario, or a very slight increase—I forget which—I think a decline—and in the Maritime provinces only seventeen per cent of an increase in the rural population and a sixty per cent increase in the urban population at a time when we were getting immigration at the rate of a thousand or twelve hundred a day and at a time when we have large undertakings under construction employing an army of men, all consumers. Yet, we have a declining rural population. What is the remedy? The remedy is unquestionably increased production. That is my view—I am speaking only for myself.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: How are you going to increase it?

Mr. WHITE: We will come to that. The way not to increase it is to disregard the interests of agriculture, as my right hon. friend did from 1896 to 1911. I am going to show precisely what was done. If a fraction of the money that has been spent upon the National Transcontinental between Moncton and Cochrane had been spent for agriculture, I do not believe this question of the high cost of living would have been to the front to-day. There is an overlapping jurisdiction in agriculture between the Dominion and the provinces.

I asked my department to prepare a statement as to the expenditure upon agriculture for the past four or five years, just in order to get a comparison between the two Administrations in the matter of agriculture. What do I find? I have the items here, and I intend to place them upon 'Hansard.' The total expenditure upon agriculture in 1910-11 was $1,192,417.13. In 1911-12 it had risen to $1,489,973.46. In 1912-13, the first year that we were in power, the expenditure had been increased to $2,436,103, and in 1913-14 we spent more than double the amount that was spent in 1910, namely, $2,630,500. That is not by any means all that this Government has done to promote agriculture.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: What has been the result?

Mr. WHITE: Did my hon. friend hear the eloquent address of my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) last night? If not, he missed a treat. My hon. friend from Red Deer said: Give it time for operation. The impatience of my hon. friend surprises me sometimes. A Bill was introduced last session by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell), one of the most important measures, one of the most statesmanlike measures ever introduced into this House, setting aside the sum of $10,000,000, at the rate of $1,000,000

a year for the promotion of agricultural education throughout Canada. I shall be much surprised if that Bill does not produce very substantial results, just as soon as it is possible for it to get into operation, taking agricultural instruction to the farmer, teaching him as to his soils, as to his grains, as to his breeds of cattle. At all events that is a statesmanlike measure. A government that does that is doing something to promote agriculture. Therefore we have expenditures in the Estimates of 1913-14 of $2,630,500; and, notwithstanding the financial stringency, the Estimates of the coming year for agriculture are going to be greater than that. Notwithstanding that increased expenditure, there is $1,000,000 a year set aside for ten years. Whatever money is required by the Minister of Agriculture for the purposes of promoting husbandry throughout Canada, the raising of cattle, the raising of grain, is going to be supplied, so far at all events, as I can supply it. Therefore, in our humble way we have done something to deal with this question of the high cost of living by increasing production in Canada, because I think that is the very gist of the question, to increase production in Canada, to make farm life more agreeable, to make it brighter, to make it more attractive, to counteract the lure of the city and to make it more profitable. Let me ask my right hon. friend this question: how are you going to increase the attractiveness of farming, how are you going to appeal to the farmer's boy to stay on the farm, if you cut down the price of his product? The object of my right hon. friend, as I understand it, by abolishing customs duties upon food, is to cheapen farm products, eggs, butter, cattle, swine, sheep. Is that going to be a sovereign remedy? Will that appeal to the farmer if he gets less for his products? Will it? I ask that question.

I think that concludes that branch of the subject as to the high cost of living, brought into the discussion of my right hon. friend, and the fiscal policy which he announces as the policy of the Opposition —free food—that is to say, the abolition of all custom duties upon natural products and manufactured products constituting food.

The tariff has been somewhat under discussion in this debate upon the Address, although I entirely agree with my hon. friend from Red Deer, who fairly observes the rules of this House—in fact, who is somewhat of a stickler for the observance of its rules—that this is not a Budget occasion, and consequently it is not the time, properly speaking, to discuss questions of the tariff. I am not suggesting for a moment that it is not in order, because any question can be discussed in connection with the debate upon the Address, either on the ground that it is not in the Speech from the Throne, or that it ought to be in the Speech from the Throne. While that is acknowledged, it is a fact that the proper time for a debate upon the tariff is when the Budget is brought down. My hon. friend from Red Deer is a consistent free trader, with one notable exception of backsliding, to which I shall not refer again; because I can imagine that he might be sensitive about it. After all, one fall after a long consistent course of adherence to conviction should not be imputed too harshly to a man.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM: Speaking personally?

Mr. WHITE: Well, I am always willing to apply a rule to myself, but when I supported my right hon. friend he was a good protectionist. My hon. friend from Red Deer eulogizes and I join in the eulogy, Woodrow Wilson, the President of the United States as a great man. I join sincerely in that tribute to President Wilson. It gives me great pleasure to associate myself in the admiration of my hon. friend from Red Deer for the great head of our neighbouring republic. I have so expressed myself upon previous occasions. My hon. friend from Red Deer is nothing if not vigorous, and he told us last night in the most picturesque and forceful language how President Wilson has taken the American protective system and torn it up by the roots and scattered it to the four winds of heaven. Those were his words.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I am sure my hon. friend will allow me. My recollection is that I said he had taken protectionist heresies, not the system. It would take time to take the system.

Mr. WHITE: I do not quite see how it is possible to separate the heresies from the system. I do not believe my hon. friend quite realizes what is involved in that statement. President Woodrow Wilson is the President who has brought about the revision of the American tariff under the terms of the Underwood Bill. And, in order that

my hon. friend may see just how far he has 'torn up' either the protectionist system or the protectionist heresies, I want to point out to him that the rate of duties upon dutiable articles in Canada at the present time is under 26 per cent, and I will read to the House what Mr. Underwood, who introduced this Bill, said with regard to its effect upon the tariff of the United States. That will enable the House to see how far he has 'torn up' the whole fabric of protection—although my hon. friend from Red Deer did not use that term. This is from the Congressional Record of September last:

> With few exceptions the House agreed to the Senate reductions. The Senate receded on about one-half of the raises that it made in the Bill, with the result that the Bill as it is now presented to the House, as ascertained by the calculations made by the experts, will reach an average of about 26 per cent—almost as low as the famous Walker Bill, which carried a low tax on liquor and tobacco—and the tax on liquor and tobacco raises the average of this Bill very much.

I see an estimate in the London Times as to the average rate upon dutiable goods entering the United States under the new tariff, and that estimate was that it was 29 per cent—three points higher than the figure named by the parent of the Underwood Bill. The point I desire to make is that my hon. friend from Red Deer is filled with admiration for the President of the United States for tearing up these protectionist heresies because he has brought about a situation in the United States under which their tariff is higher than that of Canada to-day, and yet the hon. gentleman is opposed to the tariff of Canada because it is a protectionist tariff. That seems to me to be a reductio ad absurdum.

9 p.m.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: What are the respective tariffs of the two countries on agricultural implements?

Mr. WHITE: At present agricultural implement in Canada—that is, the principal agricultural implements such as binders, reapers, mowers and harvesters—pay 17½ per cent. Under the reciprocity agreement negotiated by my predecessor this duty would have been reduced to 15 per cent to remain there practically for all time.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: What is the tariff in the United States?

Mr. WHITE: I think these articles are free.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Absolutely free.

[Mr. W. T. White].

Mr. WHITE: My hon. friend will correct me if I am wrong. I try to carry as many of these matters in my head as I can, but I cannot carry them all.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: That abolition of duty means something 'torn up.'

Mr. WHITE: The point I am making is that while my hon. friend from Red Deer is continually attacking our tariff, the tariff of the United States to-day, with the changes made to which he has referred, has a higher average of duty on dutiable commodities than has the tariff of Canada. I deal with the tariff as a whole because the hon. gentleman was dealing with it in that way and not with any particular duty. Mr. Underwood goes on:

> To all intents and purposes, the Bill that is now presented to the House for its consideration provides an average of lower taxation than any Bill that has been presented in three-quarters of a century.

It follows, then, that the tariff of Canada which my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) is advising us to revise—and in a year like this of all years—is lower than any tariff in the United States for three-quarters of a century. Yet my hon. friend from Red Deer tells us to look to the United States. Mr. Underwood proceeds:

> The Wilson Bill carried an average rate of duty of 39.95 per cent. The Payne Bill carries an average rate of duty of 40.12 per cent, as compared with about 26 per cent that this Bill will carry.

My hon. friend has asked the Government to make an announcement as to certain matters brought to their attention by a delegation of farmers. There has been in Canada, I believe, ever since Conderation and earlier, what I regard as a sound practice, namely, that announcements respecting the tariff are made only to Parliament, on the floor of Parliament and in the Budget speech. Personally, I have jealously guarded that rule. I consider it an eminently sound practice. I do not propose, and the Government does not propose, to depart from that rule, that custom, that sound practice. Whatever announcements the Government has to make respecting the tariff will not be made on ill-timed, unexpected occasions, but will be made in due course, at the proper time and in the Budget speech, and in the proper place, upon the floor of Parliament.

My right hon. leader (Mr. Borden) has called my attention to the language of

my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) in connection with this matter. He said:

I see the hon. member for York (Mr. McLeod) still gets lessons from that great counrty, because he quoted it in one particular in his speech to-night. Well, I looked to the great country to the south and I kept on looking, and now I turn to my hon. friends opposite and I say: Look at the great country to the south and what do you see? We see a great, simple and sincere man coming into office and cutting up protection and tearing its economic fallacies and false arguments into shreds and casting them to the four winds of heaven.

Notice the vigor and enthusiasm of that utterance.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: That is what I said—'fallacies and false arguments.'

Mr. WHITE: Scripta manet. Having read the words of my hon. friend from Red Deer, I do not see any reason to change the view I expressed as to his utterance, unless he meant what he said about 'cutting up' protection to be taken in a merely figurative sense. I supposed that by 'cutting up' he meant making mincemeat of protection.

I fear that I have engaged the attention of the House for too long a time on this occasion; and I am very grateful to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House for the close attention they have given me. I desire briefly to go over the heads of the subjects upon which I have touched. I referred to the naval question, and in this connection I want to ask my hon. friends opposite one question. In the speech of my right hon. friend I did not hear very much with regard to these two splendid battle units, one on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific, which were to be the immediate programme of hon. gentlemen opposite. I have not heard anything about the expenditure of $50,000,000 that would be required, $25,000,000 for each fleet, or the annual upkeep of $6,000,000, representing four per cent interest on $150,000,000. Perhaps the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) when dealing with this matter will tell us whether that is his programme at the present time. Will hon. gentlemen opposite engage in this expenditure, to say nothing of the enormous expense that would be involved in establishing armament manufactories in Canada in order that the ships composing those units may be constructed wholly in Canada, afterwards to be manned and operated by Canadians?

In so far as the attack upon our expenditure is concerned. I contend that, as compared with the record of hon. gentlemen opposite, this Government has been a prudent and economic government; that we have conserved the revenues of the Dominion, and that our surplus revenues have really been used to repair the mistakes made by our predecessors in office. In the fiscal years 1911-1912 our revenues were $168,000,000 and our expenses were kept within the moderate bounds of $143,000,000, giving a surplus over current, capital and special expenditure of $25,000,000. We used that $25,000,000, as I have said, for the purpose of repairing the blunder made by hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with the giving of the guarantee to the Grand Trunk Pacific. And yet hon. gentlemen opposite have the temerity to attack this Government for retrieving the errors which they themselves made, and for avoiding the loss of money and national credit which might have resulted from those mistakes. Considering the fact that we have devoted the greater portion of our expenditure to the completion of enterprises promoted and inaugurated by hon. gentlemen opposite, I must say that their attitude is something like the unnatural parent denouncing the benefactor of his children. Any unusual financing we have done this year is not due to any programme initiated by this Government; it is but the aftermath of my right hon. friend's financial methods during his term of office, resulting in the expenditure of $22,000,000 with $10,000,000 more to come, to pay for the three per cent bonds guaranteed by the Government of Canada to the Grand Trunk Pacific. I hope therefore, that we shall hear no more about this question of lavish expenditure since we have taken office.

With regard to the cost of living, as I have said, the best remedy is to increase production, and we intend to do what we can, by the promotion of agriculture, to accomplish that most desirable end. The new fiscal policy of my right hon. friend is simply a re-incarnation of reciprocity, which was pronounced against by the people of this country in 1911. As to the tariff, I have this to say to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). From time to time there are, of course, changing conditions which have to be met, but to consider as he suggests, a revision of the tariff downward in a year such as this—a year of slackening trade—and after such a period of financial stringency as that through which we have passed, would be to dislocate the industries of this country. So far as I know, there is no public opinion in

favour of a revision of tariff at this particular time. As I said in the beginning of my speech, we have gone through a very trying period; a long continued and severe depression. But the light is now beginning to break; money is easier in the international centres, and that is the most hopeful sign to-day. Last fall was a good season for ploughing in Canada, and, with the promise of a favourable crop in the spring and the easing off of the money situation, this country should soon resume its wonted prosperity. No doubt we should go ahead cautiously for a time; it is very proper that we should, but the people of Canada should proceed also with confidence, and hon. gentlemen opposite should not, I think, discourage that confidence.

With regard to government expenditure, this Government has vast enterprises in hand, most of them inaugurated by our predecessors. We propose to carry out these public works; we propose to complete the great works to which we have committed ourselves. Extravagance is always to be deprecated, and I will never stand up in this House and defend the spending of money simply for the sake of spending it. That is unsound; on the other hand a policy of parsimony or timidity is more unsound. The middle course is the sound and sensible policy from the standpoint of private or national finance, and that is the course we propose to pursue.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): In attempting to offer some remarks to the House in this debate, I hope that my hon. friend the Finance Minister will not understand me as accepting on behalf of hon. gentlemen on this side the somewhat lengthy apology he has given for the position of the Government and its inaction in regard to the crisis which exists throughout the country. I was particularly interested in the remarks which my hon. friend had to offer on what at one moment he was pleased to call the new policy, and what at other moments he was pleased to designate as the old policy of the leader of the Opposition. I will not spend further time in criticising that part of my hon. friend's remarks, except to say that, carefully following them, it seemed to me that the latter half completely answered the first. Whereas he declared specifically in the beginning of his remarks that certain industries to the extent of hundreds of millions of capital and thousands of people would be in danger if the policy enunciated by the leader of the Opposition were adopted, in the latter half of his remarks he was at great trouble to prove that by no possible change in the tariff could the cost of living be reduced.

The remarks of my hon. friend followed very closely the lines laid down in the Speech from the Throne, as well as in the addresses delivered in support of the position of the Government as there set out. This, I believe, is the first occasion in the history of the Canadian Parliament on which the Government has met Parliament with what can only be described as a purely ostrich policy. They have dropped, or forgotten, or ignored their policy regarding highways which at last session was one way of saving the country; they have ignored and dropped their policy regarding extensions of the Intercolonial railway; have they ignored and dropped that great policy that was not only to save the country but also the empire, the naval question? And, Mr. Speaker, although they have relieved their minds of these important questions, in all the broad expanse of this Dominion of Canada, in its three thousand miles from ocean to ocean, with its seven millions of people and its rapidly growing interests, they have not found anything that requires the attention of Parliament at this session of sufficient importance to be mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, with the one exception alluded to by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), legislation that is automatically required by the British North America Act.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: And even with regard to that they are late.

Mr. OLIVER: May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the attitude of the Government in the two previous sessions was that of the ostrich that runs around in a circle, but this session it is that of the ostrich which, having found no result from the circling process, sticks its head in the sand and thereby hopes to protect itself and to deceive its enemies. May I be pardoned if I suggest that the position is not graceful; it is not creditable, and it is decidedly vulnerable?

I think, Mr. Speaker, that our friends are under a misapprehension as to their responsibilities and as to the conditions in this case. I observe that so far from giving any intimation to the country that they have any views or intentions with regard to legislation, they have so far confined their allusions to expressions as to the policy of the party of the Opposition and of their honored leader. Far be it from me to in any way minimize the importance of these views and expressions by the leader of the Opposition and his followers in the House, but let me sug-

gest that the questions at issue before this country are to be decided by the Government on its responsibility and not on the views or opinions of the members of the Opposition, or even of the great leader of the Opposition. And may I suggest further that these gentlemen cannot escape from their responsibility, nor can this House afford the time to discuss or consider opinions that may have been expressed years ago; actions that were taken years ago; opinions that were proper and well supported at that time; actions that were taken for good reason and with sufficient results at that time. The fact of these actions and these reasons having been taken has no necessary bearing on present conditions. My hon. friends opposite in their attitude as expressed this session, bring to my mind the criticism of that great royal Bourbon family, of whom it was said: they never forgot anything and never learned anything. But our friends of the Government have gone the Bourbons one better, for judging by their policy as expressed in the Speech from the Throne, they have forgotten everything, and judging of it as expressed in the speeches of their supporters delivered in this House, they do not seem to have learned anything.

I may be permitted to deal at some length with the situation of the country as it is and with the duties and responsibilities of the Government in connection with that situation. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance have an easy way of dealing with it. They say: True, the times are hard; the times have been hard before and possibly will be hard again; what is that to us; why in 1907 times were hard and the then Government met Parliament with a paragraph in the Speech from the Throne parallel to the announcement which is inserted in the present speech. That is their idea of the fulfillment of their whole duty in a great national crisis. But let me remind them that the paragraph they have been good enough to quote from the speech of 1907 did not state that action had been taken by the Government of that day to meet what was on their showing a crisis parallel to that with which we are face to face to-day. My hon. friend knows well that on the occasion of the depression of 1907 this Government did take such action to meet the conditions then existing; that when Parliament afterwards met they were criticised by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in words to the effect that they might as well have taken crowbars and gone down to the treasury vaults as take the action they did. While gentlemen opposite say: Yes, times are hard, they were hard before and will be hard again, and we have nothing to do with it, the late Government took drastic action, action which was I believe outside the law, in order to meet the conditions, and they did meet them. And that was one reason why the country recovered as rapidly as it did on that occasion. I ask my hon. friends, charged with the direction of the public affairs of this country as they are, what warrant have they for presuming that matters will improve if they will only leave them alone? I am not prepared to say but that their judgment may be right in this particular instance, but I do say that they have no right to assume that that is the case. Nor have they any right to assume that they are doing their full duty that being the case. I would ask my hon. friends, to what end does Parliament meet, for what purpose is the Government in office, if it is not to meet from day to day conditions as they arise, so that the people of this country will be benefited. If the Government has not that authority, if Parliament has not that responsibility, I ask, to what end are we here? Is the Government and Parliament a body whose sole duty is to levy taxes and to spend money? If that is my hon. friend's idea of the sole duty of Parilament, I take issue with him here and now, and so I think the country will.

I was struck by the stress that my hon. friend laid on the amount of money that was being spent in aid of agriculture, and particularly in agricultural education, by this Government as compared with expenditures by the previous Government. He brought out strongly the difference in the amounts spent, but I think it was when he made his claims as to the result of the expenditures by his Government that he excelled himself. We are to have a reduction in the cost of living without a reduction in the tariff. We are going to have a result that will mean many many millions of dollars to the people of this country by means of this expenditure. My hon. friends are spending about a million dollars a year more than their predecessors did in aid of agriculture. It is peculiar that our hon. friends who are so generous to agriculture, who expect such magnificent results from that generosity, should have up to date specifically refused, so far as the records show, every request that has been made by the author-

ized voice of agriculture in this country. I have here a report of a delegation which visited Ottawa recently. It comprised representatives from the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association, the United Farmers of Alberta, and the Ontario Grange. They met members of the Government, including the Premier, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Public Works, the Postmaster General, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of the Interior and the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), to whom they stated their views and desires. May I point out that one of their specific requests read as follows:

> We ask that all foodstuffs be placed on the free list, as we believe that the taxing of food is a crime against humanity.

Hon. J. D. REID: What did the other deputation of farmers say on the same day?

Mr. OLIVER: I was speaking of the organized farmers of the four great agricultural provinces. I say their demands expressed in formal manner lead me to believe what the farmers believe rather than the Finance Minister or the other gentlemen who heard the farmers. I am one of those who believe that the farmers speaking by and large generally know their own business and know what they want.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Did the organized farmers ever come to the late Government?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Did they get what they asked for? I will endeavour to show before this debate is over that they did not.

Mr. OLIVER: We will be glad to hear from my hon. friend, but I do not know how he can fail to remember that something like one thousand came here. They made certain demands and the Government of that day acceded to those demands, but my hon. friend and his friends were able ultimately to defeat the Government because of those demands. Notwithstanding that fact, we still believe that the farmers knew what they wanted and, speaking for myself, I believe they wanted what was their right, and am prepared to stand behind that principle, win or lose.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: When you are in opposition.

Mr. OLIVER: I think perhaps I could not do better than to place before the House and on the record some statements made by this delegation to the members of the Government, as they bear very strongly on this question of the high cost of living. They say in their memorial:

> In four years previous to January, 1913, fifty-six industrial mergers were negotiated, with an aggregate authorized capitalization of $456,938,-266. The fifty-six amalgamations absorbed 248 individual companies. The aggregate capitalization of 206 of these individual companies was approximately $167,289,182, indicating that, whereas the people of Canada had to provide dividends on $167,000,000, they have now to provide dividends on three times that amount. This enormous increase in capitalization is almost wholly made up of common stock, which admittedly represents very little real investment, being simply protection capitalized. A few outstanding illustrations are: The Canada Cement Company, Montreal, capitalized at $38,-000,000, absorbed eleven companies with a total capital of $17,750,000; Ames-Holden & McCready, boots and shoes, capitalized at $11,-500,000, absorbed two campanies, capital $3,-500,000; Canada Cereal and Malting Company, capitalized at $3,250,000, absorbed eight companies with $809,000 capital; Dominion Canners, Hamilton, capitalized at $12,500,000, absorbed forty-five individual companies whose capital was given as $1,324,000. The total capitalization of manufacturers for the Dominion of Canada, according to the census returns, increased from $446,916,487 in 1901 to $1,247,-589,609 in 1911; the ascertained surplus after deducting cost of raw material, wages, power, &c., from the gross revenues, showed an increase of net earnings on capitalization from 19.82 per cent in 1901 to 25 per cent in 1911.

I noted in the remarks, I think, of both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, that they could not understand how the farmer could receive a higher price and the consumer pay a lower price; but the farmers in this memorial throw some light on this subject. They say:

> The average price paid farmers for tomatoes last year at Ontario factories was 30 cents per bushel. In some cases the price ran as low as 27½ cents. It is stated that a bushel of these tomatoes will, under ordinary conditions, fill ten cans, the price of which to the consumer in western Canada is 20 cents per can.

I will place it before you if there is not ample room for an increase in the price for the producer and a decrease in the cost to the consumer. It is a puzzle for the Government to work out to show that the spread between the price received by the producer and the price paid by the consumer is not an inordinate one and does not represent extortion upon either the producer or the consumer. That is their business, Mr. Speaker. To follow on:

> That is to say, what the Ontario farmer gets 3 cents for (the Manitoba farmer pays 20 cents for. The manufacturers' census of 1911 shows the surplus earnings of canning factories of

fruit and vegetables to be equal to 50 per cent. of the capital employed in the business. At the annual meeting of the Dominion Canners, Limited, in December last, it was given out that the net earnings of the company, after paying all fixed charges were 12 per cent on the common stock, which is supposed to represent nothing but water, and was selling on the stock exchange at 86.

Protection is intended to increase the cost of goods in the interest of the home manufacturer. It may be safely assumed that he will add the full amount of his protection to the selling price of his goods. Now the census and trade returns show in 1911 that for every dollar's worth of dutiable goods we imported, we manufactured $4 worth, consequently for every dollar we paid to the Government for revenue we paid four to the manufacturer.

I do not intend to traverse at any great length the question as to the condition of the country as it is; but I think it is no harm to bring in the evidence of authorities that no one in the House or the country can dispute, for the purpose of showing that the Government of Canada have a responsibility and that the country calls upon them to discharge that responsibility. In the Ottawa Citizen, which is generally supposed to be a supporter of the Government of the day, and is published near enough to these halls to have a knowledge of the facts, I read as follows:

Unemployed in Canada.

Reports come from practically every center of population in Canada of large numbers of unemployed who are feeling the pinch of poverty. In the cities of the West there has been industrial distress for several months. The number of unemployed has been greatly in excess of the number to be expected by reason of the end of the demand for seasonal labour in the prairie provinces, and the consequent unemployment of the men so engaged. In British Columbia the same conditions have existed. In Regina, Sask., the situation is such that the police find it difficult to maintain order, it being feared for a time that martial law might have to be declared. That ominous institution, the soup kitchen, has made its appearance in this young and prosperous country. In Montreal hundreds of men stood in line at midnight to receive coffee and bread. In Toronto it is estimated that there are at present 15,000 men out of work, with the number on the increase.

In to-day's Ottawa Free Press, published here in the Capital city, I read the following:

Toronto Wants Work Started—Thirty Million Dollars Worth There to Help the City's Unemployed.

Toronto has adopted the plan resorted to in India in times of famine and has asked the Government for relief works. There are plans and appropriations for ten million dollars harbour improvements, for a new customs house, a new post office and the railways have plans for a new union station.

Altogether there is about thirty million dollars' worth of work in sight. Some has not been started and what has been commenced is being proceeded with in a leisurely fashion.

To-day—

To-day, when the Minister of Finance took his place in this House and tried to make Canada believe that he did not know what the conditions were, or that the conditions are as they are—

To-day Mayor Hocken, Controller Church and Controller Simpson waited upon Hon. Robert Rogers, Hon. J. D. Reid and Hon. L. P. Pelletier, and asked that operations be started full blast upon all of these works to provide relief for the army of unemployed in Toronto.

Hon. J. D. REID: The Free Press is not stating the truth; I was not there at all and never heard of it until I saw the Free Press.

Mr. OLIVER (reading):

They also waited upon Chairman Drayton of the Railway Commission and asked him to make a peremptory order directing the railways immediately to begin work upon the union depot.

A sympathetic hearing was given the requests and it is understood that strong efforts will be made to meet the situation disclosed by the Toronto representatives.

The Minister of Finance read from the Labour Gazette of 1907 as to the conditions then. Would it be any harm to read from the Labour Gazette of December, 1913, as to conditions now?

Victoria.—Labour conditions were dull, not so good as during October, and much worse than the same month a year ago.

Nanaimo.—The labour situation shows very little change from last month, the city and district being full of idle men owing to the strike in the coal mines causing a general slackness in all branches of business.

Vancouver.—Industrial activity was less than it was at this time last year. Large numbers of unemployed men were walking the streets, and so serious is the situation that at a special meeting of the city council, held on November 21, a sum of money was voted for the purpose of opening up relief work for married men at $2.00 a day.

Lethbridge.—There was no improvement in labour conditions over last month. Farm help was not in demand. The city has been extending sewer and water connections, giving work to a number of men who otherwise would be idle. The building trades were dull. Work in the railroad yard is still being pushed ahead. Coal mining was very active, giving work to increasing number of men. All other branches of employment were dull.

And so on, practically all along the line.

I think, in view of all these quotations, it will not be argued that there is not a condition that requires the attention of the Government, if the Government has any purpose or business as such. If they are

to take the position, as they have so far taken it, that they have no responsibility; that it is only their business to levy the taxes and spend the money as they please, and wait for things to right themselves, it is desirable that that point should be nailed in the public mind, and that they should stand before the country of Canada as a Government in office and in power, not only unable, not only unwilling, but absolutely unknowing as to the conditions that require their attention.

Admitting that there are conditions that require attention, may I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to bring before the House some information and views of my own as to how and why that condition exists, with a view of directing attention to the means necessary to secure its removal. My hon. friend has said, and has repeated and repeated that conditions in Canada are only as they are elsewhere throughout the world; that conditions are only as they were in 1907. What were the conditions in 1907? Everybody knows that the conditions in Canada were immediately, directly and unquestionably due to a condition of financial panic in the United States, such as that country had seldom seen, such as seldom occurred before and such as never has occurred since, and certainly such as does not exist now. At that time Canada had suffered from serious failure in production. We had had a terribly severe winter in the West that wiped out possibly half of the range cattle, thus cutting off several million dollars in the winter of 1907-8. The summer was unfavourable. The harvest was late. The crop was damaged. Conditions were unfavourable in Canada; but still it was the panic in the United States that caused the financial stringency and made the difficulty that had to be coped with upon that occasion. To-day, as has been said and as has been repeated, Canada has harvested the largest crop that she has ever harvested. She has harvested it under the most favourable conditions; she has marketed it under the most favourable conditions, except as to price. There is no panic in the United States. Conditions of finance and labour in the United States to-day are better than they are in Canada. In Great Britain conditions not only are good but are magnificently good, both in regard to labour and finance. Canada is the country to-day that stands by herself as the country of depression, in the face of the most magnificent crop it ever harvested. In 1907, in the face of a bad winter, in the face of a bad summer, Canada still stood as the best of the countries within our immediate range, as far as finances were concerned. There is no comparison between the conditions in 1907 and the conditions of to-day.

Just as the conditions of 1907 had a cause, which was the panic in the United States, so the conditions of to-day have a cause, and the conditions of to-day call for a remedy. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) repeated and repeated that the cure for the present condition, for the high cost of living, for the financial stringency, was increased production, more people on the land, and more production from the land. There is no doubt that is the cure; but my hon. friend did not give us any indication as to how he was going to apply the cure, and he did not even hold out the idea that he was in any way responsible for its application. Let me point out how the disease has come about, as I understand it. Enough has been said to demonstrate beyond question that, when all the great financiers, all the great industrial institutions and all the great transportation organizations are set on one side, the source of the wealth of Canada is the land; and the progress of its wealth is absolutely dependent upon the progress of the cultivation of the land, which again is contained in the agricultural development of the prairie provinces. If we have had increasing prosperity in Canada, we have had it because there has been increasing production in our prairie west.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance almost shed tears over the fact that the late Government had practically ignored the agricultural industry. Does my hon. friend know that under the late Government, if I may quote from the material which was presented to himself, amongst others, by the delegates from the western provinces and Ontario, the acreage under crop in the three western provinces in the year 1901 was about 2,500,000 acres, and in 1911 it was over 17,000,000 acres? This agriculture that the late Government did not encourage increased seven-fold during ten years under the administration of the late Government. I ask my hon. friend, has he any hope or prospect that it will increase seven-fold under his administration, with the aid even of his $1,000,000 a year for agricultural education? It was that increase in cultivation in the West that made Canada; that built the railroads, that started the factories, that gave dividends to the banks; that created the great commercial houses; that did whatever has been done that amounted to any-

thing in those years. It was the foundation of it all. The homesteader on the prairie with his yoke of oxen or his team of horses and his plough, who has been held up to obloquy as the miner of wheat, who has been advised by my hon. friend to go into mixed farming in order to save the country, this was the man who made Canada. What treatment has he had at the hands of my hon. friend and his friends since they came into office? They will educate him. Yes. But he needs something more than education. I would like to say to my hon. friend that the western farmer is fairly well educated in what constitutes his own business. The fact that he has done what he has done is all the evidence that is necessary upon that point.

Let me call the attention of the House back to the year 1911, the year when my hon. friend took office. There were unfortunate weather conditions at that time. There was a damaged crop. There was a grain blockade. I had the honour to bring to the attention of the House facts and figures, which were not denied in any degree, showing that the direct loss to the wheat farmers of the prairie west that year, because of the grain blockade then existing, which did not need to exist, which should not have existed, and which would not have existed if this Government had taken proper action, was not less than $10,000,000 in cold cash.

10 p.m.

In the year 1912 there was another occasion of unfavourable harvesting conditions, another year of late forwarding of the crop, another year of partial grain blockade. I shall not trouble the House with figures; but, if my memory serves me right, while in the year 1911 the condition became so bad and the facts were impressed so strongly upon the attention of the Government, that they did finally take certain action, in the year 1912, as far as I recall, the grain blockade existed without any relief at the hands of the Government of the day.

The farmer of the West does not raise wheat for fun or for the sake of its appearance. He raises it to sell, and upon the price that he gets for that wheat depends the possibility of his continuing in business. If he makes a profit, he stays in business, let the profit be never so small. If he does not make a profit, what happens to the banker or the manufacturer or the merchant, happens to the farmer; the sheriff gets him; he goes out of business. One of the factors affecting the price of wheat to the farmer is the cost of transportation. The distance from the wheat field to the ultimate market is stupendous. Toll is taken at every point, by the receiving elevator, the railroad, the terminal elevator, the steam-boat over the lakes, the receiving elevator again, the railroad, the ocean elevator, the ocean vessel, and again the ocean elevator.

We have been told at great length in this House about the steamship combine on the Atlantic ocean and how that has unduly increased the rates of freight upon the western farmers' wheat, causing the depression in prices. There is no doubt that combine has taken place. There is no doubt that fact has materially affected and limited the profit of the farmer in the West. Ocean transportation is not within the jurisdiction of this House. It is a magnificent subject for declamation, and speeches made on that subject look well on 'Hansard,' but they do not mean anything. They do not get anywhere; they do not take anything off the rates of transportation, and they do not add anything to the price of the farmers' wheat. But there is a link in that line of transportation which is within the jurisdiction of this Government and Parliament of Canada, that link which extends from Fort William at the head of Lake Superior to such port at the foot of Georgian bay or other lake ports as may occur. This is a link of transportation that is within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, and what has taken place on the ocean has taken place on the lakes. A lake merger has been formed and the rate of freight across the lakes has cost the farmer from one to two or even three cents a bushel during this and the previous year. What have our friends on the other side done in that regard? Everybody will remember that last session a Bill was before the House to make provision for an increased capitalization for the express purpose of giving that merger firmer control of the situation, and facts advertised in the newspapers, stated the reason for the forming of the merger as being for the purpose of levying toll upon the transportation of wheat. When the question was brought to the attention of the Government, they were asked to take action. Votes were taken upon it in this House and what was the answer? They have money to spend for the education of the farmer, but they have no attention to give to secure for him a fair price for his product, or to protect

him against the rapacity and extortion of mergers and combines. We have this year 150,000,000 bushels of wheat marketed up to this time. The price of every bushel that is actually marketed is based upon the export price. That is to say, the price of every bushel of that 150,000,000 bushels has been subjected to a reduction by the amount of the extortion of the lake merger, an average of two cents a bushel, as I am credibly informed. That means that there has been taken out of the farmers' pockets this year, out of the pockets of the raisers of wheat, in a winter when the price is abnormally low, $3,000,000 with the knowledge and consent and assistance of this Government and their majority in Parliament. And they are going to save the country by the amount of education they propose to give the farmers. They are teaching the farmer a good many things he did not know a few years ago, but I think that the farmer will teach them something when the next opportunity occurs.

I have told the House that the farmers of the West lost $10,000,000 on the crop of 1911. I have not given the figures for the crop of 1912, but I have given $3,000,000 with regard to the crop of 1913. What is the result? The result is that while the farmer some years ago was farming at a profit; while farming was increasing from year to year, it having increased from two and a half to seventeen million acres in ten years, it has practically been at a standstill during these three years. The increase of production which was the gold mine of Canada has not occurred in those years, and for that reason. Immigration into Canada has increased, but homestead entries have decreased; there were 10,000 less entries in the year ended March 31, 1913, than there were in the year ended March 31, 1911. This is how my hon. friends opposite have been pushing people on to the land; this is how they have been encouraging increased cultivation and helping to bring down the cost of living.

I have read from the memorial of the farmers' delegation a quotation showing the burden that has been placed upon the whole of the consumers of this country, and upon the farmer more than any other, by the capitalization of protection and the formation of mergers. I have mentioned the canners' combine, which increased to the consumers of the West the cost of the product of that combine, a necessary of life in that country, by seventy per cent.

Again we are told that the farmers need education; what I say is that the farmer needs a living chance; he needs a fair opportunity, and it is for this Government to meet conditions as they arise and to give the farmer the opportunity to which he is entitled, and of which if he gets it, he will take full advantage for the good of himself and the good of the country.

But what has that to do with the conditions of finance and labour in Canada as a whole? I said in the beginning, and I say again, that as the increase of cultivation in the West was the gold mine upon which the increase of Canada's prosperity was built in the last ten years, so when that gold mine ceases to increase in production, will the prosperity built upon it cease to increase in corresponding degree. If the farmers in the West do not make a profit, they cannot buy the products of the factories of the East. If there are factories closed up in the province of Ontario to-day—and there are; if there are others running on half time and on reduced wages—and there are; if collections are difficult and money is tight, it is in a large measure because the farmers of the western prairie have not been dealt with fairly or justly by this Government since it came into office. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say 'this does not concern us.' I say it does concern them. When there is a lack of employment, when there is a lack of business, it is for the Government to search out the cause and apply the remedy. I give them in a large measure the cause; I give them the remedy. Give us favourable conditions in the West in regard to transportation, in regard to the tariff and in regard to land conditions generally, and we will give you increased cultivation; we will give you increased production; we will give you increased prosperity. But we cannot make bricks without straw. If you tie our hands; if you burden our backs; if we must pay excessive tolls to the railway companies, the steamship companies, the canners' combine, and every kind, shape and form of business interest that can claim the protection of this Government, then you cannot get favourable results. The result will be that you must face the same condition that faced this country during the unfortunate period when the predecessors of the late Government were in office, when the same policy as the one which my hon. friend has vaunted here to-night was the policy of the Government, and when the country wound up in the same condition as that

towards which it is rapidly going to-day.

My hon. friend says we cannot change the tariff in an era of hard times. I ask him when should we change the tariff, if not during a period of hard times? Why are times hard? Because—I am speaking now to the Minister of Finance—because people spend more than they have; because they need to get more money and to spend less. Then surely it is obvious, even to a minister of finance, that to give the benefit of wider markets to the great productive interests of the country and to lessen the taxation paid by the whole people would surely be a measurable remedy for the shortage of money. But my hon. friend says no. He says that at this time we cannot do anything; we must wait until, I suppose, times get better. I take my hon. friend at his word; he has declared the policy of his Government, and I desire to register my strongest opposition to him.

I have a clipping here which I wish to place before the House, following up the idea that the burdens which are carried by the western farmer and by the whole of the consumers of this country are unreasonable, that they have tended to bring about the present condition, and that they call for remedy at the hands of the Government. It will be said that the late Government did not apply any remedy. That is true. There were many things that the late Government did not do. If that Government had done everything that ought to have been done, there would be no need for this Parliament. I quote from the Canadian Grocer of Nov. 29, 1912:

> There are many staple lines of groceries that no one except a legitimate retailer can purchase,—

This was in 1912, it will be noted. That was not under the late Government; this is an announcement made while hon. gentlemen opposite were in office.

> —and they must also be bought from legitimate wholesale groceries at prices set by the manufacturer. These include well-known brands of sugar, cereals, syrups, canned goods, soups, etc.

That is to say, the ordinary necessaries of life, articles of food and of the greatest utility, we are buying in an absolutely restricted market and at prices fixed, not by the law of supply and demand, but by the avarice of those who control that market.

My hon. friend says that the tariff would not make any difference. Well, as I have said, he answered that theory himself so well that it would be out of place for me to spend any time upon it. I do not know that the tariff would make all the difference, but I do submit—and it is a well-known fact—that it is the foundation upon which the combines build their arrangements, and the taking away of the tariff would be the first step, and the most necessary step, towards breaking the combines. My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) reminds me that I am beating the air in making this argument to the House. I call upon my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who has already proved absolutely, not by words but by acts, the truth of my argument. He did this when he took off half the duty on cement. Why did he do that? Because there was a combine. He then believed that the reduction of the duty would have a beneficial effect in favour of the consumers of cement. And he was right; the place where he was wrong was when he put the duty back.

On the question of the high cost of living and the advice of my hon. friend that we all go out and raise steers, let me give the House some information from a point of view that I have not gathered from the newspaper criticisms of the situation that I have seen. There seems to be a general idea running through the newspaper comments that beef is scarce because prices are high. Now beef is scarce because the price a few years ago was so low. The arrangements as to marketing beef in Canada were such that the price was forced down to the lowest possible margin, and hundreds of people went out of keeping cattle because the keeping of cattle did not pay. The increase in the price of beef will mean an increase in the quantity of beef in due course; and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance if he will only not shut our beef out of the American market, can depend upon it that the price that we have received because of our access to that market will insure an adequate supply of beef in due course. In 1908 the average price of beef cattle in Winnipeg was $3.53 per 100 pounds. In 1913, the average price was $6.07 per 100 pounds. The price nearly doubled in that time. And to-day the price in Chicago is $7.50 per 100 pounds. Now I need not labour the argument:—that in the case of the farmer as in the case of every other business man it is the profit on the business that enables him to carry it on; that if he does not make a profit he cannot remain in business; and that when the price of his wheat or his cattle is forced down so that he does not make a profit, he cannot pay his debts, he is forced out of business, and production is

reduced to a corresponding degree. Give the farmer a profit and the farmer will give you the production. If you are not going to let the farmer have a profit; if you are going to back the railroad companies against him, if you are going to back the canners' combine against him, if you are going to back the bank against him, if you are going to back every interest that comes along against him, you are going to put him out of business and you are going to get the results you have got.

That reminds me: At the last session of Parliament we had a revision of the Bank Act. An amendment was inserted to make provision that banks might lend money on wheat. When the Bill was before the House the proposal that banks should be allowed to lend money on cattle was brought to the attention of the Minister of Finance. It was considered advisable that there should be the same privilege in regard to cattle that was given in regard to wheat. Did my hon. friend make this Chamber ring with his assertions as to the desirability of the farmer going into mixed farming, and everybody going out to raise cattle and hogs, and that every assistance that legislation could give would be given? Not at all. He stood in his place and absolutely refused the request made. He kept out of the Bill the provision that would permit the banks to advance money on cattle on a parallel with the advance upon wheat—another instance of the encouragement that my hon. friend gives to the farmer in the prosecution of his business. He is willing to educate the farmer; he is not willing to let him do business in a business way.

I take issue with my hon. friend on his view with regard to the inadvisability of action being taken by the Government at the present time to remedy existing conditions. I say that if ever action was necessary it is now; I say it is demanded at this session of Parliament and without further delay. If we must wait for the Budget, then the Budget should come down; if there is to be any remedy provided by the Budget that remedy should be applied at once. So far as the crop of the past year is concerned, it is out of the farmers' hands now and the price of wheat, as will be seen, is gradually going up. The Finance Minister and his Government could have put into the pockets of the farmers in the West as a part of the price of that crop—and could have put it in the pockets of the farmers of the West by the stroke of a pen—anywhere from $4,000,000 to $8,000,000. That would have been encouragement. All he had to do was to repeal the duty on wheat; what he half did in regard to cement he could have all done in regard to wheat. The difference in prices between Winnipeg and Minneapolis on the same quality of wheat has run anywhere from three cents to six cents a bushel this year; to-day it stands at about six cents. Had the Finance Minister been minded to give the Western farmer the benefit of free access to the Minneapolis market, he could, I am advised, have done it without waiting for Parliament. He did not have to wait for Parliament in the case of the reduction of the cement duties; he did not need to await Parliament to reduce the duty on wheat. And, if he had done so he knew there would be no doubt about his receiving the sanction of Parliament. To-day the farmers of the western country have from $5,000,000 to $8,000,000 less money than they would have had if the Minister of Finance and his colleagues in the Ministry had simply put pen to paper. I ask you, would not that have made some difference in the present financial condition of this country? Would the distribution of that $5,000,000 throughout the prairie West not have saved many a farmer from bankruptcy; would it not have kept many a man in this poor year out of the hands of the sheriff? I say it would. I say it would have helped to keep open the factories of Ontario; it would have helped collections by the banks and commercial houses, and it would have helped every interest in this whole Dominion. But the Minister of Finance has a policy; it is the National Policy, he says, of 1878. He is for high tariff and he won't admit that a change of tariff will make any difference in the cost of living, and I suppose he will not admit that any change in the tariff can make any difference in the price of wheat. His Government will have to stand on that and they will be judged by it. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) told him what had happened in the case of oats, and that because the United States reduced the duty on oats to six cents a bushel we have been able to send many millions of bushels of oats to that country. That saved the situation in regard to oats. We were selling oats at from 16 to 18 cents a bushel. That did not pay the cost of production. The Minister of Finance was raised on a farm and he knows it did not. It was the reduction in the United States duty which enabled us to ship some of our surplus oats to the United States that saved the situation so far as oats is concerned, and even on what we did ship we had to pay the six cents a bushel, because it was not the United States consumer who paid it,

it was the Canadian producer who paid. And yet the Minister of Finance says this is not the time for us to make changes in the tariff, when the prairie farmer will be able to buy his fruit at a price less the amount of the duty; this is not the time to make changes in the tariff or accept the provisions of the reciprocity arrangement and enable the Canadian apple grower to sell in cities of hundreds of thousands, where he is now restricted to cities of tens of thousands? Surely, if ever there was a time to call for energetic action on the part of any government; if ever there was a time that called for action that would reduce the burden upon the people of this country, that time is now. The occasion calls for the Government; it is for them to respond or not. They have had their opportunity; they have declared their policy; there is nothing in sight for this country; the Government is in the hands of the men who put them there to do their bidding and the country may save itself so far as they care.

I do not know that I would be justified in closing without making a reference to a subject that has been mentioned by all of the speakers on the Address up to the present time, namely, the naval question. I do not speak of the naval policy of the Government, because, however they may have a tariff policy, aparently they have no naval policy. I will not delay the House at any great length on this point, but I will say this: the right hon. the Prime Minister, and his colleagues who have spoken, and his supporters, and his press in the country, have been vociferously claiming that their naval policy was actuated by and founded on the principle of Imperial loyalty; the idea of strengthening this great empire which stands for liberty throughout the world. It is strange, it is pasing strange, that conditions have so changed in such a short time that that which only a year ago called for a definite policy and for a vast expenditure, and called so loudly and insistently that it was necessary to deprive this House of its traditional and necessary privileges; it is strange that the same Government comes to this House now and has not a word to say in regard to the policy of naval defence. May I say that, in my humble judgment, if they are to claim credit for a sound imperialism, if they are to claim credit for a patriotic Canadianism, they will have to make some declaration before this session closes in regard to a permanent naval policy; a permanent policy of Canadian naval defence, having regard to Canada's position and Canada's imperial obligations.

These gentlemen have made high claims for themselves. They have gone out of their way to heap discredit upon the position and views of their opponents. They have raked the dictionary for words to express the depth of their loyalty and the urgency with which they were prepared to rush to the rescue of the empire. To-day their desire to rush to the empire's rescue has degenerated into a quarrel with the Upper House of this Parliament; and while a year ago they were declaiming about the sacrifices they were prepared to make in the interests of the empire, to-day they are satisfied with making threats against the Upper Chamber. I need not say that such action on their part is not only improper, it is unparliamentary, and may I suggest that it is even unconstitutional. I submit that it is unheard of, that the motives of the Upper Chamber of this Parliament should be called in question in this House. By what right does the Premier of Canada say that the Upper Chamber, a body co-ordinate with this House, does not act on its own motion and for its own good reasons. I say that such a statement as the Premier made here is improper and to my mind unparliamentary and should not have been made under those conditions. The Senate of Canada has a certain responsibility given it by the Imperial Parliament. Because it has seen fit to discharge this responsibility according to the judgment of a majority of its members it is to be called in question in this House, to be threatened as it was threatened by the Prime Minister. That is not parliamentary government in its proper sense. Everybody knows that a threat made against the Senate is an absurdity. There are no means whereby that threat can be carried out, even with the high authority of the leader of this Government. Our constitution comes from the Imperial Parliament and it is only there that our constitution can be revised. If there is to be a question before the Canadian people as to the right or wrong of the Senate, then I say it is for the Government, if they have a policy that they believe in, and that the Senate does not believe in, to get their views before the country by bringing forward that policy just as often as they have an opportunity. If they had believed that they were right and that the Senate was wrong they would have done it and they would have had their Highways Bill, their Branch Lines

Bill and the Naval Bill before the House at this session. But they knew they were wrong and that the Senate was right, and they did not dare to come before the court of public opinion again with that legislation. They preferred to keep in the background, to send out threats and insinuations, depending upon taking the country by surprise, upon misrepresentation and lack of understanding on the part of the people at the next general election. If these measures are right let them be brought forward and threshed out before the people of the country. We on this side of the House are prepared to stand behind the position that we took and I am satisfied that the Senate will again take what action its judgment may commend to it, when the occasion arises. But aside from the quarrel between the Senate and the Government, I say the Government cannot evade the responsibility that properly rests upon them to provide for the naval defence of Canada as a part of the British Empire. The combination between Nationalists and Imperialists which was to be carried through under cover of an emergency policy has now no excuse, and if those who claim Imperial loyalty are loyal, now is the time to show it by bringing before Parliament proposals for a permanent naval policy. The fact that the Government have not done so is evidence that they dare not and shows that the claims they made of loyalty to the empire are empty and were made under false pretenses. They have the opportunity and they are not able to make good. They have been in power for two years. They have tried to pass the question over by an emergency policy. They were not able to do it. They are not now bringing forward a permanent policy. Let their present position be contrasted with the position they held at the last session when they came to Parliament with great declarations of imperial loyalty and with great propositions for the salvation of the empire. To-day they dare not even say they have a policy that will have any effect either for the safety of Canada or for the empire. I can only repeat what I said in the beginning that never was a Parliament of Canada met by a Government with such a lack of policy and such a lack of proposals as upon this occasion. As at the last session they hoped to defend themselves by a policy of silence, so now they hope to protect themselves by having no policy at all. But I say that in this country of 7,000,000 people, of 3,000 miles in distance, a country with problems that are growing from day to day and demanding solution, I say that in this country they cannot satisfy public opinion by a policy of seeing nothing, knowing nothing or doing nothing.

[Mr. Oliver].

Mr. MARSHALL: I was not in when the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) was referring to canned goods, but I understand that he stated that canned goods have increased in price 70 per cent in the last five years.

Mr. OLIVER: That is what I understood.

Mr. MARSHALL: You are entirely wrong. Canned goods are cheaper to-day than they have been for five years. Tomatoes are 30 per cent. cheaper than they were a year ago, peas about 25 per cent cheaper, and corn about 10 per cent cheaper.

On motion of Mr. Edwards the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

Wednesday, January 21, 1914.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. SINCLAIR moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 9, to amend the Canada Shipping Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to enable captains holding coasting licenses to sail as far south as the mouth of the river Plate. In former times captains holding coasting licenses were allowed to sail to any part of North or South America and around the Horn if they chose to do so. A few years ago the distance which they could go south was restricted to Cape Hatteras, but since then the distance has been extended to somewhere about the mouth of the Amazon. There are a large number of ships commanded by coasting captains who have business in South America, in such places as Rio and the river Plate and I see no reason why captains holding these licenses should not be allowed to sail to those ports. The object of this Bill is to define the places to which coasting captains can sail and to enable them to go further south than at present.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS.

PUBLIC BILLS.

Bill No. 8, to amend the Railway Act.—Mr. M. Martin.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Bill No. 10, respecting Barcelona Traction Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. A. C. Macdonell.

Bill No. 11, respecting the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 12, respecting The Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 13, to incorporate The Central Canada Railway Company.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

Bill No. 14, respecting The Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'The Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company.'—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

Bill No. 15, respecting The Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 16, respecting The Lachine, Jacques-Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill No. 17, respecting The Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 18, respecting The Tillsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 19, respecting The West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill No. 20, respecting The Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

DEATH OF LORD STRATHCONA.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister): It is fitting, and I am sure that in this all the members on both sides of the House will agree, that we should pay a tribute of respect to the memory of the grand Canadian who passed away yesterday. I speak of Lord Strathcona as a Canadian because, although born in the old land beyond the seas, his life work was almost altogether carried on in this country to the service of which he consecrated so many years of his life. He had a notable career, a career carried on especially in the early part of his life in the face of conditions and difficulties more arduous than those which most men are called upon to meet. When one looks back upon the great span of years over which his lifetime stretched, one is tempted for a moment to recall all that has transpired in His Majesty's dominions on this continent since Lord Strathcona first came to this country at the age of 18. At that time there was much political unrest in Canada carried in some parts of the country even to the extent of rebellion. At that time we had not achieved the right of self-government, or enjoyed many of those constitutional liberties which have since been developed and have come into force from time to time Nearly half the period of his allotted life was passed before this Confederation was formed and after his first arrival in Canada in 1838, he saw in the succeeding years what one might call without exaggeration the complete transformation of the northern half of this continent. He had been a notable figure in the public life of Canada for more than a quarter of a century before he undertook, at the age of seventy-six, to discharge the duties of the great office of High Commissioner for Canada. My right hon. friend knows perhaps better than I do the devotion which Lord Strathcona gave to those duties. I have known many men who were imbued with a high sense of duty, but I do not know of any man among all of those of my acquaintance or knowledge who was more profoundly inspired by a sense of public duty than was Lord Strathcona. As the weight of increasing years bore upon him, it was almost pathetic sometimes to see the devotion with which he insisted upon performing even the minor duties of his office. In all the time that I had known him, and that was during the later years of his life, I was especially struck by the fact that time did not seem in any way to have dimmed the freshness of his spirit, the vigor of his will or the strength of his purpose. The duties of the office which he discharged as High Commissioner for Canada were always important and sometimes delicate; and it is satisfactory to us to remember that no man more than he had a high pride in this country, in all that it has achieved and in all that it may look forward to achieve in the future and no man more than he had a deep and abiding interest in all that concerned the honour, the dignity and the interests of Canada or was more concerned to discharge fully his duty in that regard.

I need not recall to the memory of the members of this House the notable events of his great career. Through many difficult conditions he advanced with indomitable will and unshaken strength of purpose to great things, and for many years he has been truly a great Imperial figure.

I believe that the example of his life may well be an inspiration to all Canadians and indeed to all the citizens of the Empire. Some one said many years ago that Thomas Carlyle spent his life in preaching earnest-

ness to the most earnest people in the world. Some lessons in earnestness, perhaps, might not be thrown away even upon the people of the British Dominions; and I am sure that the earnestness of purpose which is set forth in all the record and career of Lord Strathcona may well serve as an inspiration and an exemplar to us in Canada. It is not for me to-day to speak at length of his great public service. In the office which he filled he discharged very important duties indeed and performed services of the highest character to this country and the Empire. Besides that his many benefactions for great charitable purposes are known to all men so that I need do no more than allude to them to-day. I consider that it would be a fitting tribute of respect to his memory that this House should stand adjourned until to-morrow and I shall move, seconded by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that the House do so stand adjourned; but before doing so I should like to read to the House a message which has been received by His Royal Highness the Governor General from the Secretary of States for the Colonies. It is in these words:

London, 21st January, 1914.

I desire on the part of His Majesty's Government to convey through Your Royal Highness to the Government and people of Canada an expression of deep sympathy in the loss which the Dominion has sustained by the death of Lord Strathcona, High Commissioner for Canada in London for the past seventeen years, a sympathy shared by his many friends in the United Kingdom and throughout the Empire.

His name has been for many years a household word among us embodying to all the thought of Canada and her marvellous progress, as well as of his own notable career distinguished by large public usefulness and magnificent liberality, and his memory is assured of an honoured and abiding place in the annals of the Dominion, to which he devoted his faithful service to the end.

(Sd.) Harcourt.

In conclusion, I am sure that I may, on behalf of Canada, of all the members of this House and of all the people of this country, convey to his daughter and to all the members of his family, the assurance of our deepest sympathy and of our sorrow for their loss.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, in whatever might have been proposed or suggested by the Government to do honour to the memory of the illustrious dead whose loss we deplore, we on this side of the House would have heartily and willingly agreed, believing that whatever might be done would hardly express the deep sense of regret which now prevails from one end to the other of this land. Since Sir John Macdonald's time I do not know that there has been any Canadian who, on departing this life, left behind him such a trail of sorrow as Lord Strathcona. He is mourned by His Majesty the King, whose personal friend he was; by the peers of the realm, in whose illustrious House he had found an honoured place; by the authorities of commerce and of finance in the commercial and financial metropolis of the world, who had found in him an equal; by the poor of London, to whom on repeated occasions he was the incarnation of benevolent Providence; by the people of Scotland, the land of his birth, with whom he never completely severed his connection, and in Canada, the land of his adoption, by all classes of the community, rich or poor, high or low, of whatever creed or race it might be. This universal sense of sorrow is a tribute bestowed only upon men of strong personality, and to this class he undoubtedly belonged. Perhaps the secret of this regret, so universal and so deep, may be found in the fact that wherever he passed, amongst those with whom he came in contact, whether it was the Indians of the forest or the prairie, or the most eminent political or commercial men in Canada, or in the highest sphere in London, he everywhere created a deep, a lasting, and a profound impression.

He came to Canada when he was only eighteen years of age, more than seventy-five years ago. At that time all his possessions were the sound, practical education of a Scottish country lad and more than a full share of the characteristic qualities of his race: keen business acumen, courage, caution and firmness—firmness never loud and assertive, but always unflinching, the whole constituting a strong nature, adamant against all reverses, and never spoilt even by the most phenomenal success.

He came in the service of the Hudson Bay Company as a simple junior clerk, and from that humble station he rose step by step until he became, after the death of Sir George Simpson in 1860, at first in fact and afterwards both in fact and in name the Governor of that historic company, a position which he held to the last day of his life. Here, perhaps, it may not be unfitting to remark that since the amalgamation of the Hudson Bay Company with the Northwest Company in 1821, almost one hundred years ago, that power-

ful institution has been ruled by two men, and two men only: Sir George Simpson and Lord Strathcona.

When the territories of the Northwest and Rupert's Land were acquired by Canada, Donald Smith, as he was then, had acquired over these then distant territories a paramount influence; an influence of which we in these later days have little conception, and which was invaluable to Canada. It may perhaps be truly said that without that influence the transfer of those lands to Canada, which was not accomplished without bloodshed, would have been even more tragic than it was. His services in this connection never, it seems to me, have been properly appreciated, and certainly they never can be too highly extolled. The policy of the Hudson Bay Company had been to keep these distant lands solely as a vast hunting ground; but the keen business instinct of Lord Strathcona showed him that no force could resist the tide of advancing civilization, and, with characteristic promptness, he at once took steps to make the necessary change. The steps which he took were then eminently valuable to Canada.

He realized that the first need was communication between the East and the West. At that time railway communication had advanced westward only to the Mississippi river, and he organized, as we remember, a powerful syndicate to give communication by rail from the Mississippi river at St. Paul to the Red river, and from that point by water up to the junction of the Red river with the Assiniboine, at a point which has since become famous as the city of Winnipeg. But this was only a preliminary step; he bent his whole mind and gave his whole soul to the project of having the Eastern provinces connected by rail altogether on Canadian soil with the provinces of the West, and hence arose the project of the Canadian Pacific railway. It is a matter of history that in the construction of that railway he took a most prominent part; but it is not perhaps as well known as it ought to be that before the Canadian Pacific railway became an accomplished fact it was often perilously near collapse, and it was due to the splendid courage of Lord Strathcona and his associates, who more than once risked their all, that at last the Canadian Pacific railway came into being.

We are proud to remember that he was at one time a member of this House, and those who, like myself and yourself, Mr. Speaker, had the privilege of being his colleagues, can testify that his sound judgment, his moderate views, his dignified conduct, always commanded the respect of both sides of this House.

It is due to the Government of Sir Charles Tupper to say that it is to that Government we owe the appointment of Lord Strathcona as High Commissioner at London, and no wiser selection could have been made or ever was made for a high office. My right hon. friend the leader of the Government has given some inkling of Lord Strathcona's intense devotion to duty in that capacity, and, as the right hon. gentleman has said, perhaps I am in a better position than he to know the particulars in that regard. Lord Strathcona's devotion to duty, his courtesy in all matters of business as well as in social matters, his generous hospitality, and above all his ever-watchful eagerness to put Canada to the front in all matters whether important or unimportant, made him certainly an ideal High Commissioner. The manner in which he discharged his duties was a constant source of pride to his compatriots.

Every one knows that his private life was on a par with his public life: he was a model husband, a good father, and a true friend. It was his privilege to attain a very great age, and perhaps it was still a greater privilege to him to realize, if he cared indeed to realize it, that as he advanced in years he grew more and more in the respect, the admiration, and the affection of his countrymen. His, on the whole, was a fortunate life, and it must be told that whatever he acquired of wealth, of reputation, of fame, and of public esteem, he fairly won and thoroughly deserved. It is my privilege, Sir, to second the motion of my right hon. friend.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.35 p.m.

Thursday, January 22, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Department of Customs for the year ended March 31, 1913—Hon. J. D. Reid.

Report of the Department of Agriculture for the year ended March 31, 1913—Hon. Martin Burrell.

Report of the Department of the Naval Service for the year ended March 31, 1913.—Hon. J. D. Hazen.

Report of the Dominion Railway Commissioners for the year 1913; also report of the Commissioner of the Transcontinental Railway for 1913.—Hon. Frank Cochrane.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, part II, for the year ended March 31, 1913.—Hon. Geo. H. Perley.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

APPOINTMENT OF OFFICIALS.

Mr. SPEAKER announced that he had directed the Clerk of the House to lay upon the table his recommendation and the Clerk's report in the matter of the appointment of Mr. Francis H. Gisborne to the position of Parliamentary Counsel; of the promotion of Mr. A. G. Troop, Clerk of the Law Branch of the House, from Grade B of the Second Division to Grade B of the First Division; of the appointment of Mr. John Lockhart Godwin to the Assistant Clerkship in the Votes and Proceedings Office, with the grade of B in the Second Division, at an increase of salary provided by the Civil Service Amendment Act; of the appointment of Mr. Joseph Smith as the Chief of Stenographers for Members, to be graded A of the Second Division under the said Act.

COLLISIONS AND SALVAGE AT SEA.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 21, to amend the law relating to Merchant Shipping. He said: The purpose of this Bill is to amend the law in respect to collisions and salvage at sea so as to enable the Government of Canada to give effect to their adherence to the International Maritime Convention on these subjects held at Brussels on September 23, 1910.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: Has this reference to the convention recently held in London?

Mr. HAZEN: No; this has reference to the convention which took place at Brussels in 1910.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General to a complaint which I have received from Toronto, and to several other complaints on the same matter, which I have received from members of the Montreal Board of Trade. These complaints have reference to the Atlantic Mail Service. I shall read two paragraphs from one of these letters so that the minister may give his explanation:

Dear Mr. Lemieux:

There is a great deal of dissatisfaction amongst the business community here, and I have no doubt elsewhere in Canada, over the English mail service which is now being furnished. As I understand it, we are so excessively patriotic that we will not let our letters go by New York, although in that way they would reach their destination several days sooner than by the Canadian service. I can speak from personal experience in saying that this has caused serious business inconvenience to my firm on many occasions, and I am sure you would have no difficulty in getting many expressions of a similar nature.

As a concrete example, after the English mail closed here last week at six o'clock on Tuesday morning, there was no mail until Thursday night at six o'clock when it closed for Saturday's sailing of the Tunisian.

I wish further to ask the Postmaster General if the arrangement still prevails that if one routes his letter 'via New York,' that letter will be sent by the New York route and not by the Canadian route?

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General): There has been some dissatisfaction with the Atlantic mail service, due principally to the fact that we have been disappointed by the two new and splendid ships of the Allan Line, the Alsatian and the Calgarian, not coming into service at the date we expected when the contract was entered into. On account of strikes, and for other reasons, as I am informed, these steamers, which should have gone into the service in July or August, are not yet in commission. I am, however, pleased to say that the Alsatian will begin her Atlantic service from Halifax this week. The arrangement is only for a year, and if any other similar arrangement is entered upon, the Government will see that the ships are such as to render first class Atlantic mail service to the people of Canada. The rule is in force that all Canadians who wish to have their mail sent via New York have the privilege of doing so if they so direct their mail matter.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. H. F. McLeod for an Address to His Royal High-

ness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, resumed from Tuesday, January 20.

Mr. CLARENCE JAMESON (Digby, N.S.): Mr. Speaker, it must have been something of a surprise to this House a day or two ago when the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) criticised the Government because of its large expenditures. It is not so very long ago that the hon. junior member for Halifax used to applaud large expenditures upon the part of the Government. He used to defend expenditures made by the Government. In this House and outside of it, he used to support expenditures made by the Government whether they were great or small, whether they were wise or otherwise, whether they were good, bad or indifferent. But there seems to have been a change since the old days. To be sure, in those times, the hon. gentleman had a seat upon this side of the House. He was supporting the Liberal Administration. Can it be that, having crossed over to the other side of the House, and having followed his party into opposition, he has so materially changed his view-point? If there ever was an occasion when the junior member for Halifax should have come into this House with gratitude in his heart towards the Government, it is upon the present occasion, for the constituency which he represents is now, for the first time, receiving justice and ample justice at the hands of the federal Government.

Throughout the length and breadth of the land other great works are being undertaken by this Government in their comprehensive scheme for the development of Canada east and west; and the hon. junior member for Halifax, who by the way did not object to the expenditures for the splendid terminals and docks in his own constituency when they were being discussed last year, should not lose sight of the fact that throughout Canada other places like Halifax were long neglected by the Liberal Government, and that they are entitled to consideration which they are now receiving from this Government. I think that the hon. junior member for Halifax, when he has more fully considered the matter, will conclude that it would be only fair and just for him to congratulate the Government upon its expenditures rather than to condemn it.

From passing references which were made by hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the recent by-election in South Bruce, we may conclude that the Liberal party was rejoiced at being able to carry one seat out of the seven by-elections which were held during the late recess. But there is something which this House might well remember and which the country should remember as well. That is, that in three constituencies in which by-elections were held recently, the Liberal party was unable to place a candidate in the field. It should also be remembered that Chateauguay, which since Confederation has always been in the Liberal column, has recently returned to this House a Government supporter whom we on this side of the House very cordially welcome. The Liberal party should also bear in mind that South Bruce—of their winning of which they are so proud—in the local elections of 1911 gave to the Liberal candidate a majority of 398. That election was held two months after the general Dominion election in September, 1911, and at a time when Sir James Whitney, Premier of Ontario, was at the very height of his power.

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) set himself the task of commiserating certain members of this Administration who vainly expounded the policies of the Government in South Bruce. If they were chagrined at the result of their mission, no person is better able to sympathize with them than the hon. gentleman's leader, for he has suffered from bitter experiences in the past. It is not so long since his tour of the Maritime provinces in 1911, but that we may recall the result. He came attended by that gifted orator, who was, Sir, your predecessor in the last Parliament; by his Minister of Finance, as purse-bearer; by his Minister of Public Works, who with lavish hand dealt out breakwaters, public buildings and docks, and by his Minister of War, whose pockets bulged with epaulets, stripes and medals, as rewards to those who, against conviction, might still be induced to remain steadfast in the faith. Never did a political warrior come better equipped to re-establish his power in the Maritime provinces, 26 of the 35 seats of which were then held by his supporters.

He spoke in a large number of places, and in several of them great meetings were held. Digby was one of such. All that special trains, free tickets, bands, processions, bunting and American tourists with their flags, their mottoes and their cash could do to make the event of immediate and lasting benefit to the Liberal

cause, was done. Even free food, on which the right hon. gentleman is now very strong, was to be had.

In the ridings of Westmorland, St. John, Digby, Annapolis, Kings, Hants, Halifax, Colchester, Cumberland, Pictou and Queens, Prince Edward Island, the people gathered to listen for the last time to the right hon. gentleman in his capacity of Prime Minister of Canada. With what result? In Westmorland, the majority of his Minister of Railways was reduced from 1,395 to 64; in St. John, that of his Minister of Public Works from 496 to 65. In Digby, my own majority of 131 became 260. In Annapolis and Hants, seasoned Liberal veterans were defeated. In Kings, his Minister of Militia went down before the lance of his young opponent. From Halifax, we welcome the Prime Minister. In Cumberland, the Liberal candidate was overwhelmed. In Colchester, the Conservative majority was three times doubled. In Pictou, the Liberal majority was reduced.

Mr. MACDONALD: How much?

Mr. JAMESON: Some reduction.

Mr. MACDONALD: The great amount of ten.

Mr. JAMESON: While Queens, Prince Edward Island, which had formerly elected two Liberals, sent two Conservatives in their stead. To sum up, the right hon. gentleman's majority in those provinces declined from 16 to 3. In every constituency in which he spoke, except three, his candidates were defeated, and the extent of the disaster was only limited by the field of his operations. If any political leader might well sympathize with another in like case should he meet him, it would be the right hon. gentleman.

The country has heard much of late from the right hon. gentleman and his followers in regard to the high cost of living in Canada. We all deplore it, but no one should do so more than the right hon. gentleman himself, for the high cost of living in this country, while due in part to world-wide conditions, is largely due to the policy pursued by the right hon. gentleman during his term of office. To an immigration policy which brought into this country many consumers and relatively few producers; to an agricultural policy which studiously avoided all problems, but more particularly the problem of increased consumption and decreased production, and to the disastrous effect of bad roads upon the rural life of the Dominion, with which he made no attempt whatever to grapple.

To lessen the cost of living, is it not necessary to popularize life in rural communities and to increase production? Is the right hon. gentleman sincere when he deplores the high cost of the dinner table? If so, why did he use his artificial power in the Senate to twice defeat the Highways Bill, which was the first step, and a long one, towards reducing that cost?

This is the record, but it is not all. In 1910 the right hon. gentleman's Minister of Labour, with all the enthusiasm of youth, laid on the table of this House a report which showed that the cost of living in Canada had steadily increased from 1897 to 1910. Does the right hon. gentleman forget this, or does he merely think that the people have forgotten it, when he berates this Government for conditions which his own policies did so much to create, and did absolutely nothing to redress.

During the right hon. gentleman's term of office the cost of living in Canada increased 35 per cent, and because of conditions created by the policies which he had pursued, and which could not be immediately arrested, it has since increased 7 per cent. The right hon. gentleman ignored the 35 per cent increase which was heaped up during his term of office, but he has been making the country ring with that 7 per cent increase.

It is related of a captain whose ship had been cast away and was sinking, owing to an error of judgment on his part, that seeing the members of the crew lashing themselves to spars and floats, he tied himself to an anchor. The right hon. gentleman's party recently experienced shipwreck owing to an error of judgment, and now we find him tying himself to an anchor—the anchor of the high cost of living.

The right hon. gentleman has recently declared a free trade food policy. Is it not rather surprising to find the right hon. gentleman reverting to the practice of former Liberal leaders in opposition: the practice of coquetting with the Nemesis of his party in the form of a trade policy? What misfortune has it not brought to the Liberal cause? Look at the political history of this country. 1878, defeat; 1882, defeat; 1887, defeat; 1891, defeat; 1911, defeat—and on each occasion a Liberal trade policy! What a record of defeat, disaster and disappointment! And yet we find the right hon. gentleman applying the same old Liberal remedy to his hurts; the remedy of a hair of the dog

that bit him—a trade policy once more. What a record that policy has had, to be sure: always good to raise a cheer, it never could produce a majority.

But the right hon. gentleman appears to have ignored certain facts which the people of this country cannot afford to allow him to forget: first, that during fifteen years of office he boasted of a prosperity that was the direct outcome of a protective tariff policy, the National policy of Sir John A. Macdonald. And, second, that the great and constant warfare which is being waged between the nations of the world to-day is the struggle for commercial supremacy. The generals are the statesmen of the respective countries; the weapons with which they fight are the tariffs, while the rank and file of the army consists of the princes of agriculture, the captains of industry, and their employes. 'Disarm your men, throw away your weapons, expose yourselves to your adversaries,' says the right hon. gentleman, 'and we, the great Liberal party, the party which always goes out of office and stays out on its trade policies, will defend you.' Sir, do you think that the farmers of Canada would subscribe to that doctrine? I do not believe they would.

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) visited the province of Nova Scotia recently on a political mission. It has been said of the hon. member for Red Deer that he has buffaloed the trade policy of the Liberal party. I do not know whether that is the case or not.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Would my hon. friend tell me again what the verb is?

Mr. JAMESON: Well, it means something in the nature of a stampede. The hon. gentleman made a self-conducted tour through the province, and he spoke in a number of places. The burden of his lay was that he had had some steers which had gone into the United States under the new Wilson tariff and for which he had received one dollar per hundred pounds more in the United States market than he would have received in Canada. And now we find the hon. gentleman's leader seriously suggesting the removal of the tariff, with the view of meeting the problem of the high cost of living, so that our Canadian consumers can purchase in the United States market, in which the prices according to the evidence of the hon. member for Red Deer, are higher than in the Canadian market. It would appear that the great Liberal party, which has so many heads, and consequently so many minds, is becoming quite distracted.

The hon. member for Red Deer, during the course of his speech the other day made an interesting remark regarding the removal of the tariff on wheat. He said:

> Have the farmers not the right to speak for their own industry? I contend it is the right of the wheat growers to be the judges in this matter.

I presume the hon. gentleman means in the matter of the removal of the tariff on wheat. I would like to ask, if it is a fair question, whether the hon. member would take the same view with regard to the stock-raisers, whether he would say that they also should have the right to speak for their industry and to say whether or not the tariff should be taken off. The hon. gentleman does not reply.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I must not be understood as not wishing to reply; I did not wish to interrupt my hon. friend. My meaning was that the farmers ought to be the judges as to how prices would be affected by the removal of the tariff. If I did not make that clear I wish to make it clear now.

Mr. JAMESON: I am glad that the hon. gentleman has made the statement clear, it was not quite clear to me as it stood; it is perfectly clear now.

There must be some better remedy, some better method of dealing with the high cost of living than that proposed by the right hon. the Leader of the Opposition, namely, the purchasing of our commodities in a higher market.

During the last ten years the Canadian urban population has increased 60 per cent and the rural population 17 per cent, although in the Maritime Provinces the rural population has actually decreased. This means, of course, that the consumption of farm products has tremendously increased and the production has not been increasing correspondingly, with the result that the cost of the dinner table has gone up.

This Government, when they came into office, recognized that to have cheaper food the production of farm products must be increased, and they set about popularizing rural life and so starting a movement of the people back to the land. Towards that purpose they have bent their energies, and I think I may fairly and frankly say that during the two years which they have been in office they have done more in that way than was accomplished during the whole fifteen years of their predecessors.

The measures which they have taken were, first, a good roads policy. This is something for which the country has been

hoping and asking for many years, something the value of which cannot be overestimated. Good roads would increase the value of farm lands, bring his market closer to the producer, lessen the cost of carriage of products to market, and so lessen the cost to the consumer.

Secondly, the Government provided for a grant of $10,000,000 for instruction in agriculture, to enable those desiring to become farmers to obtain that knowledge of the science of farming which is now regarded as essential to the successful prosecution of the industry; to help those who wish to go back to the land to fit themselves for their great undertakings and enable them to get the greatest return for their labour.

Thirdly, they instituted the parcel post system which will establish communication between the country merchant and the farmer, between the producer and the consumer, thereby saving both time and expense.

Fourthly, the extension of the rural mail delivery which has been energetically proceeded with all through the country.

Tariffs may or may not affect the cost of the dinner table, but there is no doubt that by increasing production the cost of living will be decreased and by the popularizing of life in the rural communities these desirable results will be attained.

It is to be regretted that owing to the partisan action of the Senate the Highways Bill has been destroyed. Hon. gentlemen opposite were in office for fifteen years during which time they might, had they so desired, have introduced legislation to this end. They could have framed it to suit themselves, they could have moulded it as they chose, but when it was introduced by this Government they took the only possible way of preventing the country from getting the benefit of this splendid piece of legislation.

Surprise has been expressed by some hon. gentlemen opposite, I do not know whether or not it was simulated surprise, that the Prime Minister does not intend to reintroduce the Naval Aid Bill of last session. The hon. the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), in referring to this, spoke of 'cowardice on the part of the Government,' as he termed it. There is no cowardice on the part of the Government, neither do I think there is anything in connection with this matter regarding which hon. gentlemen opposite should be surprised.

After weeks of debate, discussion and obstruction last session; after this Parliament had been compelled to amend the rules of debate; after the Government had been obliged to apply closure, the Naval Aid Bill passed in this House and went up to the Senate. There, at the dictation of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, it was destroyed, destroyed by men whom he had placed in the Senate.

What is the condition of affairs to-day? We have the same hon. gentlemen opposite, we have the same right hon. leader of the Opposition—I do not believe he has experienced a change of heart—and we have practically the same Senate. Why should the Prime Minister invite further humiliation for Canada in the eyes of the world by a repetition in the Senate of what occurred last year?

Mr. Speaker, the issue is clear before the people of this country. We have, on the one hand, an Opposition navy of the type of those two great bulwarks of Canadian autonomy, the Niobe and the Rainbow, and we have, on the other hand, the Government proposal of a Canadian division of the Imperial navy. We know what the naval policy of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition means. It means, as he has very clearly explained in the past, the severing the ripe fruit from the parent tree, in other words the taking of Canada out of the British Empire, the beginning of the disintegration of the British Empire. Canada, he says, is a nation, and no one I know of disputes this fact, although lately he has been finding fault with some of those who agree with him on that point. But it should not be forgotten that not long ago the right hon. gentleman was busily engaged, with President Taft, in endeavouring to make Canada an adjunct. Canada is a nation but for my part—and I think that in this I may speak generally for the people of Canada—I do not desire to be simply a citizen of a minor nation when I am today and may honourably continue to be a citizen of the greatest Empire that the world has ever seen. And because I believe in the maintenance of that empire, because it can only be maintained by an efficient navy, because I believe that the maximum of efficiency at the minimum of cost can, for the immediate future be provided by the proposals of the Prime Minister, I shall continue to support those proposals.

Since he came into office two years ago the Prime Minister has been attacked by the Liberal press and Liberal speakers probably more bitterly and more persistently than any other man who ever occupied the

same office. But my right hon leader has been selected by the people of this country to perform great and important duties. Even as Sir John A. Macdonald was chosen by the people of Canada to initiate the National Policy and to develop our manufactures, so the Prime Minister of to-day has his mandate from the Canadian people. The mandate to protect and to encourage our agricultural, fishing and other great industries, to equip and develop our national ports, to preserve for Canada and Canadians the benefit of our growing transportation, and to maintain, so far as Canada is concerned, the integrity of the British Empire and secure for Canada in the councils of the empire that voice to which her importance now entitles this Dominion.

And right well has the Prime Minister entered upon these great and important duties. But though he has entered upon them ably and prosecuted them with energy, they cannot in the very nature of things be brought to fruition in two years or in four. And the people of Canada who have entrusted the Prime Minister with the carrying out of these splendid policies have confidence in his integrity, his judgment and his ability. They will not be turned aside by the carping criticism of hon. gentlemen opposite—which they know to be inspired by burning jealousy and remorse at loss of office. But on the contrary they will accord to the Prime Minister, by legitimate and constitutional means, whatever time may be reasonably necessary for the accomplishment of his great and important purposes.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.): As, owing to the regrettable illness of my colleague from Prince (Mr. Richards), I happen to be the only member from Prince Edward Island on this side of the House at the present time, and inasmuch as I have some views on the subjects that are now before the House, I take this opportunity of expressing my opinions thereon before the debate closes. I listened the other evening with a great deal of attention to the speech of the right hon. the Prime Minister and I gathered from that speech that the right hon. gentleman does not approve of the Senate as at present constituted and that he certainly does not approve of the action of the Senate in regard to the Naval Aid Bill of last year. My impression is that the right hon. gentleman with the very valuable assistance of Winston Churchill, Windermere and the Montreal Star, not being able to bring on a war with Germany, would not be opposed to having a scrap with the Senate, but my right hon. friend might find these gentlemen fairly formidable opponents if pressed into active service. The speech of the right hon. the leader of the Government more than justified the action of the Senate last year in regard to the Naval Aid Bill. He stated that at the present time arrangements of an international character are being considered as a result of which there might be a retardation or cessation of the mad armament building which the nations of Europe have been carrying on for the last few years. Under these circumstances the Government of this country, he says, is going to wait and see the result of these arrangements before doing anything further in regard to supplying the dreadnoughts that were to be constructed under the Naval Aid Bill of last year! Could there be a better justification of the attitude of the Liberal party on this question, could there be a better justification of the action of the Senate in asking the Prime Minister to consult the people of Canada before embarking upon that course? The Prime Minister has stated in effect that those ships may never be needed and that our action or interference might be an embarrassment to the mother country in her negotiations with other countries. The Prime Minister on September 21, 1912, speaking at the Windsor hotel, stated that he would ask Parliament for a contribution and that if Parliament did not grant that contribution he would appeal to the country. He repeated that statement on December 5, when introducing the Naval Aid Bill in this Chamber. All the Senate did was to take the Prime Minister at his word and to say that in their estimation also, an appeal to the people was the proper course to pursue, and further that inasmuch as the Bill was a departure from the policy laid down by both parties and unanimously agreed to by Parliament a year or two before, they considered that the people of Canada had a right to be consulted before the Bill became law. The Prime Minister did not carry out his promise in that respect, and appeal to the people.

With regard to the permanent policy, he has stated that that policy will be evolved later and the people consulted upon it at the next general election, and he has stated that he will keep this promise whatever happens. He laid emphasis upon that. He stated that the Liberal party and the Senate were willing to embark upon a permanent policy without consulting the peo-

ple of Canada and he considered that a remarkable and unjustifiable thing. Surely the right hon. gentleman will remember that he gave his consent to a policy of that kind in 1909 and 1910. He says now that it was remarkable and unjustifiable. It is more than that. When the resolution introduced by the then leader of the Government looking to the establishment of a naval organization in Canada was submitted to this House, the then leader of the Opposition, now the Prime Minister, thought that no time should be lost in embarking upon that policy and suggested that the word 'immediate'—

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM: 'Speedy'—

Mr. HUGHES: No, he suggested that the word 'immediate' should be put before the word 'organization' and they compromised upon the word 'speedy'; now he says there is no need of the word 'immediate', that there is no need of being in any hurry. He says that it is not the part of a gentleman to hurry anyhow, but that before the next general election will be time enough to formulate a policy. The next general election may take place next year; it may take place next summer, or the summer following in 1915, or possibly in the summer of 1916 and that will be quite time enough. There is no emergency now, there is no thunder and lightning, there is no need of haste. The Nationalists of Quebec have to be consulted and Mr. Bourassa has to be consulted **before** any kind of a naval policy is adopted by the Conservative party.

What is the history of the naval question? We all know that the first time that it really took concrete form was when the present hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), in the ablest speech that has ever been delivered upon this question, in the session of 1909, introduced a resolution. The then leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) agreed with the proposition of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The then leader of the Opposition (Mr. Borden) stated that the Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke for the Conservative party and both parties then agreed to a resolution which was finally submitted and unanimously passed by this House.

I think that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) was the only member who did not support the policy that was then adopted. Shortly after that certain parties in the province of Quebec, Mr. Bourassa, Mr. Lavergne, Mr. Pelletier, Mr. Nantel, Mr. Blondin and a number of other gentlemen thought that they could make political capital out of that question against the leader of the Liberal party and against the party itself. An election was held in Drummond and Arthabaska. The Conservatives put up no candidate, the Nationalists had a candidate and the Liberals had a candidate and quietly the Conservatives gave their support to the Nationalist candidate. When the Montreal Herald telegraphed the Minister of Trade and Commerce and asked him how Conservatives should vote in this contest, the reply was: Beat Laurier by any means. What course would honourable and patriotic gentlemen pursue in a case of that kind? When they had assisted the Liberal party in passing that resolution through this House and when they saw that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was unfairly attacked and misrepresented in Quebec, was it not their duty to stand by the policy that they had assisted in passing through the House? Would that not be the duty of honourable and patriotic men? But they threw their principles to one side for the purpose of trying to make political capital on that occasion. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has said that this is a Government of dissolving views. It is worse than that; it is a Government of dissolving principles. That election was held, the result was that the Nationalist candidate was elected and from that time forward the alliance with the Nationalist party of Quebec has been an accomplished fact, to the great, to the eternal discredit of the Conservative party, and from that time the naval question has been a political football in this country. Publicly the Prime Minister is endeavouring to blame the Senate for the course that he is now pursuing, but privately I believe that he is pleased with the course that the Senate took, that he is pleased that he has not been obliged to spend $35,000,000 to build ships that he now admits himself may never be needed.

There is another chapter to this question. Under the Naval Service Act, passed unanimously by Parliament, two training ships were purchased from the Admiralty and brought to this country, and provision was made for the training of young men who wished to enter the service of their own country. I noticed

4 p.m.

the other day that Windermere, in telegraphing to the Montreal Star, quoted from a statement made by Lord Selborne, who was the first Lord of the Admiralty under a Conservative Administration, to the effect that the greatest need the British Admiralty has is men to man the ships, and not ships themselves. Without men ships are of little use for fighting purposes. That was the one feature of the Naval Service Act that the Nationalists of Quebec and the Conservatives denounced in the strongest possible terms. That was the one feature of the Naval Service Act that the present Prime Minister promised to repeal, and did cancel, and that was the one feature of the Naval Service Act which enabled the Nationalists of Quebec to misrepresent Sir Wilfrid Laurier's attitude to the greatest possible extent. If these men did not wish to enter the naval service of their country, and there was nothing compulsory or obligatory about it, they had no right to deprive young men of British or French origin who had a vocation for a seafaring life from availing themselves of the opportunity of entering the naval service. Young men who wish to follow the sea, or who wish to enter the naval service, are now obliged to go to the United States to give their services to a foreign country and to serve under a foreign flag. That is the result of the unholy alliance which the Conservative party entered into with the Nationalists of Quebec.

The Prime Minister told us that the Senate of Canada, in refusing to pass the Highways Bill, had committed a very improper act. As was well pointed out by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), the Senate did not kill or mutilate that Bill in any way; the Senate amended it so that the Government would be compelled to do what they declared they intended to do anyhow, and the Government would not accept that amendment. The Prime Minister told us also that he and the Minister of Railways had given a very distinct promise that the money expended under that Act would be expended in the different provinces on the basis of population, but the Prime Minister would not consent to put that provision in the Bill. Suppose the right hon. the Prime Minister were drawing an agreement between two parties and that one of the parties said: I intend to do so and so, but I do not want it to be put in writing, would the Prime Minister, in his capacity as a lawyer, advise any man in his senses to submit to an agreement of that kind? And yet, that sort of thing is what the Prime Minister says the Liberal party of Canada should agree to. We had good reasons for doubting the sincerity of the Prime Minister and the Conservative party in that respect. This Bill was not yet before Parliament, it had only been mentioned, when a by-election was held in South Renfrew, and five ministers of the Crown, including the Minister of Railways, went into that county and told the electors that if they voted for the Conservative candidate enormous sums of money would be expended in that county under the provisions of the Highways Bill; and, conversely, if they did not vote for the Conservative candidate, that very little money would be spent there. With that fact staring us in the face, we were asked to take the word of the Government that they did not intend to use the money under the Highways Bill for political or corrupt purposes. We were justified and amply justified in asking for guarantees. The hon. member for Red Deer asked the Prime Minister, while the Bill was under consideration, to state to what extent the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition could in any event prevent him from doing what he said he intended to do, and the Prime Minister did not and could not answer that question. The amendment offered by the Opposition in no way prevented the Government from doing what they said they intended to do under the Bill, and yet they refused to accept that amendment. Did they want the Bill to pass? I am doubtful about that. But there is more. There is nothing in my opinion that shows the insincerity and duplicity of this Government better than their action and attitude on that very Highways Bill. During the last days of the session we had in the Estimates an item of $1,500,000 to be expended under the provisions of the Highways Act among the different provinces, when the Government knew that there would be no Highways Act in existence under which to expend it, and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), wishing to have the use of that money during last summer, moved that the words 'under the provisions of the Highways Act,' be struck out and that the money should be given to the provinces to be expended by them on their highways. And, Sir, every Conservative member present in the committee on that occasion voted against that amendment, and I am sorry to say that my Conservative colleagues from the province of Prince Edward Island

voted with the majority against the amendment, showing clearly that the Government had no intention of allowing that Bill to pass, or of voting that money unless they were in a position to use it for political and corrupt purposes.

I wish now to say a few words on the high cost of living. I listened attentively to the speech of the Minister of Finance in this debate, and I recall that he stated that a great many people in Canada were puzzled, I suppose he among the number, at the arguments advanced in favour of reciprocity, when that measure was under consideration. He said he could not understand how the farmers could get more for their products, while at the same time the consumers in the cities could get these products at a reduced price. I do not think the Minister of Finance is so obtuse as he sometimes wishes to appear; if he is, with all due respect, I do not think he is qualified for his position. This is a country of very great extent and transportation is difficult and expensive, and it should be plain to the Minister of Finance that it would be just possible for people living in the eastern part of Canada to be exporting products and produce to the United States, while those in another part of Canada might be importing similar products from the United States, and, to the great advantage of both countries. I will take the commodity of potatoes as an example. Potatoes are a valuable article of food, and Prince Edward Island produces them in great abundance. We send to Halifax, and Sydney, and Newfoundland, but not in great quantities; our natural market is in Boston, New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, the cities of the New England states, and chiefly because of the cheap water transportation and climatic conditions. At the same time that we would be exporting potatoes to the New England states, the inland cities of Canada, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and others, might be importing potatoes from the United States. Even if the price were the same in Montreal and Toronto, we could afford to sell our potatoes to the United States; and because of cheaper transportation, the producer would get more for them. Producers in New York and other border states might send their potatoes into the inland towns and cities of Canada and get more for them, and the consumers in those towns get their potatoes for less than we could sell them at. That is easily understood. In addition to that, we could ship to the eastern cities, to the cities in New England, much later in the season than we could to the inland cities of Canada, because the mercury does not fall nearly so low in the late autumn on the seaboard as it does in the interior part of Canada in the same latitude. We could not ship at all late in the season to the cities of Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa.

The same thing holds true of other products, but particularly of vegetables and fruit at other seasons of the year. In late spring and early summer, before the fruit and vegetables of Canada are fit for consumption, except when raised under hothouse conditions, the consumers in the cities and towns of Canada might be greatly benefited by having the privilege of importing fruit and vegetables from the United States. Later on in the season, when our fruit and vegetables would be at their very best, and the season for them in the United States had passed, it might be to the great advantage of the producers of these articles in Canada to have the privilege of sending them to the United States, in fact, to the great advantage of the consumers and producers in both countries. That is how and why the producers might get more for their products and the consumers might get them for less.

Another article of food that might be taken into consideration are eggs. At certain seasons of the year, we cannot produce eggs economically in this country because of weather conditions. The Canadian hen, for some months in the winter is not on the job. In the spring and early summer months the Canadian hen is right on the job, and at that season of the year we have more eggs than we can consume, and we are putting them into cold storage. Cold storage is an expensive way of preserving food, but it is better than letting the food spoil. It would be a great advantage to the Canadian farmer if, at that season of the year, he could ship his eggs to the United States. It is quite conceivable that he could get more for them; and that the consumer in the United States could get them for less. In the months of December, January and February, when the Canadian hen is not producing eggs, except under very difficult and very expensive conditions, it would be to the great advantage of the consumers in Canada to have the privilege of importing eggs from the southern states of the United States, where the Yankee hen is then on the job. This is not such an abstruse question that the hon. Minister

of Finance (Mr. White) can not understand it. At first sight it might appear a paradox, but I think the paradox has vanished. If the hon. Minister of Finance cannot understand that, I repeat the statement that he is hardly qualified for the position which he now occupies.

Wheat is an article of food that the producers of Western Canada would certainly be benefited by being permitted to ship to the United States. I know that there is a millers' combine. I do not know whether it enhances the price of flour or not, but this I do know that you cannot buy a car of flour in Canada from any milling house in Canada for one cent less than the combination price. There is a combination in price, at all events, and I am quite satisfied that the miller's combination do not regulate the price of their flour according to the price of wheat. They regulate the price of their flour in accordance with what they think they can afford to sell it at, and with what they think the Canadian consumer is willing and able to pay, in fact, what he must pay.

The hon. Minister of Finance has stated that tariffs and trusts and combines have very little to do with the high cost of living, and he said that a commission, appointed by the state of Massachusetts some years ago, had brought in a report to that effect. That commission, I presume, acted under the instructions of the body that appointed it, and republicanism and high protectionism were then the policy of the United States. Somebody must pay the duty; and, if the duty does not enhance the price, then what in the name of common sense is the duty for? Of course, this is an old question. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) in this House some years ago stated that that was the very object for which a customs' tariff was imposed, namely to enhance the price. The present hon. Minister of Finance seems to have a different opinion. The Prime Minister, the other evening, stated that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce was returning to this country and he thought his return might cause dismay in the ranks of the Liberal party. I am not of that opinion. If his return causes dismay at all, I am afraid it will be in the ranks of the Conservative party and in the Cabinet itself, because, as is well known, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, before he left this country, stated that a commission to ascertain the cause of the high cost of living was absolutely useless; that there were more commissions in this country than we had any use for; that they were as thick as blackberries, and that no commission for that purpose would be appointed. Yet he was hardly out of the country when the Government appointed a commission, against the advice of the man who, the Prime Minister stated, was the most capable man in this country to give advice on that subject.

This commission, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce says, will spoil a good deal of paper, use a good deal of ink, and make a report which will probably never be read, and certainly will not be acted upon. I think I can give hon. gentlemen opposite some information with regard to the high cost of living. One of the things which make it difficult to live in this country at the present time and which is responsible for the increase in the cost of living is the reckless, wanton and unparalleled extravagance of this Government. The Minister of Finance the other day took exception to the word 'unparalleled' as applied to the expenditure of this Administration, but I will use the word, and I think that before I sit down I shall justify its use. The government of this or any country are the trustees of the public funds, and they should guard the expenditure of public money just as carefully as trustees would guard the expenditure of trust funds. Has this Government done so? I think not. I will point out to hon. gentlemen opposite several considerations which have contributed to the high cost of living in this country. First, let me call attention to the fact that the Minister of Public Works sold to a political favourite for the sum of ten dollars a piece of public property worth at least $100,000, situated within the confines of the town of Prince Albert. Do not such transactions contribute to the high cost of living? The Postmaster General last year gave a contract for 350,000 padlocks for $350,000—

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER: Never.

Mr. HUGHES: Well, perhaps he did not give the contract for them, but he ordered padlocks for the mail bags sufficient to last forty or fifty years, I am told.

Mr. PELLETIER: That is not a fact.

Mr. HUGHES: More padlocks than have been used in this country since Confederation.

Mr. PELLETIER: I have told the hon. gentleman that that is not a fact.

Mr. HUGHES: What are the facts in connection with the matter?

Mr. PELLETIER: My hon. friend should know the facts himself, since he is speaking about the matter.

Mr. HUGHES: The Postmaster General will not tell me the facts; I know that statement was made repeatedly in this House.

Mr. PELLETIER: It was denied repeatedly.

Mr. HUGHES: How many were ordered?

Mr. PELLETIER: There were 10,000 ordered, and not one delivered.

Mr. HUGHES: The Postmaster General evidently intended to order them, but someone interfered, and prevented that item from being added to the other transactions which have tended to increase the high cost of living. Then there is another item: the expenditure in the Militia Department. I dare say the Postmaster General knows something about that; at any rate the Minister of Finance is well informed. Armouries and drill halls are being erected all over the country at enormous expense, and in many instances there is no more use for them than there is for the fifth wheel to a coach. Do these things not add to the high cost of living? Then there is the fact that it cost $40,000 to carry the Minister of Militia and Defence, Sir Ian Hamilton and party, from Vancouver in the west to Sydney in the east; is not that a reckless and unparalled expenditure, and would that not add something to the high cost of living? I understand also that twenty or twenty-three militia officers, with their wives, families, and invited guests and twelve or fifteen lady secretaries travelled all over Europe at the public expense, which amounted, it is said, to at least $100,000—and this to gratify the curiosity and vanity of the Minister of Militia. Do not these things add to the high cost of living? I think they do. The Minister of Militia and Defence dined with marquises, earls, kings and emperors in full dress, and at the expense of the taxpayers of Canada. If the Minister of Finance was properly guarding the public funds of this country and doing his duty as a trustee of those funds, he would compel the Minister of Militia and Defence to pay these bills out of his own pocket. Then there is the $15,000,000 which Mackenzie & Mann got last year as a gift. I am sure the Finance Minister must agree that this would add something to the high cost of living. Then there are the ten or twelve millions paid on foodstuffs by the consumers of this country in customs duties. These are the things which, in my humble judgment, add to the high cost of living, and these are the things which, I venture to say, the commission now investigating the matter will not mention. But the people of this country ought to be informed, and, having the information, they will draw their own conclusions.

I listened attentively to some figures given the other day by the Minister of Finance, and his statement that the cost of living had advanced more rapidly in Canada during the past few years than in any other country he mentioned, notwithstanding the fact that the countries of Europe are burdened by enormous expenditures for armaments and military equipment from which we are happily free, and notwithstanding the fact that a large proportion of the able-bodied men of those countries are taken away from the productive walk of life at an age when they are capable of doing their best work. That, I think, should give food for reflection, because something must be wrong with this country, with all its boundless resources and with the population that we have, when the cost of living is relatively so high. Considering these things, and in view of the fact that the present Government apparently are not willing to do anything reasonable to remedy these evils, considering their attitude with regard to the naval question from which they would now like to run away—considering the fact that the emergency has been exploded, that there is no such thing now, considering their record on all these points during the last three years, I do not wonder at their putting off an appeal to the Canadian people to the last possible day, and saying that, in the meantime, they will consider all these things that were quite emergent a few years ago. I am inclined to think that, under these circumstances, when this Government next appeals to the people of Canada they will go down, as has been stated by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), unwept, unhonoured and unsung.

Mr. FREDERICK L. SCHAFFNER (Souris): Mr. Speaker, I assure you, I do not intend to delay you or the House for any very great length of time this afternoon, but I feel that every representative who has the honour to have a place in this House should feel that he has a duty to perform to those who have sent him here. So, this afternoon, I have a very pleasant service to perform to not only the Conservatives of my constituency, but to at least

85 per cent of all the people in that constituency, in extending to this Government the congratulations of my people for the splendid manner in which they have fulfilled the promises and the pledges they made previous to the last election in connection with my own constituency and the other great prairie provinces. We have in Canada what might perhaps be classified as three forms of government. We have our municipal government, which deals with the people at home. That is enlarged into what is called our provincial or local governments that deal with a wider sphere. Then we come to the great federal Parliament of this country, whose duty it is to legislate in the best manner possible for all the people. I refer to those three forms of government to show how different are the functions of these three legislative bodies. The municipal government has to do with local affairs all of a similar character. We might say that the provincial governments of this country, whether in British Columbia or in Nova Scotia, are concerned with the affairs of people who are engaged in about the same vocations of life. But how vastly different is the legislation required in this House of Commons! We have a great variety of creeds, a great variety of languages, a great variety of industries; what may be good for one province or locality may not be the best thing for the whole country. So I claim that whether a government be Liberal or Conservative, every member in this House should sympathize with them; they have to direct the way, to formulate policies and to enact legislation which will make for the good of the people of the whole country.

Then, Sir, we must have in this country what is called party government. It is the form of government of the British Empire. It is the form of government so far as I know, of the whole civilized world. It may have its defects, it may not be perfect; for while I suppose there are still a few people who will tell us they are perfect, most of us, I presume, are willing to admit that we have not reached perfection, whether it be in our local or in our federal administration. Yet I hold that the aim of all governments is to legislate for the good of the people. Hence it is necessary for us to watch very closely the actions of any government. I am prepared to say that I have never been altogether satisfied with what any Conservative Government has done, and I do not suppose there is any one sitting on the other side of the House who has been entirely satisfied with all their Liberal friends did. We are more or less independent, perhaps I should pay the hon. member for Red Deer the compliment of saying that his independence is perhaps as great as that of any of us. Yet, however much it is to be desired that we should be more independent so long as we have this form of government, we must endeavour to convince those who form a Cabinet and who practically rule, whether, it be on the other side of the House or on this side, of the wisdom of adopting measures of which we approve; conversely it is the duty of a government to seek interviews with the members of the House and to ascertain from them what is in the best interests of the individual provinces. A government which will assimilate the views so ascertained will probably do what is in the best interests of all concerned.

I listened very closely the other afternoon to my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). My hon. friend is a bold man, he is a brave man, and I thought he was a more accurate man than the last speech he delivered in this House proved him to be. He started his speech with that old story about the ostrich hiding its head in the sand and likened that quality to the humility shown by members of the Cabinet. Well, after all humility is not a thing to be entirely despised whether it be in the Cabinet or among any other set of men. He ended up by saying that these men had circled around like the ostrich and then stuck their heads in the sand. When I heard that I began to look around for the heads of the Cabinet. I have observed, as no doubt you have, Mr. Speaker, that some of them have pretty large heads, which would make quite a hole in the sand and it occurred to me that if ever our friends opposite came into power in this 20th century and tried to put their heads in the holes made in the sand by the members of this Government, I think the holes would be much too large for them and that their heads would be rattling around like peas in a dry pod.

I was bold enough to interrupt my hon. friend from Edmonton the other night when he was speaking of a delegation of farmers that came to Ottawa to interview the Government. A delegation came here a few weeks ago, with what success I do not know, but I know this, that when our friends opposite were in power a delegation of from 1,000 to 1,200 farmers came to Ottawa, I remember distinctly they came in at that door, and filled up this entire

chamber, and put us right out of the door opposite, and I could not help thinking how delighted I would be if I could get a seat in the House of Commons just as easy as those fellows. They were a splendid lot of men, good-looking, intelligent and well-dressed—yes, well-dressed. A man down town said to me the other day in reference to some well-dressed fellows who had just passed us: Those are not farmers from the West, they are bankers, Cabinet Ministers or something of that kind. The point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that, while it took 1,200 farmers to storm the late Government, their grievances have so disappeared under the present Government that it was required to send in 1913 less than a baker's dozen of delegates. I do not know why a farmer should not have the right to dress as well as anybody else. I had the temerity the other night to ask the member for Edmonton if any delegation that visited the late Government had had their requests granted, and he said—they came and asked for reciprocity and Sir Wilfrid Laurier tried to give it to them. I propose to show this afternoon that not one request that any delegation of western farmers ever made of the late Government was ever granted. My hon. friend from Edmonton is very often inaccurate. He is not very well fortified with facts and he fell down badly there. Let us see what the hon. the leader of the Opposition said in reply to that delegation. Referring to the tariff he said:

> You have suggested to us that the first thing we should try to get is a treaty of reciprocity with our neighbours.
>
> Mr. Drury: I think you are misinformed as to the contents of our recommendation.
>
> Sir Wilfrid Laurier: I understand that what is proposed is closer commercial relations with our neighbours—whether by treaty or concurrent legislation is another matter—I suppose you would rather have it in the form of a treaty than not have it at all. If what you have in view is better commercial relations with the United States we are at one with you. I am happy to say that at this moment we are negotiating with the American authorities to do this very thing which you ask—to improve our commerical relations with our neighbours.

The point I wish to make is that Canada's representatives had already gone to Washington before this delegation had approached the Government and therefore my hon. friend from Edmonton was wrong when he said the late Government had tried to grant the request of that delegation of farmers. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a play, real vaudeville. I do not intend to give it this afternoon, but it may be presented in this House before the session closes. It was acted in Winnipeg some time about the first of December last, when an election was held in the constituency of Macdonald. I fully expected my hon. friend from Edmonton to refer to the Macdonald election. Anybody that sat in this House last year will remember that whenever my hon. friend spoke and he spoke often and long, he always dragged in the Macdonald election, but in his speech the other night I cannot find a word about it. But to continue. There was to be an election in Macdonald. My good friend, Mr. Norris, leader of the Opposition, a well-respected man in the province of Manitoba, did not want an election, neither did Mr. McPherson, a valuable Liberal member of the local House and this play was staged by the hon. member for Edmonton and had as its particular stars the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and Senator Watson. These gentlemen forced upon the citizens of Macdonald an election, and have they not been sick since? Talk about the ostrich! If these men could have buried their heads any deeper than an ostrich they would have been mighty glad to do it. The Minister of Finance the other night accused the right hon. the leader of the Opposition of being troubled with amnesia, which means loss of memory. That was not the trouble with my hon. friend. He had no amnesia; he had a good memory. That Macdonald election is written right on his heart and he remembers it well.

5 p.m.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Is it true that any one on this side of the House accused my hon. friend of suffering from amnesia?

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I did not say that; my hon. friend has misunderstood me. I say that the Minister of Finance referred to amnesia, which means loss of memory. If I said that anybody on that side of the House accused him I take it back, because that was not my intention at all. What I want to assure you of, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. member for Edmonton was not suffering from amnesia, but that he was suffering from aphasia or aphemia; that is, impossible articulation—he could not say the word 'Macdonald.' He made some strange statements. I did not know that such a good-natured man could be so pessimistic

as that hon. gentleman was that afternoon. He said that Canada stands by herself to-day as a country of depression in the face of the most magnificent crop ever harvested. I think that the hon. gentleman knows better than that. I think he knows very well that the depression to-day is world-wide. Were it not so the depression which we may have in Canada to-day would not be so severe and would not be felt to the extent that it is. But my hon. friend does not agree with other great men in his province. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister the other day referred to the remarks made by the premiers of the different provinces upon this subject. I am not going to refer to all that has been said by the different lieutenant governors of the provinces, but I would like to show what the Hon. Mr. Bulyea, Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Alberta, from which province my hon. friend comes, has to say on this matter. He said on December 16, 1913:—

Since the prorogation of the fourth session of the second legislature of your assembly, the people of the province of Alberta, in common with the whole civilized world—

The hon. member for Edmonton thinks it is confined to Canada, but Mr. Bulyea, with the responsibility of his high position, stated that the people of the Province of Alberta, in common with the whole civilized world—

—have felt the strain of a severe financial depression, which, I am pleased to say, is now lessening.

He goes on to say:—

Notwithstanding the stringency, however, general business throughout the province has been good. The population has largely increased with the natural consequences, increase in buildings and improvements, and with the unmatched harvest with which it has pleased an all-wise Providence to reward the labour of our farmers. The prospects of all classes of people in the province are better than ever before.

That is not very pessimistic, yet that is what the Lieutenant Governor of Alberta thinks. I said that my constituents sent me down here to congratulate the Government upon the splendid manner in which they have fulfilled their promises. There are some things that the farmers who have been coming down from Western Canada in recent years have been asking for. To be provincial for a moment, we have been asking for years for the extension of our boundaries; that is No. 1. We have been asking for a reduction of freight and express rates, we have been asking for a government system of terminal elevators and we have been asking for aid to agriculture, aid to roads and the Hudson's Bay railway. I think that hon. gentlemen on both sides will agree with me that these were the chief requisitions of the people who came down from Western Canada, and I say without fear of contradiction that not one of these requests was granted by our friends opposite. What about the extension of our boundaries? We were the little province of Manitoba for years, termed the postage stamp province. I said in this House before, and I want to repeat it, that I am not provincial. If we are to have a great country here we must get away from provincialism and must try to advocate what is in the best interests of the whole country no matter from whatever province we may come. But we did feel in Manitoba that we were not being treated with that fairness which we had a right to expect. We were the pioneer province out west and no one has a higher estimation of that western country than I have. I have lived in that country since 1882 and I have practically grown up with the people there, but yet I say that we are interdependent one upon the other in every part of this country. Manitoba, as I say, is the pioneer province. It is the province that taught the people that the western country was worth living in. It is the province that taught the people from Ontario and other parts of Canada who went into Saskatchewan and Alberta that what Manitoba had done could be done in these western provinces and it is being done to-day. We were kept down for many years to a province of 72,000 square miles, while Ontario on the east had 250,000 square miles, and Saskatchewan on the west had 250,000 square miles, the responsibility for which fact I lay at the door of hon. gentlemen opposite. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, for some reason or other—I am not going to say what—refused time and again to give us our rights and to extend our boundaries. But the people of this country said that they would formulate a new government, the Borden Government came into power in 1911, in 1912 our boundaries were extended and instead of having 72,000 square miles we have now 250,000 square miles, or a territory about equal to that of the province of Saskatchewan, and equal to what the province of Ontario had. That is one of the things that the farmers of Manitoba were asking for, and it is one of the things that they got from the present Government.

What about transportation? If you

could have heard the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) going through Souris, and no doubt other parts of the province, and talking about how terribly high freight rates are you might have thought that he really was in earnest in regard to the matter. The freight rates are too high yet. But let me ask him what his Government did to reduce the freight rates. They talked, and talked and talked, but so far as anything to the advantage of Western Canada is concerned they did nothing but talk. The Conservative Government attained power and in 1912 a delegation came from the West which presented a petition to the present Minister of Railways, who, in proper course, sent it to the late Chairman of the Railway Commission, Mr. Mabee, in the death of whom the country has sustained a great loss. There is on file a letter from Mr. Mabee stating that this petition was the first intimation he ever had received that the farmers of the West were asking for reduced freight rates. But the present Minister of Railways took further action. He referred the whole matter to the Railway Commission and the lawyers were appointed to represent the people before that commission and a remedy was demanded, and ever since the Railway Commission has been wrestling with the question. We have heard our friends opposite speaking a great deal about Mr. Cowan, who appeared before the commission on behalf of the provinces, and Mr. Cowan has proved himself a most efficient advocate of the rights of the people, and he has done good work for the Western provinces, but Mr. Cowan or no other man would ever have had opportunity to advocate reduced freight rates if the late Government had stayed in power. It was not until the Conservative Government took the helm of state that the Railway Commission was asked to take up seriously the disposal of this very important question. Then, with regard to express rates, Mr. Mabee stated in the communication to which I have referred that he had previously heard of the demand for the reduction of express rates, and although that matter came before the Railway Commission in 1904, it was not until 1910 that a decision was arrived at and then a report was made against the reduction of express rates in Canada. That was under the late Government; but, what did the present Government do? It has not been in power long, but it has had time to have the express rates dealt with and a reduction of twenty per cent made in these rates west of Sudbury. That is a very good beginning and no doubt other reductions will come in due course. But what will do more than anything else to reduce freight rates in Canada is the inauguration of the parcels post system by the present Government. So far as I know, we heard nothing of the parcels post system under the late Government, but we have heard considerable about it since the present Government came into power. I have no doubt that in inaugurating the parcels post system the Government is facing difficulties which the ordinary member of parliament and the people outside are unable to appreciate, but they have to encourage them the splendid success of the parcels post system in the United States. No doubt the Government of the United States instituted its parcels post system with many misgivings, but the results have been most satisfactory and no doubt far and away beyond the anticipation of the United States Government. I trust the parcels post system will be as successful in Canada as in the United States, and I believe more than anything else will its success enable us to get reduced express rates in Western Canada.

May I refer to the energetic action of this Government in prosecuting the Hudson Bay railway project? In every election from 1896 to 1911, while the Liberals were in power, they used it as a political football, and they were always promising to build the Hudson Bay railway, but that promise they never fulfilled. The position of the Hudson Bay railway, when the Liberals left power, was, that there were a few piers erected in the Saskatchewan river at The Pas, and that was all. But what is the position to-day? The Government now in power is rushing that railroad to completion with great energy; I believe the contracts have all been let, and that some 160 miles are graded. And not only that, but the Government is proceeding energetically with the construction of terminals at Hudson bay, so that everything may be ready when the railway comes to be operated. And, what are some of the Liberal papers (I hope not all of them) doing to-day? They are trying to prejudice what has been done by the Government to make possible the safe navigation of the Hudson bay, that body of water which I believe the good Lord put there for the benefit of the people of the prairie provinces, and especially the people of Saskatchewan and Alberta. The Liberal papers are complaining because out of ten or twelve ships sent to navigate these uncharted waters one or two have

met with misfortune and have not been able to entirely unload their cargoes. When we take into consideration the marvellous success the Government has had in the difficult work they have undertaken in connection with the Hudson Bay Railway project, it is a matter in respect to which every Canadian should feel proud.

Amongst some of the things to the credit of this Government, I might mention the enlargement of the boundaries of Manitoba, the reduction of freight rates and express rates, and the aid given to agriculture. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) spoke of the freight congestion in 1911, and the consequent loss sustained by the farmers of Manitoba through not being able to get their grain to the market. Of course, no fair-minded man should blame the present Government for the conditions which existed with respect to the crop of 1911, because the Government had only a short time before come to power and had not had the opportunity to provide facilities for the transportation of the crop of that year. But what about the conditions in 1912? The hon. member (Mr. Oliver) says that while there was great congestion in 1911 there was partial congestion in 1912, and for that small concession on his part I suppose we must be thankful. But the fact is that never before were there such facilities for the transportation of the grain crop as in 1913. There may have been a few points in the West which did not get all the cars they needed, but I do not believe there is a single man on either side of the House who will say there has been any real shortage of cars in the three prairie provinces in 1913, or that the grain crop was not expeditiously taken to market. Under the progressive and businesslike Government now in power, transportation facilities were improved and the farmers of the West reaped enormous advantages thereby. The western farmers asked for Government owned terminal elevators and under the efficient supervision of our Grain Commission one is in operation at Fort William, and internal terminal elevators are being erected at various points in the West. My hon. friend spent some time discussing free wheat, and told us what we had lost by not being able to ship our wheat to the United States. When he went through Macdonald, he said that we had lost from $1,000,000 to $5,000,000 because of that. That figure has grown since, until the other night he said we had lost from $5,000,000 to $8,000,000. He argues on the basis that every bushel of wheat shipped from western Canada would go across the border, which is certainly ridiculous. The farmers of Macdonald knew that it was ridiculous. My hon. friend went there in 1912. My friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) did not go then. There were reasons why he did not go—I mean no disparagement of him at all, but he did not go. This year he went, and my hon. friend from Edmonton went through that constituency talking about free food. In his speech on the 1st of December he says 'You must fight; when you see a head hit it.' Well, a head got hit, and it has not yet recovered. He went through the splendid constituency of Macdonald, and he said: We have got a new policy—it was so well put the other day—momentarily, a new policy for the moment. But he explained that policy of free food, told all about it, told about the terrible things that the present Government had done, and what the Liberal party would do for the people. Now the constituents of Macdonald are nearly all farmers. What was the result? What could be the result of a speech like that, a speech similar to that which he delivered before the House the other night, and which I trust you will all read carefully? What did the constituents of Macdonald do? They raised the previous majority of 784 to about 1,000. That was the result of this splendid speech, and the splendid arguments that you listened to the other night.

Mr. MACDONALD: Was there any talk about free wheat in Macdonald?

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Yes, there was talk about free wheat in Macdonald, and there was talk about protection in Pictou, and my hon. friend talks protection when he is down in Pictou.

Mr. MACDONALD: What did the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) say about free wheat?

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Well, I have nothing to do with the Minister of Public Works. If you ask him, he will tell you. He can take care of himself. He has been able to do so so far.

I want to say something with respect to agricultural education. Education is a good thing, no matter in what department it is, whether in regard to agriculture or engineering. This Government promises to give $10,000,000, at the rate of $1,000,000 a year, in aid of agricultural education. This Government will be derelict to their duty if they do not increase that sum before the end

of ten years to $50,000,000, and I believe that will be done.

I used to have conversations, in the House and out of it, with the late Minister of Agriculture. I said to him: 'Mr. Fisher, your experimental farms are good things, but I know from experience, living not very far from the experimental farm at Brandon, that they are not doing the work.' He said: 'Why?' 'Well,' I said, 'Mr. Fisher, it is because they are not reaching the people.' That is my opinion, but the people are somewhat to blame. The people should take advantage of these experimental farms; they should visit them, but, as a matter of fact, very few do so. Now what is this aid to agricultural education doing towards taking the work of the experimental farms to the people? We got this year, I think, about $50,000, and that, with the additional sum granted by the Provincial Government, has enabled the Minister of Agriculture of the province of Manitoba, Hon. George Lawrence, to establish in every local constituency that asks for it, a forty acre plot right in the neighbourhood of the people, where all classes of people, coming to town or going out of town, would pass by and thus see the results. To me that is a splendid example of affording agricultural education. If we wanted an example, we could refer to Belgium and France. Belgium farms produce $50,000,000 more annually than they did twenty-five years ago, at a cost, for every kind of agricultural education, of not more than $200,000 a year.

These are the things that the farmers came down here asking for, enlargement of boundaries, reduction of freight rates, reduction of express rates, Government owned terminal elevators, parcel post, aid to agricultural education and aid to roads. If I have heard the late Government condemned for any one thing more than another, except the navy, it has been for throwing out the Bill for good roads. One way of helping to reduce the high cost of living is to keep the men on the farms, the boys and girls on the farms. Nothing will keep the girls and boys on the farms more than to give them good roads. In the constituency of Souris the people have felt very keenly the fact that the Senate saw fit, under the direction of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to throw out the Highways Bill.

Mr. PROULX: Would the hon. member have confidence in the Manitoba Government to spend the money properly?

[Mr. Schaffner].

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Why, certainly. Is there anybody on earth who has not confidence in the Manitoba Government?

Mr. PROULX: Why did not the hon. gentleman induce the Government to accept the Senate amendment?

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I think I have shown that this Government has been the Government of action, the Government that has helped our western people. Do you wonder that I come down here so delighted, bearing with me the congratulations of both Grits and Tories in the constituency of Souris for the splendid work this Government has done in helping that great country?

I am not going to say very much about the high cost of living. In my opinion, an editorial in this morning's Citizen has summed up the causes of the high cost of living fairly well. It speaks of what the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) says, as follows:

> With wider and truer view he enumerated other contributory causes which have large influence in creating the present unfavourable living conditions, and which must be reckoned with by those who are seeking economic rather than political advancement. The drain of the people from the land to the city has decreased agricultural production, and thereby raised the cost of food. It is well known that by far too great a margin exists between what the producer receives and what the consumer pays, and that much of it is due to the lack of scientific and co-operative principles as applied to agriculture.

I believe that that is an exceedingly strong point. There is to-day too much difference between what the producer gets and what the consumer pays. What we want in this country, and what I believe the western farmers are working for, is a co-operative system by which existing conditions can be remedied, at least to a considerable extent.

> It must be apparent to all careful thinkers that every non-producer, whether rich or poor, is a direct burden upon the community. It could be shown that the demands of the people to-day have far outrun their financial ability to pay, or their economic ability, under present conditions, to create.

This thought is, I think, worthy of consideration. People to-day are too extravagant.

> The importance of the free food cry of the Liberals has been greatly exaggerated. It has been cunningly devised as a vote-getter for a general election yet ahead. In spite of the fact that the Liberals for fifteen years allowed the general tariff to remain practically untouched, until it was attacked in the desperation of an impending defeat, they are now declaring that it is the cause of the high cost of living.

And so on. The article concludes by referring to the land monopoly in connection with the high cost of living. There is no question about the fact that the land speculator and the subdivision man has done Manitoba and the West a great deal of harm, and I would like to see something done, by legislation or otherwise, to remedy this evil. It may be said that if a man wants to buy, he has a right to do so, but if I had time I could relate some very sad experiences of persons who have bought subdivisions in western Canada.

Just a word about the navy. What I have to say about my constituency—and I have lived in it for 27 years—is this: During the past year I have gone up and down among my people, and I never in my life saw such evidences of humiliation as exist in the constituency of Souris at the present time because the Senate thought fit to refuse to do something for the British Empire. This Government tried its best to relieve the British taxpayer, and eighty per cent at least of the people of Souris are absolutely in sympathy with the policy of the present Administration in regard to the navy. It has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite that the policy of the Government was a permanent policy, but I would call attention to what the right hon. Prime Minister said in Toronto:

> I do not advocate—I have never advocated a policy of permanent contributions. We propounded no such policy, but propose under urgent conditions to build, to own—

That is another thing hon. gentlemen opposite like to dwell upon. They are fond of saying that we were giving the ships to the British Admiralty. We were doing nothing of the kind; the ships were to be ours. The right hon. Prime Minister said again and again that when in the future a permanent policy was inaugurated, those ships would be ours; they could be recalled and used in accordance with whatever policy the Government might see fit to establish.

> —to own and to utilize for the common defence of the empire three battleships which will be in the fighting line in the day of peril.

I do not know about other constituencies, but I can tell hon. gentlemen that my constituency was mighty anxious that we should have an election on that important point. I cannot understand why my friends opposite, only on the ground of political partisanship, should refuse to do something to help Great Britain. Do we remember today that we are the largest and the oldest of the overseas dominions of the British Empire? Australia, New Zealand, far-away India, South Africa, and even little Newfoundland, have done at least something to relieve the British taxpayer, but we have done nothing. As I have said the people of my constituency feel very deeply the humiliation of having done nothing to help that great empire of which we are so important a part, and upon which the sun never sets; that great empire whose flag, whose ships and whose sons have carried the great ideals of justice and fairplay across every ocean and into every port. Yet we stand idle here to-day because a partisan Senate refused to permit us to do our little share in assisting this great empire.

I set out to prove, and I believe I have done so, that this Government has been the friend of the West, and just so long as they continue that way, whether through myself or through someone else, they will have the support of the constituency of Souris. They have got to walk straight, for the people out there are a mighty independent people, but the Government will have their support if they continue as at present and proceed to fulfil and carry out the good work they have begun.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester, N.B.): It is my pleasant duty to offer my tribute of appreciation of the speech delivered by the mover of the Address (Mr. McLeod) who comes from the same province as myself; a man who has won for himself a reputation in the province of New Brunswick. The hon. gentleman had risen high in the estimation of his people, having for four or five years held the position of solicitor general under the administration of the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and had been more recently promoted to the higher position of provincial secretary. He has delivered in this House a speech in which he has well maintained the reputation he acquired in the province from which he comes and which is now extended throughout the Dominion of Canada. In entering the sphere of Dominion politics, because of the high position he held in the provincial government, no doubt he made a sacrifice, but it was a sacrifice for which he may have some compensation in the fact that he will come in closer touch with his former premier, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Certainly I have every reason to give expression to my appreciation of the able manner in which the hon. gentleman acquitted himself of the duty which has been allotted to him by the Prime Minister of Canada. It has been his good

fortune to have received the felicitations of the great statesman of Canada who leads this Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

I wish, as I come from one of the smaller provinces of this great Dominion, to call your attention and the attention of the House to one of the first remarks of the mover of the Address, the hon. member for York (Mr. McLeod), in reference to redistribution, the subject which forms perhaps the most vital part of the speech from the Throne. The hon. member for York has expressed his views upon the principle of representation by population in this House of Commons. He has not altogether expressed the views which some from the Maritime provinces have urged in the past. Owing to unforeseen events since the Fathers of Confederation adopted the system of representation by population, we are to lose some of our representation. My hon. friend has admitted that we have no legal status, but he intimated that something might be done in sympathy with our position. I thought we might have learned that it was his intention or that the suggestion might have been made to him that in the Redistribution Bill some possible remedy might be introduced for the province of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, which has not yet been defined, but which might possibly again be found a just cause for the postponement of the Redistribution Bill for another session, if we are not to have an election this summer. I for one have always entertained the opinion that it is better for the Maritime provinces, for the smaller bodies of this Dominion, to be very careful before departing from any of the fundamental principles of the British North America Act. I know that these views are supported in the province of New Brunswick by men of the most intelligent class in that province. They feel that the future development of this country depends not on such questions as representation in Parliament, but upon the development of the resources of this great country, to which there is no limit, and I, standing in the province of New Brunswick, viewing our great harbours, through which will flow the products of the great West, feel just as much pride as does the farmer in the West who surveys every morning his endless wheat fields from which he will reap a crop which will be the astonishment of other countries. We should cease finding fault with the Fathers of Confederation, more especially as the Fathers of Confederation, in anticipation of the preponderance of the West in the future, did not confine the Maritime provinces or the smaller provinces to representation in this House alone, but provided that they should have a fixed representation in the Upper Chamber, in the Senate, in compensation for the sacrifices which the Fathers of Confederation from the Maritime provinces had to make for their people, and that representation in the Upper Chamber is just as essential to us as our representatives in the House of Commons. Our representation in the Senate is to be equal to that of Ontario or that of Quebec, or of all the western provinces combined, and therefore I find reason to believe that the Fathers of Confederation had foreseen the marvellous future development of the West. Twenty-five or thirty years before Confederation, Joseph Howe, from the city of Halifax, foresaw a new British Empire in those prairies of the West, together with the great resources of British Columbia, and was predicting that, perhaps before the century was over, the centre of the empire would be transferred to the very middle land of Canada between the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock

Mr. TURGEON: When you left the Chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the fathers of Confederation had provided the Maritime provinces with a permanent representation in the Senate in compensation for the loss of their representation in this House; but it is not the representatives in the Senate alone nor the representatives in this House, but the combined representation in both chambers that forms the Parliament of Canada. Although I feel sorry as a Canadian for this loss in the Maritime representation, it is not due to the British North America Act, nor is it due to the lack of vision on the part of the fathers of Confederation, for Sir Charles Tupper himself said at the time of Confederation that the only way in which he could compensate the Maritime provinces was by giving to them permanent representation in the Senate. Whatever the circumstances are we shall have to stand by them, we shall have to suffer in the interests of the constitution. Sacrifices have often been made by minorities in the interests of the constitution and as a New Brunswick man I know that our province has had to make many concessions in order that the fundamental principles of Confederation should not be disturbed, and I am again willing to submit with resignation for the sake of the

Constitution. We are hearing a great deal about the Senate just now. It was the wisdom of the fathers of Confederation that created that upper chamber, whose duty it is not only to undo, if it sees fit, any legislation the lower house may pass, but more particularly it was created to protect the minorities in the Dominion of Canada. I have faith in that body, and I believe the smaller provinces, as well as all minorities will always receive from it the justice and protection to which they are entitled. The Catholic minority in the province of Ontario has always enjoyed through the Upper Chamber due representation and similarly with the province of New Brunswick, whose Catholic minorities (English and Irish) are not represented in this House to-day. But through the Senate these Catholic minorities have their representation. Therefore, I say that if you wish to change the representation of the smaller provinces, you must change the representation of both chambers of Parliament. I maintain that to overthrow the principle of representation by population would be to destroy wittingly or unwittingly the Act of Confederation itself. We all know that without the admittance of that principle there would have been no such thing as Confederation. Ontario and Quebec would never have consented to it, and the Maritime provinces who were called upon to make a great sacrifice received as compensation the Intercolonial railway which has proved to be the greatest factor in uniting the East and West. The newspapers carried on an agitation urging that the Martitime provinces would not get fair representation, but those newspapers were not giving correct reports to their readers.

I have always been advocating the acceptance of the Act of Confederation as it is for the people of New Brunswick and of the other Maritime provinces. I do not wish to take up the time of the House by giving quotations but at the same time I speak with conviction. This is a question to which I have given close study all my lifetime and the more I consider the question and the progress of the country, the more I consider the progress of the West, the more am I convinced year after year, that it would be committing suicide for the people of the Maritime provinces to undertake to tinker with the principle of representation in this House. If we commence to interfere with or treat lightly the fundamental principles of our Confederation, we do not know what the consequences may be. Since Confederation we have been inviting people by millions to come to our land and we have been guaranteeing them that permanence of constitution and happiness that it was the view of the fathers of Confederation to secure. We have shown them the permanence of our constitution, we have pointed to our aspiration to become a great Canadian nation under the British flag and we do not wish to give these people to-day the pretence of a change which would certainly react to the detriment of all localities in Canada. It is by the principle of permanency that we are going to build up this nation. That was the great consideration of the Fathers of Confederation and it was with that object in view that the Act of Confederation was framed. To-day we are living happy and contented and if we wish to be happy and contended we must endeavour to keep true the principles which actuated the framers of our constitution. A great many of us in the Maritime provinces are willing to make some sacrifices in order to contribute to the permanence, happiness and contentment of Canada as a great nation under the British flag.

There was only one way in which an amendment to the constitution could be made that could justify Parliament in making a change. The way was a reference to an Interprovincial conference. The only way in which a change in the status, of a province can be made is by securing the consent of that province to it. No change can be made in the status of any number of provinces without the consent of each province. Every province is interested in the representation of Canada, every province is interested in that principle and, therefore, the united demand of all the provinces of Canada for a change in the constitution alone can possibly effect such a change. It is the only thing that can justify a request by this Parliament for such a change in the constitution. We have had different conferences; we had one as recently as last October or November. The Premiers of the Maritime provinces—I am sorry to say in one way—submitted the question of representation to the Interprovincial conference in October in the Capital of Canada. They were not able to agree at the Provincial conference with regard to the representation of the Maritime provinces and therefore that ended the question. That is the only way; no other method would be practicable. That was the way which was adopted by the right hon. leader of the Opposition

(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when he was leading this Government. The provinces for some years had been clamouring for an increase in their subsidies, asking for more money to spend on their roads and upon education and this demand came more particularly from the Maritime provinces. Before changing the principle with regard to provincial subsidies the Prime Minister of that day (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) called an Interprovincial conference composed of the Premiers of all the provinces of the Dominion and he told them that if they agreed upon one principle the Government would ask the Imperial Parliament to make a change based upon such agreement. They came to an agreement and the policy laid down by the Prime Minister of that day was carried out. But the premiers of the provinces, during the conference last October, were not able to agree upon such a principle. We have had some reference during the present discussion to the question of subsidies. The premiers agreed upon the necessity of granting further subsidies to the Maritime provinces, but there is nothing in the speech from the Throne which mentions that part of the proceedings of the Interprovincial Conference. I would have been pleased to have seen something in the speech from the Throne giving some hope that that part of the proceedings of the Interprovincial Conference would be looked into. Such an announcement may, let us hope, come before the end of the session. I sincerely hope that it will, but so far we are at a loss to know whether the Government of the day is willing to entertain the unanimous recommendation of the premiers of the provinces for an increase of these subsidies.

Meanwhile, do not think that I am indifferent to the position which may be created for the provinces by this diminution of representation. Perhaps if I were to view this question from a party standpoint I might say—although I do not say it with the intention of blaming the Government in advance—that it is most likely that it will be the Liberal party that will be affected most seriously by the change of representation owing to the Act of Confederation. Meanwhile we are willing to submit to it. It is not with indifference that I take up that point and recommend it to my fellow countrymen and to the people of the Maritime provinces in whatever position they may be. In anticipation of the possibility that the representation might be decreased in certain portions of the Dominion, the fathers of Confederation inserted a provision in the British North America Act guaranteeing as far as possible the representation which the provinces acquired at the time of their entrance into Confederation. It is provided by section 51 of the British North America Act that:

> On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained, at the then last census, to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards.

This means that although the Maritime provinces might not perhaps possess the unit of representation made necessary by the unit of representation in the province of Quebec, there is still the safeguard that unless the population of the provinces is diminished by more than one-twentieth as compared with the figures of the preceding census—not with the first census taken after Confederation, or after two or three decades, but the last census—these provinces shall keep the representation which they possessed at the time. Therefore, I wish to call the attention of the Government to that point. It is more particularly in order to call the attention of the ministers and of the members of any committtee which may be formed to look into a redistribution of seats in this House that I have undertaken to speak on that question this evening.

I ask the Prime Minister, who represents Nova Scotia, and I ask the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen), who represents New Brunswick, to take care that they safeguard the interests of their native provinces, and, if in the computation to be made there is any chance of one member holding his seat in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia by the operation of this saving clause in the British North America Act, then I ask that it be applied. I know that our population is very close to the necessary number and I trust that the computation may be carefully made so that we shall be justly dealt with. There can be no object in delaying further the introduction of the Redistribution Bill and pressing it to a conclusion at the present session. If only one-half of the people in the Maritime provinces, who are in the United States to-day, had stayed at home, we would have the necessary number of people to give us full representation in this Parliament. We have invited the citizens of the world to come to our shores and we have filled up the West, but in time to come that huge volume of

immigration must lessen or cease altogether, and then, when in the future we have to depend upon the natural increase of population, I believe the Maritime provinces will be able to maintain the standard of representation which was allotted to them at Confederation. We have been in a rather unfortunate position in the Maritime provinces, because in the early days of Confederation when wooden ships were superseded by steel ships, thousands of our people were thrown out of employment at home and they had to seek their means of livelihood in the United States.

Let me say, Sir, that I look with hope to the day when the island of Newfoundland will be included in the Dominion of Canada and when will be consummated that grand idea of rounding out the union of all the British people in North America. I urge upon every member of the House the importance of securing by all proper means the inclusion of Newfoundland in Confederation, for our benefit as well as for the benefit of Canada, and especially of the Maritime provinces. The interests of the Maritime provinces and the interests of Newfoundland are cognate in many respects, and should the ancient colony come into Confederation with a representation of ten or twelve members in this House, and her share of representation in the Senate, then, Sir, the Maritime provinces would become a powerful entity in this Parliament. I quite understand that to induce Newfoundland to enter Confederation is not an easy task now, but I do regret that the efforts in the past which at one time seemed near to being crowned with success proved futile, and especially do I regret it because of the fact that on one occasion only a sum of half a million dollars stood in the way, a sum which to the Dominion of Canada at the present day is of comparatively small account. Now that we are thinking of establishing a navy, the inclusion of Newfoundland with its hardy maritime population becomes a matter of prime importance. I know of my own personal knowledge that the best people in Newfoundland, the professional men, the clergy of all denominations, are educating the people of that island to appreciate that the destiny of their colony is to become one of the provinces of this prosperous Dominion. For my part I would rather see New Brunswick or Nova Scotia represented here by ten or eleven members, holding their seats by the strength of the constitution, than by thirteen members holding their seats by the charity of the West or the sympathy of Canada. We want to be here by the right of the people and the right of the constitution. We do not want to be here otherwise. We do not want to encroach upon any principle of the constitution, nor do we want to encroach upon the rights of any other province of the Dominion of Canada. I hope that after this debate is concluded the Government will bring down the Redistribution Bill. I expect that the redistribution will be made in all fairness to every party and every province. The Government, in bringing down this measure, will at least be acting according to the constitution, as it should have been done last year, if not two years ago. According to the constitution it should have been done immediately after the figures of the census were obtained, so that the country might be ready for an election.

After speaking in regard to immigration, my hon. friend the mover of the Address (Mr. McLeod) spoke of the Transcontinental railway as it affects New Brunswick. He spoke of the Transcontinental railway having been brought down through the middle of the province of New Brunswick as a great mistake. While I am on this question of redistribution, I must say that this railway is of advantage for this very reason alone, the increase of our population, the opening of our territory to the people in order to bring more population to the centre of the province. New Brunswick has its population to-day merely scattered along the boundaries of the province between Nova Scotia round the north shore, and between the province of Quebec and the state of Maine. We have immense areas of virgin forest lands which have seen no homes yet. By introducing the railway to the centre of the province we are opening up that portion of the province to the lumbering interests and the farming interests, and are thus bringing in many people. We have increased our population already by bringing the Transcontinental railway to the centre of the province. That was one of the considerations which, I remember, the right hon. the leader of the Government of that day (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) took into account, namely, that it would bring more population to New Brunswick, which we desired so much, and which we needed to retain our representation.

I shall not speak of the other advantages, which would accrue to the provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island as well, by the building of a branch line from either one point or another to St. John, New Brunswick. It would connect St. John

by the centre as well as by the other route. It seems strange to me that the hon. member for York (Mr. McLeod) blames the Government of that day so much, because the railway has gone through the centre of the province of New Brunswick, a province the interest of which I am sure he has as much at heart as myself. He ought to see that the representation, the very principle upon which he is working to-day, would be greatly benefited by the increase of population in that district.

He has spoken of the forests which were destroyed by fire owing to the railroad going through. Railroads go through other forests in the Maritime provinces and through other forest areas in Canada. At the same time, I would sooner see the immense forest area of New Brunswick in danger of fire caused by railroads than see it without any railroad at all, because, if the railroad was to set fire to the forest traversed by it, you would be sure to have quick communication and speedy assistance, and you would be able to control the fire; whereas you have not been able to do that in large forests where there is no communication of any kind. In northern New Brunswick, before the building of the Intercolonial, you had the Miramichi fire, which destroyed millions and millions of feet of lumber of the best quality. There was no railroad, no communication, and you had to wait until the elements were able to subdue the activity of the fire. Since the Intercolonial has been built fires have done some small damage, but they have been stopped at once, and the same would happen in the centre of the province.

My hon. friend from York (Mr. McLeod), who moved the Address, is a man of many virtues and good qualities. He is a man who recognizes no limitations; and as the speech from the Throne was not big enough for his ambition, he would not be bound by its subjects, but went further afield. He discussed the Highways Bill of last session and the session before. Following what we have heard from the other side of the House during last session, he has blamed the Senate for having killed the Highways Bill, which was to be so beneficial to the province of New Brunswick, from which he comes, as well as to the other provinces. As I said a short time ago, it was merely in the exercise of one of their protective functions, the protection of provincial rights, the protection of the Constitution, that the Senate made an amendment which would have rendered the Bill constitutional, which would have made it fair to every province in the Dominion, and which would have preserved the rights of provincial governments, whether Conservative or Liberal. The Senate has the custody of the rights of the provinces under the Constitution, and the Constitution states positively that road-building and road-structure belong to the provinces. We only asked that they be left to the provinces, and an amendment to that effect was moved on this side of the House. The right hon. the leader of the Government replied that it was his intention to do so. We asked him to put his intentions in black and white in the Bill. The Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals refused to do that. The Bill went to the Senate, and a majority of the Senate took the same ground as we did and added the same amendment. It is said that the majority was a servile majority. If there was any servility, it was servility to the Constitution.

No senator would be true to his mission unless he intelligently and conscientiously exercised that function when he felt it his duty to do so. The Senate put the matter down in black and white; the Bill was referred back to this House, and the amendment was rejected by the Government. It would be better for the provinces to wait a year or two than that the money should be given them against the provisions of the constitution. The hon. member for York (Mr. McLeod) said that it would have been a great benefit to the farmers of his province to have obtained that money for the improvement of their roads. The matter was debated in this House, and I do not wish to go over it again, but I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that while the Minister of Railways and Canals and the right hon. the Prime Minister said that the money would be distributed to the provinces according to their population and under their own supervision, when the Bill went to the Senate the representative of the Government in that body put upon the Bill an interpretation different from that of the Prime Minister and of the Minister of Railways and Canals. Mr. Senator Lougheed, who addressed the Senate on behalf of the Government side on May 22, 1913, as reported in the Senate Debates, page 661, had this to say:

> It seems to me that hon. gentlemen who have been performing the role of critics of this Bill have a very great misconception of the policy, the nature and the origin of the Bill.

Hon. gentlemen seem to be obsessed, if I may use that term in its more courteous sense, with the idea that a great constitutional wrong has been done not only to the province but to the Senate of Canada by the Government in the introduction of this Bill. Hon. gentlemen seem to be equally obsessed by the idea that a very great discourtesy has been extended by the Government of Canada to the Senate on account of their failure to attach that importance which certain gentlemen think should be attached to this amendment which the Senate made to the Bill last year. If hon. gentlemen will look at the preamble of the Bill they should come to a different conclusion than that which they apparently have arrived at as the object of this Bill. If they will observe the language in the preamble of the Bill they will find that this is not a local undertaking. This has not for its object the improvement of roads in a particular municipality, or group of municipalities. It is not intended for a moment that this assistance should be given to the ordinary highway in a local sense. . . . . Then I direct the attention of hon. gentlemen to the first clause of the Bill in which this is entitled the Canadian Highways Improvement Act. A proper distinction should be drawn between the Bill and the meaning which hon. gentlemen are disposed to attach to it. Hon. gentlemen seem to think that the Government of the day in its generosity has suddenly come to the conclusion that municipalities should be helped and that the provinces should be helped only so far as the development of local highways is concerned. But there is a larger object than that in view. The Government has the object in view set out in the preamble of the Bill. I maintain that while highways in their local sense are peculiarly provincial undertakings, that this is more than a provincial undertaking. This is an interprovincial and national undertaking and does not come within that class of cases referred to by my hon. friends, and particularly the hon. gentleman from De Lorimer, who cited to us last night section 92 of the British North America Act, in which he sought to bring this undertaking under subsection 10 of section 92, and within the language 'local works and undertakings.'

Another interpretation, therefore, was placed upon the Bill by a member of the Government in the Senate: an interpretation which had not been given in this House, and which would seem to make it impossible for the farmers living along the byways and byroads of any of the provinces to have obtained the benefit of a single dollar of that money if the Bill had passed and the money had been appropriated according to the views of the hon. gentleman of the Senate from whose remarks I have quoted. I ask the hon. member for York, who pitied the farmers of his constituency because they have not been given that money, would that money have been of any benefit to his friends the farmers of York, or to the farmers of Gloucester, Queens and Sunbury, or any of the other portions of the province? It is not the farmer who lives within a few miles of a town or city who need this money the most; it is those who have to go from ten to twelve miles over roads that are sometimes impassable, who should obtain the benefit of any money to be appropriated for the improvement of roads. If the recommendation of the Interprovincial Conference is put into effect by this Government, the money given to the provincial governments will be used on behalf of the farmers who particularly want it, and therefore it will pay the farmers to have waited a year or two to get the money in the way they want it.

There are other considerations which demand the attention of the people of this country. We have heard a great deal during the last few years about reciprocity with the United States. We know that the arrangement which was made by the late Government did not meet with the sanction of the people on September 21, 1911. Although the majority of the people, for many causes and because of many influences, did not appear to approve that policy at that time, I still maintain with all respect that the verdict of the people was a popular error—an error for which the people of Canada have already repented, and which they are ready to repair at the earliest opportunity. I am convinced, although the verdict of the people was against reciprocity, that if the question had been given a fair trial; if the reciprocity pact alone had been considered; if the question had not been diverted by other considerations, the result would have been different. In the meantime, things have changed. The United States has taken action, and in this country we are confronted with conditions which have changed considerably during the last few years. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has made an offer, as leader of the Liberal party—a leader who has always stood by the principles of true Liberalism—he has told the people of Canada in a speech at Hamilton that he would advocate, free food for Canada—that is food free from customs duties. The Minister of Finance, the day before yesterday, did not consider very favourably the proposition; he did not, in my estimation, treat it with the seriousness and the consideration with which he should have treated it as coming from the greatest Canadian statesman of the day. Meanwhile, under the circumstances in which we are situated, with an increasing cost of living and with a great number of our working men out of employment, my right hon. friend, in his

9 p.m.

policy of free food or food free from duty for the masses of the people of Canada, has a determined follower in the person of the member from Gloucester. They say: but you have been promising the farmers of Canada a larger market. Yes, we have been promising the farmers a large market and we would have given them the greatest market that any country can look for, a market of ninety five millions of people, which was refused to them by the erroneous policy of the Government supporters in defeating the reciprocity agreement. To-day the right hon. leader of the Opposition appealed for free food for the people and the Minister of Finance says: What effect would it have on conditions? He says that the tariff is not the cause of the increased cost of living. It is not the only cause but it is certainly one of the causes and one of those causes which can be removed at any moment by the action, not of this Parliament, but of the Cabinet itself by the removal of the prevailing duty on wheat and flour. It will not remedy everything but it will remedy one great burden which weighs on the shoulders of the people, more particularly on the working classes who, like the farmers, earn their bread and the bread of their families by the sweat of their brows, the workingmen in the factories, the men on the railroads, the men in the merchant marine of Canada, the men working at days wages. During the last fiscal year the workingmen have paid into the treasury of Canada an amount of over $10,000,000 of duty upon food introduced into Canada for the sustenance of the Canadian people. You must add to that $10,000,000, as was well illustrated by the scientific member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), the other day, a profit of 25 per cent or 33 per cent which the importer will add to the cost of the food he imports and then you have another $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 to add to that $10,000,000. There is, therefore, in the customs duty upon food for the masses of the people of Canada during a portion of the year, the winter season, when the supply of food from Canada is bound to get short, $13,000,000 that, by the removal of the duty, you can spare to the people and more particularly to the class of wage earners. That class compose the largest portion of the population and they also consume the largest quantity of food products. The poor man has at his table a larger number to feed than the rich man and, therefore, though his table may be more modestly served, it is as expensively served as the table of the rich man with two or three children, and while you save $15,000,000 or $16,000,000 for the people you have done something towards reducing the high cost of living. This is particularly necessary in a period of depression in business and in trade, when you have a lack of work in Toronto, Montreal, Regina and every other city in the Dominion. Under these circumstances, certainly one of the best remedies that can be employed and one which can be applied at once is the removal of the duties on food stuffs, and then we can look for other remedies.

The Minister of Finance talks of education and he says his Government did a great deal last year because it voted $1,000,000 for the education of the farmers of Canada. I submit that the farmers of Canada need, in many respects, more education, but that cannot be done in six months, in three months or in three years. It is a matter of time to give education to the the farmers, and it will have to be made permanent and to be made effectual. The hon. member told the House that his Government had been ahead of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in this respect. He ignores the fact that four years ago the Liberal party and Liberal Government created that Commission on Technical Education which has gone around the world and is preparing a report which I am sure, when it is published, will command the admiration of the people of Canada and will result in the establishment of a real system of technical education for farmers as well as for mechanics. But all of that will take time, that is, for the generation that is growing. It is not a remedy for the conditions of to-day. However, I claim that the Liberal Government must be given the credit of having appointed that Commission in consideration of the conditions existing in Canada. They say that production is not sufficient to meet consumption. I admit it, but the best way to increase production would be to give a market, and, four years ago, the Liberal party, under the supervision of its devoted and admired chief, asked the country to accept an agreement with the greatest market in the world, the United States, by which our people would have all the market that would be required at any moment, and that market would have benefited the people of the West as well as those of the East.

But they say that by that agreement Canada would have lost its fiscal independence. Are we British subjects? If we are British

subjects, if there is any British spirit in any Canadian, he will never lose his fiscal independence any more than he will lose his loyalty to the flag we all revere. Lose our fiscal independence! Look to-day and compare the agreement of 1911 between Mr. Fielding and ex-President Taft with the tariff that the United States, looking only to their own interest, have adopted for themselves. It is in their own interest that they have made a new tariff, they have not looked to Canada but to themselves, and we find that the pact agreed upon by both the Canadian Government and the United States Government would have given Canada a great many more advantages than Canada secures by the tariff framed by the United States looking solely to their own interests. Therefore I claim that conditions have changed in Canada to-day owing to the enlightenment of the new President of the United States. I claim that the people of the West would have saved over $20,000,000 if the reciprocity treaty had gone through. To my mind its defeat has contributed very largely to the condition prevailing to-day.

I heard with interest the hon. member for Edmonton say the other night that but for the reduced duty on oats going into the United States the people of the western provinces where the crop of oats this year has been immense, would have made a dead loss. It was the reduction of duty that saved the farmers of Alberta and Saskatchewan. But supposing the six cents duty were taken off altogether, what a difference that would make.

The revision of the American tariff has been an immense relief to the people of this country; but there is one thing the farmers of the West want, and that is the removal of the duty on wheat going into the United States. It is up to the Government to open that market to the farmers of the West. They can do it at any moment by simply removing the duty on American wheat. If that had been done this year the people of the West would have shipped their immense crop of wheat across the border and made bigger profits. The Argentine Republic was quick to remove its duty on wheat in order to get the benefit of the American market and are we behind the Argentine? I do not wish to be severe in my remarks but I must say I cannot understand the attitude of the Government in maintaining the duty on American wheat. If it were removed now it would at once let free the immense amount of wheat in the elevators and granaries of the West. The Minister of Public Works told the electors in the constituency of Macdonald last December that the Government would consider the advisability of removing the duty on wheat. Is it possible that the 13 or 14 wise men of Canada have taken that matter into consideration and have not been led to the conclusion that it was to the advantage of the West that that duty should be removed? They will not take advice from their best friends, not even from Premier Roblin of Manitoba. They would not take advice from the Conservative members from Alberta who came here a few days ago with a resolution from their friends in that province. It would seem however, that they must have left the resolution in the train, because, as soon as they get here they vote a motion of confidence in their present leader. I addressed several meetings in my constituency before coming up here—I do so every year—and let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of my country in expressing their desire for free food were voicing the opinions of all the farmers of Canada. What we want is large markets which would benefit both the working classes and the farmers. When we claim larger markets for the farmers we claim also the reduction or elimination of the duties on farm implements. The farmers to-day are expecting that more particularly since they became rich had the advantage of that great market which should have been placed at their disposal a few years ago. When you tax the farmer for his implements, for any article of necessity he has to purchase for the maintenance of his family—boots and clothing for himself, his wife and his children—you increase the cost of living, whereas, if you free these articles from taxes you decrease the cost of living and it is by this policy that we can ensure greater happiness to all classes of the community. I repeat that I stand here to-day a determined supporter of my right hon. leader, that the population of Gloucester county sent me here at the last election by a thousand majority and that they are prepared to send me here again with 2,000 majority. We are advocating to-day as strongly as ever, and more strongly than ever, that change of which I speak. It is not because we have been defeated once that we are going to abandon our principles and change our views. We were for larger markets before, we are still for larger markets and we will be in opposition as we were in the Government for larger markets and not till the Government of the day sanctions our policy or gives free food to the people of Canada and opens

the markets of the United States for the wheat and oats of the people of the West will we cease to proclaim the necessity of removing these burdens from the shoulders of the people. They say that the people of the West should go into mixed farming but I believe that the people of the West have gone very largely into the mixed farming of late. We saw published the other day a statement of the immense crop of the West. It is composed not only of the wheat that they have been growing in Saskatchewan and Alberta but also of millions of bushels of oats, barley and flax. Considering that they have been settled only for thirty or thirty-five years, which is a short period in the life of a country, they have made remarkably good progress in mixed farming. While I am a free trader in principle and theory I know that you cannot bring in absolute free trade all at once, but when our friends opposite, because they were accidentally transferred to the other side of the House by the vote of September, 1911, say, that the Liberal party has done nothing towards free trade, I say that under the tariff revision of 1897 there were changes which were notable not so much for the volume of the decrease in the tariff as for the decreases which were made in the rates upon articles required by the mass of the people.

The introduction of the British preference was a great step towards free trade, it was a great step in favour of the farmers of Canada who have to buy a number of articles imported from Great Britain or else from the United States, and if a farmer buys an article from Great Britain in consequence of the lowering of the tariff against that article, which he would otherwise have purchased in the United States, it is an advantage to the country, and it is also an advantage to those poor workers in the British Isles, who are receiving so much sympathy at the hands of the Conservative party to-day in connection with this talk about a contribution, but who never get much sympathy from them when we are talking of purchasing articles from them at a lower rate of tariff. If in this country it is desired to decrease the cost of living without at the same time hurting the manufacturer, let the manufacturer be inspired by the sentiments which inspire the manufacturers of France and Germany; let them so improve the processes of manufactures that they will be able to produce at a cheaper rate than they have ever been able to do before. If we lower the cost of production we lower the price at which the article can be sold in the country, and if an article is sold at a reasonably low price, or as low as it can be sold, the better it is for the home manufacturer, because the manufacturers of other countries are not so interested in trying to fill the markets here with their own goods, and therefore look for markets elsewhere.

There is another subject which was discussed by my hon. friend the mover of the Address; I refer to that great question of a contribution. He also joined the concert on the other side in stating that Canada had been humiliated by the position of the Liberal majority in the Senate, which had in a sense objected to the passing of the Naval Contribution Bill granting $35,000,000 with which to build three dreadnoughts as our contribution to the British navy. I do not wish to speak at length on that question, as I had occasion to give my views to this Parliament and to Canada with regard to it last session, but let me tell you again that I see no humiliation for Canada in the position taken by the Senate in asking the Government not to pass that Bill before an appeal is taken to the people, and to put into execution the promise which was given by the right hon. leader of the Government himself when he introduced his measure, and also before he introduced it. He stated publicly upon his return from England that he would introduce the Bill, and that if Parliament did not grant the money he would appeal to the people. The Senate said: Appeal to the people first, and if you are sustained by the people we will vote your Bill. We are told we have brought about national humiliation because the members on this side of the House did not agree to endorse the changed views of the ministers and their supporters with regard to the navy, but when we remember that in 1909 they were in harmony with us in suggesting a Canadian navy and protesting against the contribution, it is not to be wondered at that we were not able to swallow the altered views of the Government. And if these gentlemen opposite thought our action led to humiliation of the empire, why have they not brought on an election to test the feelings of the people of Canada. Where is there an emergency to-day; why have they not sought the opinion of the electorate? Let

me point out that the people of England, as represented by the First Lord of the Admiralty, have not looked upon the action of this Parliament as a humiliation. The Hon. Winston Churchill, speaking in the English House of Commons on the 16th of July last, after the prorogation of this Parliament, said:

> Although the Naval Aid Bill was rejected, the question of Canada participating in her own defence and in that of the empire is by no means dead. Whether we read the speeches of members of the Government or of the Opposition we see that although there are differences of opinion and method, and although the matter is one of party disputation, there is an overwhelming consensus of opinion that action should be taken and that soon.

Mr. Churchill knows that there was an overwhelming expression of opinion that action should be taken by Canada, and that it was only a difference of method between the Liberals and Conservatives, which difference of method was because of the withdrawal of the Conservative party from the Naval Service Act, to which they had given their adherence two years previously. Mr. Churchill went on to say:

> The position is not yet clear, and I am very much inclined to think that harm rather than good may result from our attempt to debate it much in public. Canada is absolute mistress of her own destiny. Although I cannot attempt to forecast the course to be finally decided by Canada, I think that these speeches taken by themselves, apart from all other public and private information plainly show that the question of Canada taking effective part in the general naval defence of the empire is by no means closed, and we have no right to assume at present that we are to be left to face the emergencies of the future unaided and left to bear the whole burden alone.

Later on, Mr. Churchill said:

> By next year, however, it is probable that the Canadian situation will have defined itself and we shall be in a better position to judge whether further acceleration of next year's ships or alternatively, direct addition to our programme will be forced upon us. That is the policy which we recommended to the committee and which we regard as a wise, sober and adequate provision. We shall not be drawn from it by any agitation.

In view of the statement of Mr. Churchill, that the action of Canada would be known this present year, it is inexplicable to me why the Government have not introduced their naval policy. The Prime Minister knows that the question of contribution is awaiting the determination of the people of Canada; he knows that his promised permanent policy will have to be submitted to the people, and why then does he not introduce a fair redistribution Bill, pass it this session, and submit the question to the people. I challenge the right hon. gentleman to take this course. I thank the members of the House for the kind attention they have given me.

Mr. DONALD NICHOLSON (Queens, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the hon. gentleman who moved the Address (Mr. H. F. McLeod), on the able manner in which he presented his views, and I specially thank him for the kind references he made to my province. Judging by the applause which the seconder of the Address received from his own side of the House, I have no doubt that he acquitted himself creditably in presenting the views of his party on the different questions at issue. Reference has been made by several speakers to the non-introduction of the Naval Bill this session, and without going into the details of the question at any great length, I want to say that I voted for the Naval Bill last year, and I voted for it because I am a true Canadian, because I am a Briton, and because I believe that anything which strengthens the British navy strengthens the position of Canada and of the British Empire. References have also been made to the omission of the Highways Bill from the Speech from the Throne, but I commend the policy of the Government for not introducing that Bill and sending it from this House up to the Senate to be slaughtered there. I believe the people of Canada are heartily in favour of the Highways Bill as introduced by the Government last year, and I believe that the farmers are specially interested and favourable to it. I know that in my part of the country there was much disappointment when the Senate rejected the Bill. As to the question of the high cost of living, it is needless for me to say that I would be in favour of any policy which would reduce the cost of living to the consumers of this country, but certainly gentlemen on the other side have not shown in their speeches how that may be done. We all know that there are many articles consumed in the household which cost no more now than they did some years ago, and that remark applies particularly to groceries. Sugar costs no more and tea costs no more, and I can give a number of other instances in the grocery line to show that the prices of such articles are certainly not higher, and in some cases they are lower than they were four years ago, or ten years ago, or even twenty years ago. It is true that, with the exception of wheat and vegetables and flour, there are few articles which the farmers produce that are costing more now than they did some years ago. It would require a long

time to enumerate the reasons why the cost of living is more now than it was some years ago, but it is not in the articles that we consume in our homes that the increased cost lies.

In 1911, the United States proposed to let our farm products and manufactured goods in free. The late Government adopted a reciprocal policy. That was the late Government's proposal to the people of this country, but in my opinion the people of Canada refused to adopt that policy for the following reason: I represent a constituency with as large a farming population as any in Canada. Formerly the people down there were free traders, but they saw the benefits of the protection they enjoyed under the tariff. Everybody knows that under our fiscal policy a certain amount of protection is enjoyed by the farmers in lieu of the protection that the manufacturers have. Suppose a farmer in Canada raises a horse worth $200; if he goes over to the United States and buys a similar horse for $200, when he comes back to Canada he has to pay $50 duty. That protects the Canadian farmer to the amount of $50 in lieu of the protection that he allows the manufacturer. On oats there is a protection of ten cents a bushel. On cheese, a farmer is protected to the amount of four cents a pound and on eggs three cents a dozen. To-day eggs are worth about fifty cents a dozen, and a matter of three cents a dozen duty paid on eggs coming into Canada surely would not reduce the cost of living very much. On all these articles, farmers are enjoying a certain amount of protection under our fiscal policy. A man who produces or raises 2,000 pounds of pork—and lots of farmers do that—is protected in his own market that protection and let the country be flooded with the products of other countries? That is the reason why progressive farmers of this country turned down the reciprocity pact of 1911.

I was surprised to learn from my hon. friend the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) the other night that 20,000,000 bushels of oats had been shipped from Alberta this year. He appeared to be pleased. I think it is a great mistake. It is simply removing the rich loam of that province to the run-out farms of Dakota and Illinois. I have met farmers out in the West where the hon. gentleman lives. They occupied their farms in the United States for about thirty years. They run-out the farms and then they came out to the virgin soil of Canada, and they are attempting to do the same thing on this side of the line. This kind of farming is ruinous, because if you keep on cropping oats or wheat year in and year out, finally fertilizers will have to be used and you will not get as much as if you had mixed farming. That is the experience of the older provinces of Canada. That is the experience that the farmers of Dakota have had, because they persisted in the raising of wheat continuously.

I would suggest that our wheat be milled in Canada so that our farmers, both in the East and in the West, may be able to procure the by-products, bran and shorts, for feeding purposes. In addition to that we would produce a high grade of flour for export and home use. I believe we ought to do everything in our power to encourage the milling of wheat in this country, as the by-products would be very much appreciated by the stock raisers of this country.

I remember the time in this country when our young men and women had to go to the cities of the United States for employment. In fact, in New England there were large colonies of French Canadians manufacturing boots, shoes, hats, stoves and cooking utensils, besides tools for artisans and also farm machinery, for shipment to Canada. We had reciprocity at that time, and the prices that we obtained were not half as good when we bought our goods in the United States as they are now in our home market. These young men visiting their homes on their summer vacations some years ago, were missionaries in favour of the National Policy that was adopted in the year 1878. They said: Why, we have to leave our Canadian homes and go to the United States in order to manufacture goods for you there. Hardly anything at all was manufactured in Canada, in the lower provinces and especially in the province of Quebec. The city of Lowell, Massachussets, is almost a French city, populated by French Canadians. The rush of young Canadians to the United States factories and cities was enormous thirty years ago.

I believe one of the great troubles in Canada is that the farmers do not produce enough to supply the wants of the home market. I need not weary the House with illustrations that go to show that although ours is a farming country, yet we have to import large quantities of produce, including beef and eggs, from other countries. The fact of the matter is that there is not enough stuff produced to feed our own people. That, however, will, I believe, be finally adjusted. Hon. gentlemen opposite speak about the great market we should

have in the United States. Only three or four years ago the cities of St. John and Halifax, and other centres throughout New Brunswick, including Chatham and Newcastle, were importing pork and beef from Chicago at a lower price than that at which it could be procured in Ontario or any of the other provinces, notwithstanding the fact that they had to pay a duty of $4 a barrel. Our great competitors were the United States, with their cheap production of pork and beef. As hon. gentlemen all know, Prince Edward Island, the province from which I come, is adjacent to Newfoundland, which has an independent fiscal policy. The duties on goods going into Newfoundland from the United States are the same as the duties on goods coming into Canada; therefore they have been our competitors, and, with regard to the articles I have mentioned, and others, they undersell us.

I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that after the election of 1911 the very best farming districts in the lower provinces returned members opposed to the right hon. leader of the Opposition. In the lower provinces the right hon. gentleman has been very highly thought of, but on account of the arrangement which was entered into with the United States by his government, his candidates in those counties were defeated. I do not think I should have entered politics at all if I had not really believed it to be in the best interests of the country, and I know that many Liberals turned against him on that very issue. The farmers of Canada fully appreciate the policy of the present Minister of Agriculture, for they recognize that his is a live, wide-awake department. I am informed also that the western farmers appreciate the work of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the matter of the improvement of transportation facilities.

I would like to ask the hon. members of the Opposition why they did not stand up in the House and insist on the late Government accepting the offer of President Taft instead of a partial or jug-handled agreement, but were content to allow the manufacturers to enjoy protection, whom they always alleged were bleeding the farmers to create bloated monopolists? It appears, to me, Sir, very inconsistent that hon. gentlemen while in opposition should be conducting a campaign in favour of free manufactured goods when they let the opportunity slip in 1911. Although I make this assertion, I desire to say that I am a protectionist; I stand pat for the protection of every industry in Canada, farming and manufacturing alike.

There is another clause in the Address upon which I wish to say a few words, namely redistribution. The people of my province know that in you, Sir, they have a sympathetic friend, and I ask the indulgence of the House while I state the case of Prince Edward Island. I do hope I shall not weary the House, but this is a matter in which I as well as the people I have the honour to represent, feel very much interested.

10 p.m.

I offer no apology for referring to a subject which has already been so frequently and so ably threshed out upon the floor of this House and in the press of Canada. To some, the question of representation in the Maritime provinces, and particularly in the province of Prince Edward Island, may not seem to be of that vital importance that it is to the people there; but Mr. Speaker, I hold that no subject that can be discussed here has greater bearing upon the loyalty, the welfare and the solidarity of the Dominion of Canada.

Next September it is proposed to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary, or the golden jubilee of the first conference held in regard to the formation or federation of the then provinces of Canada. It is significant, Sir, that Prince Edward Island, the smallest, but by no means the least important of all the provinces, should be selected as the cradle of Confederation, for it was there that the first conference, which resulted ultimately in the confederation of all the provinces, was held. Now, Sir, under the circumstances, it would be a great deed, a deed of justice, a deed I might say, of righteousness, on the part of the Canadian Parliament, recognizing this great historical fact and the rights guaranteed to Prince Edward Island at the time the contract was entered into between Canada and Prince Edward Island, if the number of her representatives, as named in that contract, was restored. It is well known, Sir, that at the time of that union, the province of Prince Edward Island was given six representatives, although upon the basis of representation set forth in the Quebec terms, its population was not sufficient to entitle it to six members. As a matter of fact, taken on a population basis, the island at that time was only entitled to five. This, Sir, ought to prove clearly that representation of the island was at first not fixed exclusively in proportion of population.

In the Journals of the Legislative Assembly of 1872, in regard to the resolution by which this province was admitted into the Dominion, I find the following set forth in the addresses at that time presented:

> That the population of Prince Edward Island having been increased by fifteen thousand or upwards since the year 1861, the Island shall be represented in the House of Commons of Canada by six members; the representation to be re-adjusted from time to time under the provisions of 'The British North America Act, 1867.'

It was further contended and insisted upon, that if the province were to enter the union, a representation of six members at least, would be one of the chief conditions.

I could quote extracts from the speeches of the island delegates at the Quebec conference, which showed definitely their reasons for standing out for the six representatives. I could give you the speeches of Messrs. Haviland, Palmer, Grey, Hensley, Howlan and others, but these have all been set forth, together with a splendid representation of our special claims in this matter, by the memoranda submitted by the provincial government. Why Sir, I could go on and quote from the transactions of that period in the provincial House of Assembly and in the Legislative Council, and show, beyond successful contradiction, that the union would never have been consummated, had it not been thoroughly understood that the island was to have six members, and that there was never to be any reduction of that number.

No man who reads the reported speeches of the Island delegates, can have the remotest shadow of doubt. We insisted on six representatives, two for each county, because nothing else would suit our conditions. The rest of the provinces insisted on our having only five, and that based on the population of Quebec. Not being able to agree, we stayed out of the Union. The same problem presented itself in 1873. Our delegates continued to fight then and on the same grounds. Less than six of a representation would give us no proper status or influence at Ottawa. At last the federal government gave way, we were to have six, the question of confederation or no confederation was submitted to the people. We voted for the Union on these terms and no other. Surely it would be a fraud on the electorate of this province for the federal Government to go back on the promise held out to us, forming as it did the main inducement moving us into the Confederation with Canada. The people believed we were to have a minimum representation of six, and that for all time, and voted accordingly. Is there any doubt on this point? Has it ever been questioned? And where is the suggestion anywhere that our representation was to be dependent on the population of Quebec or the rest of the Dominion? We knew that the Dominion would soon fill up with inhabitants. We knew that our population was comparatively stationary. Were we fools enough, were our delegates dishonest enough to lead us into a trap, whereby our members would go on diminishing, till in fifty years, perhaps, we would have none at all? The proposition is too absurd for belief. Then look at our representation in the Senate. Would any sane man believe that we stipulated for four in the Senate and in the same breath stipulated for a membership in the Commons that would soon be less than our representation in the Senate? We respect our senators, but God forbid that we should ever be deemed so disloyal to popular government as to make our voice and influence at Ottawa dependent on our senators!

Then, look at the treatment accorded to Manitoba and British Columbia when they entered Confederation. The latter was granted six members when only entitled to one, and that concession was never revoked. When such concessions were made to these larger provinces, it seems only reasonable that like, or even more generous concessions should be made to the smallest member of the Confederation, without which, despite its smallness, the Confederation would be very incomplete. Why not extend the same treatment to all? That is what is meant by the history and surrounding circumstances.

Again, Sir, it is quite clear from this determined insistence upon six representatives that the Island was not asking for this for a limited time, but as a permanent concession. Had they understood that this representation of six was likely to be reduced, possibly after the very next census taken in Canada, our delegates would not have contended so persistently for it. On the other hand, they evidently regarded six representatives as the smallest number at all consistent with the dignity and importance of a province of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is manifest that that view of the matter was apparently at first accepted by this Dominion Parliament, for at the redistribution following the census of 1881 no change was made in the Island's representation, although on a strictly proportional basis it would then be entitled to only five members. But later this course was changed, and after the census of 1891

we were shorn of one of our representatives, and after 1901 of another; and so we have already lost two of the six, and by the Redistribution Bill of this session we stand to lose a third, leaving the representation of Prince Edward Island exactly half of what it was at the time of its entrance into Confederation.

It naturally must follow, as the years pass and the population of Quebec increases at a far greater ratio than that of the Island, that before long there will not be a solitary representative from the province of Prince Edward Island to the Dominion House of Commons, if representation by population be then severely insisted upon. This would create a unique situation because, as far as I can see, it will nullify the contract of union between Prince Edward Island and the rest of the Dominion. Now, Sir, this would be an intolerable situation. Taxation without representation is, under constitutional government, impossible, and into this condition Prince Edward Island is steadily drifting.

Imagine, if you can, Mr. Speaker, the lapsing or the rendering void of the terms of Confederation between the smallest province and this great Dominion. It would be but a beginning of a most dangerous course. It would establish a precedent fraught with danger, danger not only to the little island, but danger to the great nation of Canada and danger to the British Empire, of which we form so important a part. It is not the area; it is not the number of people; it is not the extent of the trade; it is, Mr. Speaker, the part we are of the nation, which is as important, small though we may be, as any of the greater provinces forming the Confederation, which is termed the Dominion of Canada. Is it the intention because the Island is small and its population only about one hundred thousand, is it the intention of the bigger brothers between the Atlantic and the Pacific, to ignore the smaller brother and cast him adrift without a compass, without an anchor, like a derelict of the waves? Canada has already in other ways failed to fulfil its contract. Prior to Confederation, the island had a well established commerce with Great Britain and the West Indies, as well as other lands. The colonies now comprising Canada had only a very small proportion of its commerce. By entering the union, the direction and control of its commerce and industrial development were delivered over to Canada. The independent lines of trade which this island had established, were diverted to Canadian channels, and continuous communication with the mainland followed as a consequence. Before Confederation this island was doubling its population every thirty years. Its revenues doubled every twelve years. If the pre-confederation ratio of increase had been maintained, the population would now be 219,000. It is only right to assume that the unfavourable conditions brought about in the province, were the result largely of the non-fulfilment of the terms of Confederation regarding the maintenance of an efficient steam communication both summer and winter between the Island and the mainland.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to the report of the delegation from the Island to Ottawa for better terms in the year 1873. It would appear that their demand for six representatives was granted without any reference whatever to further reduction, and they fully believed that they were receiving six representatives as a minimum number.

I have endeavoured to show to this House that one of the chief terms of Confederation between the Island and Canada was the concession of six representatives. I have proved that prior to Confederation our population was steadily and rapidly increasing. I have shown that afterwards our trade and population steadily declined because the terms were not carried out in their entirety. I maintain that Canada is responsible for this condition of affairs and that it is the duty of the Dominion Parliament not to rob or deprive the Island of the representatives justly accorded to it. Otherwise a grave injustice will have been perpetrated, and ere long Prince Edward Island will be altogether cut adrift from the Confederation.

I do not ask for generous treatment from this House. I do not ask favours at the hands of greater powers. I do not present the humiliating spectacle of Prince Edward Island crawling to the Parliament of the Dominion and begging for the restoration of its six representatives, no, Mr. Speaker; on the contrary, I stand upon the floor of this House in the interests of justice, on the firm foundation of right. I stand here as a representative of a people who ask for nothing but their rights, and their rights they must have, if the solidarity of Canada is to be maintained.

There are those who scoff and sneer and scorn to treat with others who may be smaller in circumference, smaller in trade and smaller in population; but let me tell those people that it is from the foundations, the walls and the roof that

the fabric of a nation is constructed. Destroy one part of these and the whole thing falls in ruins to the ground. The people of Prince Edward Island were not anxious to enter Confederation. I believe such has been in the order of things to the greater advantage of this wide and glorious country; but I am also firmly convinced that this representation question, which some seem to think of so lightly, may yet prove that power within the nation which, working outward, will shake the very foundations of Canada, and set back our country for years to come.

There are many other phases of this question that I might present to the House; but I do not care to occupy your time further. It is monstrous to suppose that the province is to continue losing its representatives until none are left, because the draughtsman, in drawing up the terms of the union, overlooked the conclusion that would be arrived at as to representation, and neglected to use words necessary to provide for a minimum representation.

I want to call attention to another point. On the Atlantic there is the independent colony of Newfoundland and this great country will never be complete until Newfoundland joins the Confederation and I want to point out this: Prince Edward Island deals very largely with Newfoundland and if our representation is reduced, it will furnish an argument to the anti-confederates in Newfoundland. They will be able to say, look at Prince Edward Island; forty years ago she joined Confederation with six representatives but the Canadian Government has broken its agreement with the Island and now they have only two or three representatives as the case may be. That will be one of the strongest arguments they could use against Newfoundland becoming a part of this Dominion and it is well that the leaders of both parties in this House should take this matter into consideration. I say that it is not too late now to hand back to Prince Edward Island the number of representatives that it had at the time of Confederation.

I am and have always been an ardent supporter of protection for Canadian industries, and I would like to see a resolution brought down granting subsidies to shipbuilding firms in this country. I cannot understand why this Government that appealed to the country with the cry Canada for the Canadians does not at once take hold of this matter. I understand the late Government were prepared to grant such subsidies, and I urge upon this Government to do the same thing. There is another article which is largely produced in this country and which ought to be protected—copper. Our annual output of copper for 1912 amounting to about 80,000,000 pounds. All that was taken away in its raw shape to be refined in other countries. The United States got 75,000,000 pounds and Great Britain the other 5,000,000 pounds. If our Government would subsidize this industry we should see refineries started in Canada giving employment to thousands of our people. What is the use of saying we are in favour of protection if we do not carry it out. We cannot afford to wait and the Government should take hold of these two matters immediately. Let us not worry about the criticism of outsiders, we have the credit and let us go on, or we shall see a young Canadian Government rise up and do this in our stead.

On motion of Mr. E. W. Nesbitt, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

Friday, January 23, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Bill No. 22, respecting Brazilian Traction Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

Bill No. 23, respecting British America Nickel Corporation, Limited.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill No. 24, respecting the Canadian Railway Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to 'The Globe Indemnity Company.'—Mr. Baker.

Bill No. 25, respecting the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 26, to incorporate Pacific, Peace River and Athabaska Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 27, respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Smith.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. D. O. LESPERANCE (Montmagny): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I read in the Ottawa Citizen and in

the Montreal Gazette, both published this morning, an article which is as follows:

Motion to repeal Laurier Naval Act brought down in the House of Commons.

D. O. Lespérance, M.P., for Montmagny, gave notice last night of a Bill to repeal the Laurier Naval Act of 1910 establishing a Canadian navy. Mr. Lesperance is a Conservative, but in taking this action he is not in accord with the Government.

The notice he has given has caused somewhat of a flurry in the House, more especially among the members from Quebec, for in that province, at the general elections, the Act in question was a very big issue.

To Embarrass Minister.

It was rumoured about the House yesterday that a deal was in prospect whereby the Liberals would join with a section of the Quebec Conservatives and vote to repeal the Act on the ground that the Government is not carrying it out, and that while it remains on the statute-book an alternative permanent policy cannot be brought in. There is likely to be nothing in this, however, because, apart from the inconsistency of any such action on their part, the Liberal leaders have little in common with certain interests understood to be behind the move to repeal the Act. The bona fides of this action are also questioned, and allegations are made that it is aimed at a Quebec minister recognized generally as one of the ablest members of the Cabinet. With him certain people are not in accord, and an attempt to embarrass his position is hinted at.

This article contains two distinct accusations and insinuations which I consider as reflecting on my honour as a member of this House and a supporter of the present Government. I wish to give an absolute denial that, I at any time, either directly or indirectly, negotiated or attempted to negotiate with any leader, member, or representative of the Opposition in connection with this Bill. I also give an emphatic denial to the malicious charge that the aim of this Bill is to embarrass a member of this Government. In presenting this Bill I am actuated by a sense of personal honour and public duty, which this House will be in a position to appreciate when I move its second reading.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. H. F. McLeod for an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, resumed from Thursday, January 22.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): Mr. Speaker, coming from Ontario, I should like to join my voice with those of others who have congratulated Their Royal Highnesses upon the restoration of Her Royal Highness's health, and I especially congratulate His Royal Highness because he has been preserved from the greatest calamity that can happen to any man in this world of trials and troubles.

I wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address, more especially the mover because I know of nothing that would have a greater tendency to make a man nervous than speaking for the first time in this House, no matter whether he had spoken before other assemblies or not. The mover certainly made a splendid speech; and I have no doubt the seconder did also, although I could not understand what he said. That, however, is my loss.

One or two things were suggested by the mover with which I am not entirely in accord. He said that the Government were at present building up happy homes for working men and artisans. Just at present I do not see much to favour that statement, I am sorry to say; quite the contrary.

He also objected to the Transcontinental Railway in New Brunswick running through fifty miles of virgin forest where there would not be a pound of freight, and stated that the forests would be destroyed. The people living in New Brunswick must be of a peculiar character, because in Ontario a railway going through fifty miles of virgin forest would be considered as the means of developing an enormous quantity of freight. Saw mills would be erected all along the line; and therefore, judging from ordinary humanity, I am sorry that I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman that the Transcontinental would not also develop a certain amount of freight, if not a large quantity, even in New Brunswick.

I am not one of those who were surprised that the Prime Minister did not say anything in the Speech from the Throne with reference to reintroducing his naval contribution, because I imagine that the Prime Minister and the country at large had quite sufficient of that Bill last session. I was rather surprised, however, that the Government did not, in the Speech from the Throne, give us some intimation of what their permanent naval policy would be. They did say that they were going to introduce a Redistribution Bill, and one would think that after the redistribution was completed they would go to the country. In that case, they should be educat-

ing the people in regard to their permanent naval policy, if they ever intend to have one. I was not surprised that they dropped the contribution, because I imagine that the country at least did not endorse it. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) said that he thought that, if the three ships had been gone on with, as proposed by the contribution last year, it would have been the means of reducing the armaments of the world. I am rather surprised that my hon. friend should make such a suggestion. I hope that he does not think he can make us believe that he really thinks so, because that is contrary to human nature. My hon. friend himself, if he had an antagonist, no matter in what capacity, mental or physical, would be one of the very last to cease getting prepared, if he thought his antagonist was busy getting prepared. The mere fact of our contributing to an increase in the British navy would have been sufficient, in my judgment, to have stirred the German Empire, which is the nation that has been principally mentioned, to greater effort. We know that the Germans are very human in that regard. We know also that they have the means, because they did not reduce their naval expenditure, while they enormously increased their expenditure on their land forces during last season. That surely is an indication to us that, if we had joined with Great Britain in building more ships, that would have been the very thing that would have made the Germans increase their navy instead of decreasing it. There is nothing else that we could have done that would have assisted Great Britain to a greater extent in arriving at the naval holiday requested by the First Lord of the Admiralty than what we did do. It showed that while we, at least we Liberals, were perfectly prepared to do our share to relieve Great Britain from our defence, we were not willing to enter into preparations for war in Europe. I think we did what the people of Canada expected us to do. With all due deference to the jingo and imperialistic elements in the country, I think the ordinary people who have to make their living, no matter what their vocation, whether farming or labouring, are very well satisfied that the Liberals, by their efforts, were the means of defeating a proposed grant of $35,000,000 towards increasing the naval armaments of Great Britain, which grant would have had the effect of increasing the naval armaments of the other European powers.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. gentleman mean that the Liberal policy was such that the Germans would take no stock in it and therefore would not increase their armament?

Mr. NESBITT: The hon. gentleman no doubt heard what I said; I think I spoke plainly. As to the attack that the Prime Minister made on the Senate, in my humble judgment, the Senate was absolutely justified in the position it took. I do not think the attack made by the right hon. gentleman will have any effect upon the mass of the people of Canada. The mass of the people, if they never were in favour of the Senate before, I believe, were in favour of its position in that case. The Senate simply asked the Government to carry out its promise and allow the people to express their views on the question. The other day I read in the London Times an article which I ask leave to quote. We all know that, since last session, New Zealand has decided to build its own navy. The following article from the Australian correspondent of the London Times struck me as rather odd in view of what the Times has published from its Canadian correspondent:

Sydney, Oct. 7.

The first Dominion squadron, 'manned, controlled, and paid for,' as Lord Denman said on Saturday evening, 'by the people of the Commonwealth,' has come to show itself to the people who made it. Every one is just a little proud; a little inclined to dilate with more emphasis than is absolutely necessary on 'our boats' and the show they make in and about Farm Cove; a little pleased to remind you that, though the United States fleet was bigger and far stronger in the aggregate, 'our battleship' could blow any two of the vessels out of the water with ease. When that fleet was here the most characteristically Australian result of its visit was a cheerful and immediately popular song to the effect that

We're hanging out the sign from the Lecuwin to the Line,
This bit of the world belongs to us!

It was no less characteristic that the people who so boasted at once began to make good the boast. 'We live in hopes,' said Mr. Deakin then, 'that from our own shores some day a fleet will go out not unworthy to be compared in quality, if not in numbers, with the magnificent fleet now in Australia.' Five years have gone by; the flags are up again, once more the main streets are triumphal avenues, and the great public buildings are ablaze every night from tower to basement with coronals and festoons of light; for in that five years such a beginning has been made of the Imperial enterprise which the then Prime Minister foreshadowed as neither he nor any of his auditors could then have dreamt of.

It is impossible not to make comparisons between the two occasions, but I need write down one only. Amid all the enthusiasm and curiosity which marked the crowds of 1908 one note was lacking—the personal—that is

very notable to-day. Never before have Australians, especially Australian mothers, watched the entrance of a squadron largely manned by their own boys. 'My boy's on the Sydney, and I must get down to the Heads to see him come in,' said one eager, tearful woman to the tram-driver when he slowed his overladen car on a steep grade. 'Our Tom was on duty when we went over the Australia; he wouldn't look at us, and quite right, too!" a father proudly told his fellow passenger on the ferry this morning. This is the note for the absence of which no amount of contributions, skillfully engineered through Parliament, could possibly compensate. 'Our' ships and 'our' boys will serve the empire better in times of stress than would twice the millions that Australia is spending on them.

That is our answer—at least that is my answer—to the assertions made here last year. I am sorry, as I have said, that the Prime Minister did not see fit to give us some information of what his naval policy will be, for, so far as I know the minds of the Liberals, they are not opposed to doing their duty in any form to assist the mother country and relieve her of the burden of defending this country.

As to the Good Roads Bill, my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) thoroughly explained that subject. Of course, we know that the Prime Minister said that this money could have been in the hands of the provinces for use this year, and that the lack of it was a great detriment to the provinces. I remember distinctly hearing him, and also the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane), tell us that it was their intention to give the money under the Good Roads Bill to the provinces according to population. But he will remember that we moved a resolution to the effect that this should be put in the Bill. No person in this House, or in this country, knows better than does the Prime Minister that that is the only way to legislate; no person knows better than he that such a provision should have been in the Bill. Had he been on this side of the House and we on the other, and had our leader made a statement that such and such would be the case but that he did not propose to put it in the Bill, I can quite easily imagine how indignant the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) would have been and how capably he would have discussed that question from the standpoint of the public right, and quite properly too. The hon. member for Red Deer told us that wherever this matter had been properly explained the people did not hold the Liberals to blame. I can endorse what that hon. gentleman said, for I took the trouble to explain the matter to the farmers of our section of the country, and not only did we not get blame, we got praise, and so did the Senate. The Prime Minister seeks to use the failure of the Good Roads Bill to pass as an argument against the Senate, but I do not think that cat will fight.

There is one thing on which I congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), and that is on the fact that he has told us that he will bring the Estimates down at an early day. I hope he will carry that into effect. Last year, the time of the House was taken up largely with the discussion of the Navy Bill. The Estimates were not only not brought down at an early day, but they were brought down at an absurdly late day. Every person in the House was tired out. The Minister of Finance, referring to the fact that my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) had found fault with the expenses stated that we had voted last year for those expenditures. Now, I was here during all the time of the passing of the Estimates, and I know that we opposed very strongly some of the votes. Of course, we passed them. But why? Because hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House had just shown us the power they held over us by passing their pet Bill, the Closure. We knew very well what would be the effect of a prolonged discussion of any of the Estimates. We knew that our friends opposite, who had taken the great power conferred upon them by that Closure, could and would promptly pass the Estimates over our head regardless of our opinions.

Therefore it does not lie kindly with the Minister of Finance to tell us that we voted for the Estimates. After all, the Estimates are theirs, the expenditures are theirs, and they are responsible to the country; and I have not the slightest doubt that the country will hold them responsible. They are aware, as the hon. the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) pointed out, of the very extravagant expenditures voted last year. The Minister of Finance says he foresaw the stringency that would affect the country during the latter part of the year, but, so far as I could read from the papers, the enormous and unnecessary expenditures in some lines have gone on. I need not discuss these expenditures. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, in discussing the borrowings that he had made this year, told us that his predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, had increased the national debt in 1908 and in the forepart of 1909 by about $100,000,000. I looked up the public accounts after that, and I found that from 1897 to the 31st of March, 1911, the public debt of Canada had increased by $78,503,456. That is to say that when the Liberals came into

power in 1897 the public debt was $261,538,596, and on the 31st of March, 1911, it was $340,042,052, making a total borrowing in round figures of $78,000,000. In 1908 and 1909 the borrowings were, in round figures, $100,000,000, but the maturities in 1908 were $37,000,000. So, during the whole time of the fifteen years regime of the Liberal party, the increase of the national debt was, in round figures, $78,000,000.

The Minister of Finance asked the right hon. the leader of the Opposition what legacy the Laurier Government had left him in 1911. He told us about the legacy of protecting the country against loss on the Grand Trunk Pacific bonds. He did not tell us that the real legacy left to him and to the country was a surplus of somewhere about $37,000,000 that year, which was followed during the first year of my hon. friend's regime, as I think he told us, by a surplus of $25,000,000. I know of no finer legacy that could have been left to the Finance Minister or the manager of a large corporation than an immensely profitable business. Canada certainly was in the position, when the Liberal party went out of power, of such a corporation, with an immensely profitable revenue. Yet immediately following that, two years afterwards, we find that the Government in power have not only commenced to lose that revenue to a certain extent, but they have begun to increase the public debt, they have begun to borrow money to carry on their business.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance also said that the Laurier Administration commenced the system of guaranteeing bonds. He said that the policy of guaranteeing bonds was a very bad one. I wondered at the time whether it was worse than giving away immense territories of the country. I wondered if it was worse than the policy that was followed with the Canadian Pacific of giving away, free of taxation for twenty-five years I think, large quantities of land in the western country that properly belonged to the people there. Was it worth these double and treble subsidies that were given to another transcontinental railway? As a matter of fact we did guarantee the bonds both of the Canadian Northern and of the Grand Trunk Pacific in place of making them direct loans. Had we made them direct loans we would have had to borrow the money ourselves, and could probably have done it slightly cheaper. The policy may be bad, but I doubt whether we could have adopted a better policy at the time.

That brings me to this question of the financial stringency of the present day. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance read from the Labour Gazette a lot of notices from different parts of the country, in the fall of 1908, saying that there was a lack of work in the cities at that time. That is true. He read from a speech of my right hon. friend and leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Montreal, saying that there was no cry during the fifteen years of the Liberal regime of the high cost of living; and to contradict that he read these reports of the Labour Gazette showing that there were at that time men out of employment in the various cities throughout the country. I cast my mind back to that time and I quite appreciate that there were many men out of employment; but, as a matter of fact, there was no great cry or no cry that I remember at all, with reference to the high cost of living. The reason of the stringency in 1907 and 1908, as was pointed out by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), was because of the lack of money to pay their way by the bankers of the United States, You all know that while some of us are unwilling to have truck or trade with the Yankees, we follow very closely the events that take place in the United States. We copy them very closely in very many ways, especially in commercial life. Nearly all the banks of the United States in the fall of 1907 and the early part of 1908 practically suspended payment, in fact I am not too sure that Mr. Forgen did not say, before the Banking and Commerce Committee last year, that all the banks of the United States at that time had suspended payment. Certainly most of them did and a great many failures took place. Now, our banks were alarmed that that feeling of unrest would spread to Canada and the consequence was that they reduced the lines of credit to the various manufacturers and commercial interests throughout Canada at that time. The fact is that at that time the banks reduced the lines of credit to the manufacturers and the consequence was that the manufacturers were unable to manufacture up to their limit. There was no lack of orders that I know of, but the state of things this year is quite different. So far as I am aware the banks have been prepared and have supplied the manufacturers throughout the country with all the money they wanted. The commercial interests also could have got all the money they wanted from the banks.

My hon. friend from Waterloo (Mr. Clare)

shakes his head. I do not know what his experience has been, but I am only speaking from my own experience—and I am interested more or less in various manufacturing industries in this country—and my experience has been that the banks were prepared to and did supply this year just as full lines, to put it that way, as last year to the manufacturing and commercial interests of the country. But the manufacturers this year could not get sufficient orders. In 1907 and 1908 the manufacturers could get all the orders they could handle. But so far as I was concerned, we could not get the money to supply the material and labour necessary to fill the orders. Therefore I think our right hon. leader was perfectly justified in stating at Montreal that there was no complaint at that time of the high cost of living. I do not remember there being any great cry about the high cost of living at that time and I must say that probably nobody here was more actively engaged in business of various kinds, though perhaps in a small way, than I was.

The Minister of Finance also told us in an ironical sort of way that our right hon. leader has had many fiscal policies. He told us that at one time he was a free trader as they have it in England and that he is now a free food trader for the moment, and my hon. friend emphasized 'for the moment.' But I did not hear the Minister of Finance say that our right hon. leader had brought about the preference with Great Britain. Our leader did introduce the preference with Great Britain. Perhaps he was an advocate seven years ago of free trade as they have it in England, but at the present time he is an advocate of free food. You will notice that while he may have had many policies, to all appearances different on the surface, yet he has always been consistent. In all his policies his tendency has been to a reduction of duty and so it is to-day. I was present at the meeting in Hamilton and heard the speech of our honoured leader but I did not construe it as the Minister of Finance would like to construe it, that by free food our leader meant the duty being taken off all foodstuffs. I recognize that there are certain classes of foods from which it is not necessary to remove the duty, such as fancy canned goods, fancy cheeses, fancy pickles and that sort of thing, which we get occasionally on the tables of the swell restaurants and hotels, or on the tables of the rich. As far as I am concerned, I have never seen them except on occasions of that kind and I do not think any of us will advocate the removal of the duty on such goods because at the hotels and restaurants goodness knows they charge us enough to pay for the duty. By free food I understood our leader to mean free staple food. I am not speaking for the whole of the Liberal party but simply for myself and that is what I understood him to mean. The Minister of Finance also stated that if the duties were removed from all foods, it would affect according to the statistics of the Year Book, 6,985 establishments with a capital of $133,000,000, employing 252,000 men, paying $14,000,000 in wages every year and using material to the amount of $175,000,000 and with an output of $245,000,000. That is a good argument to use to frighten the people, but when you dissect the proposition of our right hon. leader you will see that very few of those establishments would be affected. The minister went on to say that the output of cheese in Canada for the last fiscal year amounted to $37,232,969, and that there were 3,625 establishments employing men to the number of 6,147. And yet, he said, our right hon. leader proposed to take the duty off cheese. During the reciprocity debate I did not hear that any of our farmers were opposed to taking the duty off cheese. As a matter of fact at the present time the dairying interests of this country are prepared to see the duty taken off cheese if the American duty is taken off. Our dairymen want the American market. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance said that the removal of the duty would destroy the cheese factories in this country and I could not help thinking when he was talking, of something I heard when I was a boy. I had an Irish friend who was ridiculing to a certain extent another chap that he was with. The other fellow got angry and said: Do you mean to make a fool of me, and the Irishman replied: No, the Lord took advantage of me; and I say the Lord, through Mr. Woodrow Wilson and the Congress of the United States has already taken advantage of my hon. friend. Let me tell the hon. minister that there will be a lot less cheese factories in Canada next year than there were last year—a lot less in Ontario at any rate and I think Ontario produces the bulk of Canada's cheese. And why? Because while at one time you could tell the farmers that they were entitled to the protection of their products just as the manufacturer is, to-day, so far as I know, there are no farmers that can be deceived in

that way any more. They are not afraid of the duties being taken off; they are perfectly willing to have them removed. What they ask for is the open market and cheap transportation. What will happen the cheese industry? As a matter of fact, our export of cheese has been going down for some years. Why? Because, for one reason, there is a great consumption of milk in the larger cities at the present time. Since the Americans took the duty off milk, the price of milk in the western portion of the riding that I have the honour to represent has increased to $1.90 per hundred pounds. They are giving $1.90 per hundred in the western portion of my riding and shipping milk to Detroit. Cheese at 12½ cents is supposed to net the farmers $1. Cheese at a price of 13½ cents, which was paid late this fall, would net the farmers from $1.15 to $1.20 per 100 pounds. The City Dairy Company of Toronto have a depot at Woodstock and dozens of teams come in every morning taking in a territory covered by half a dozen or more cheese factories. They are paying $1.60 per hundred, and they are paying in Thamesford, only 14 miles away, $1.90 and shipping the milk to Detroit. You may ask the question: Why do they not all send their milk to Detroit? The answer is that people in the vicinity of Woodstock had made a contract to deliver their milk in Woodstock. They are also shipping milk from Lakeside on the Canadian Pacific railway to Port Huron and Detroit at $1.90 per 100 pounds. While the farmer may occasionally be told successfully something that you want him to swallow, he is not so foolish that he does not know the difference between $1.20 and $1.90.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance told me, speaking of the commission that had been appointed to look into the high cost of living, that I was reported to have said at Attwood, Ont., that the appointment of the commission was a rotten farce. I am not so sure whether I said it was rotten or not, but I certainly said that it was a farce. I would not be surprised if I did add the other word, because I think that it had the germs of decay in it from the start. It was certainly built on a very tottering foundation and will do no good to the people of this country in so far as a reduction of the high cost of living is concerned. I did say that the appointment of the commission was a farce. I did also say that the main cause of the high cost of living was the lack of production. I still say so, but I also said at Attwood, and I still say to-day, that the Government had it in their own hands a remedy, in so far as it is possible for a government to remedy it, the high cost of living by taking away the duty, by opening the door, so that when goods went too high, no matter what the goods were, on this side of the line, there would be an inducement to the people of the other side of the line that have them to sell to send them over here. That, I think, you will acknowledge, because I think it is a proposition that has a strong basis. If there are no artificial doors, production and supply and demand will regulate the market.

As to mergers or combines, if they are controlling to any extent the food supply of this country, the same would apply. If there is one thing that would do away with the control either by mergers or combines it is the opening of the doors to the other side of the line. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister says that the combines and mergers on the other side of the line are worse if anything than they are on this side of the line. That may be true in a sense, but there are no persons who fight each other more than these mergers and combines, and it would be some years before the combines on the other side of the line could establish a working connection with the combines on this side of the line, if they wanted to do so in order to affect the cost of food. I am not one of those who think that the cost of food is seriously affected in a wrong way by cold storage. Cold storage may raise the price of food at a certain time of the year, but taking it on the average, the usual effect of cold storage is to keep the price down to a reasonable amount. In the summer time it does increase the price of perishable goods, but if it were not for cold storage at other times of the year the price of food would increase very much more than it does. If there is any combine in the cold storage business I am perfectly willing to see it investigated. I am perfectly willing to see any of these things investigated, but if there is anything in the world that would do away absolutely and entirely with any control of that kind it would be to take off the duties and let food circulate freely. The farmers of this country are perfectly willing that that should be done.

4 p.m.

The hon. Minister of Finance says that his proposition to reduce the high cost of living is to educate the farmers, and he illustrates that by the Bill for $10,000,000 that was passed last year for agricultural

education. There never was a newspaper, yellow or otherwise, with a bigger headline than that $10,000,000, and there never was a big headline that was a greater deception. It might as well have been $1,000,000 a year and nobody would have paid any attention to it, but it was a great headline, a great advertisement, and nothing more or less in my judgment. I am not opposed to money being spent on the education of the farmers any more than I am opposed to what is being spent on the education of any other class of the people, but I want to tell the House that in so far as I know the farmers and I think I do know them, the farmers of Ontario are quite capable of farming properly if they have the inducement to farm properly. All they ask you for is cheap transportation and open markets. You talk about educating the farmers. The hon. Minister of Finance said that he would educate the farmers in order to do away with the high cost of living. I cannot help but think of the poor fellows that were on the submarine 7A, who went to the bottom of the ocean the other day, and I wondered if it would do them any good if in some years to come somebody undertook to educate the officers and men on submarines as to how to raise themselves from the bottom of the ocean. That very well illustrates the attitude of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance with reference to what he proposes to do for the education of the farmer.

My hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) told us the other night that the Government had reduced express rates by twenty per cent, but I always thought it was the Railway Commission that reduced those express rates, and I would remind him that it was the Laurier Government that appointed the Railway Commission and made it possible for any public body in this country to reduce rates. And, if in their wisdom the Railway Commission should reduce freight rates, they will do so because the power was conferred on them by the Laurier Government. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) also told us that under the new agricultural grant, educational plots of forty acres had been opened in each township or municipality in the West, and he pointed out that this would prove of wonderful service to the people of Manitoba. Well, that depends on the way these forty acre plots will be worked, and while no doubt many of these things have been so carried on as to reflect credit on the people and on those who manage them, others have proved failures. However, I hope this system will be a success in the West. In my section of the country we have nothing of that kind. If the Minister of Agriculture were present I would point out to him that the Ontario Government sends what is called a district representative to my section of the country and he has recently established a class in the collegiate institute for educating the farmers and their sons in scientific agriculture. I cannot help but think that if he would establish such classes once or twice a week in the schools in various parts of the country he would do more good than he would be liable to do in the city of Woodstock, although at the same time he is doing good work there and I have nothing to say against that. But I was wondering if that is to be our share of the agricultural grant. At the various meetings of farmers which I attended this fall, I asked them if they had seen any signs of benefit from these grants which the Government are boasting so much about, and I could not find a farmer anywhere in our county who had heard of any benefit that had accrued.

Let me deal now with the duty on wheat, which is an important question at the present time. I understood from the Minister of Finance and from the Prime Minister that they are not inclined to grant the request of the western farmers for free wheat. I can inform them that, as far as I have been able to find out, the farmers of Ontario, of both sides of politics, have no possible objection to free wheat. So far as I have discussed it with them they say: If the western men think it will be a benefit to them, why not give it to them? After listening to the speech of my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) as to the results in connection with oats and barley and flax, I ask: Why does not the Government rise to the occasion and extend the benefit to wheat? The Government were the means of keeping the people of Canada from getting free markets in the United States two years ago, and if free cereals would be a benefit to the people of the West, why not let them have it? If the manufacturers want a duty put on or taken off any article, I am quite sure this Government or any other Government that might be in power at the time would be perfectly willing to listen to them, and I think it rather strange that while the farmers of the west are unanimous for free wheat, the Government should say to them: You do not know your own business, we will give you protection. I can-

not for the life of me see why the Government is disposed to refuse this boon to the farmers of the West, except it may be that they think it will hurt the millers. The milling industry is a large one in Canada, and I grant you it is the duty of all governments to look out for the interests of all the people and to legislate in the interests of the majority, no matter whether they are party friends or otherwise. It may be that this may hurt the miller, but why should it hurt the miller? As a matter of fact the flour made from Manitoba wheat is supposed to be the best in the world. The millers tell me that the millers of Great Britain require a certain amount of Manitoba wheat to mix with the softer wheat from southern countries, and I understand that the millers of Great Britain are ahead of the millers of the United States or of Canada in their system of mixing, which they have reduced to a science. But, after all, the best of their best quality of flour is made from Manitoba wheat. Then, if the Manitoba flour is better than any other flour, why should not western millers mark their flour so that they will get the advantage of that throughout the world? I cannot understand why that cannot be done, because after all people will pay for quality, and in that respect why have not our home millers an advantage over the millers of England and the United States? Of course, there is no possible doubt that if there were free wheat a great deal of western grain would be shipped to the United States by southern routes, and I recognize that we have built transcontinental railways at great expense to carry the grain from the West to the seaboard.

I recognize that fact, and as a Canadian I am proud to see these railways built. At the same time, I can quite appreciate that the Government fear that the grain might be shipped to the south where the western farmers could obtain a better market. If that is not the fear of the Government, then why do they not give free wheat to the people of the West? There must be some reason of that kind. I think that the ordinary every day farmer in the West, with 160 or 320 acres, is not making money; and, if he is not making money, he will not continue to reside there. In that event we shall lose our great market in the West. We who do any manufacturing in the East know that Western Canada has been our greatest market during the last ten years. If these people in the West are not making money—and they cannot make money under present conditions—then why not let them have an open market to the south of them, so that they can put themselves in a position to buy goods from manufacturers in the East. That is the question that faces us and that we have got to decide. I hope the Government will decide it wisely, because it has got to be decided one of these days. You may refuse the market to the people of the West and you may cajole, although I doubt it, the farmers of Ontario to believe that they are protected and that they need protection. For two or three years, however, I have not found a farmer who will claim that he needs protection. He is perfectly willing to compete.

At the present time, in my judgment, you will have to do more than to give free food. The hon. Minister of Finance was absolutely right when he said that there are thousands of industries in this country that, perhaps, are not in a position to compete with the very keen and severe competition from Europe and the United States, because the European and United States manufacturers have greater markets at their command than we have. They have also got their business down to a greater science. We manufacturers in Canada will have to learn to systematize our business; but, at the same time, while there are thousands of industries in this country to which we must give a certain amount of protection, there are others that compete now in the open markets of the world. Why should they be protected here? There are some of the latter industries that come into direct touch with the farmers, and I, as a farmer, may tell you that, while there may be no combines in other lines of business in this country, the sellers of agricultural implements have a peculiar way of showing competition. To save your life, you cannot in our country buy a plough or a binder or any other agricultural implement that I know of from one salesman a particle cheaper than you can buy it from another. That is a strange thing, but I have tried it time and again. In my humble judgment, the prices are also too high. These sellers will be forced, if the duties are removed or lowered to a great extent, to come into keener competition, and that will be a benefit to the farmers. The farmer cannot afford to do everything. He will be perfectly willing to give up any protection that he may have, either on his animal products or his cereals. He also will require something that this Government can give him, that this Government will

be forced to give him. The time is coming, and we may just as well make up our minds to do it, as you cannot cajole the farmer any longer into thinking that he is protected by protection. He knows that he is not, he knows that he can compete, but he also wants a fair show in the open market. The hon. Minister of Finance, I dwell on what he says, because what he says to the country should be important—tells us that instead of spending the money on the Transcontinental railway, it would have been better had we spent it on agricultural education. At the time the Transcontinental railway was started, there was the greatest possible demand from the West for a means of moving the crop. We heard from one end of the country to the other the cry: What is the use of growing the crop when we cannot get it out, when it rots in the field? That is why we spent the money in building this new Transcontinental railway to move the crop. This last day or two I have heard speakers on the other side of the House say, with the greatest of pride, that there was no block in the moving of the crops this year. Why? Because otner railways had come in to assist the Canadian Pacific railway in the moving of the crops. The building of the other railways, the mere fact of the suggestion that other railways would be built made the Canadian Pacific railway improve its rolling stock and double-track its line. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are like all other corporations. I have nothing to say against any corporation. Let them do the best for themselves. The Canadian Pacific railway are absolutely sane, and they will not do anything until they are forced to do it, and they were forced by competition and nothing else to improve their rolling stock and their facilities for moving the grain. If it had not been for that compulsion, there would be still the same old story, and the grain would be rotting on the ground there still as it did several years ago. That has been improved upon. If it will improve the opportunities of the people of the West to have an open market to the south, although the railways may suffer to a certain extent, the railways will look after themselves. If the grain is taken to the south, it has still to be carried to the markets in the east to the south of us. Why cannot our railways carry it to those markets just as cheaply as the railways on the American side of the line can? I think they can; and what is more, I think they will.

The people of the West tell us also that the transportation charges are too high. They tell us that if they grow wheat, say at Regina, and they get sixty-five cents a bushel for it, that is not sufficient money to pay them. I have figured it up time and again with some of the best farmers to be found in the West, and I do not believe it is sufficient money to pay, except to farmers in a very large way of business. Remember that the country is not made up of farmers in a large way of business, and after all it is the ordinary farmer whom we must consider; it is the ordinary businessman whom we must consider. It is not the exceptions that we must consider in legislation of any kind. I could not help but smile when I heard my hon. friend (Mr. White) say that it would have been better if we had spent the money on agricultural education that we spent in building the Transcontinental railway.

There was another thing, very funny, that I heard my hon. friend the Minister of Finance say, and that was when discussing a statement made by my hon. friend the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) as to the duty on agricultural implements. He said that under reciprocity the duty was only reduced to fifteen per cent, which, he said, would have been there for evermore. The whole challenge from end to end of the land, when the reciprocity discussion was on, was that reciprocity was simply the thin edge of the wedge. But now the Minister of Finance tells us that this duty of 15 per cent would have been left there forever if we had passed the reciprocity agreement. Hon. gentlemen opposite suggest that my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is not always consistent, but surely he is quite as consistent as hon. gentlemen opposite, especially as consistent as the Minister of Finance when he makes ironical remarks. The whole question at this time, after all, is, what is best in the interests of the country, not a question of what is best in the interests of the Liberal party or in the interests of the Conserva- party. I believe that at heart we all recognize that. There is no denying the fact, I am sorry to say, that there is privation and hardship in the country at this time. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance have said that times will improve. I believe as firmly as I believe that I am speaking to you now that, unless there is some change in the administration of the country for the benefit of the West, the times will not improve there. They say to the people of the West: Go into mixed farming. They might as well tell me to go into flying. It takes money to go into mixed farming, and it takes time. It is the same as with

the agricultural education which the Minister of Finance advocated. It is true you may educate the farmer to a better system of farming under which he will grow more grain. The farmers in Ontario could raise from two to three times as much as they are raising now on the land which they use if they would farm properly. But it takes time to bring about these changes. In the meantime, what are the people on these 160-acre farms, and 320-acre farms—the small farmers of the West—going to do? Such a man, if his farm does not pay him, will desert his farm and let it fall into the hands of the mortgagee, and that will be a great setback to the country. He requires relief; he knows what that relief should be, and why not give it to him?

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron): Mr. Speaker, speaking, as I do, for the first time from my seat in the front row of the Government side in this House, I trust you will excuse my diffidence and not allow any imperfection in my presentation of the matters which I wish to submit to prevent you from giving due attention to the facts which I desire to lay before you, and through you before this House.

I was disappointed at not seeing in the Speech from the Throne some reference to the transportation question in relation to the great inland waterways of Canada. I fear that many hon. members, coming as they do from parts of Canada distant from the centres of lake traffic, have no idea of the hugeness of that traffic. To convey to you some idea of what that traffic means, I desire to lay a few facts before you. Sir, we are fortunate in having in Canada a waterway of thousands of miles—to put it accurately—2,384 miles—reaching from the head of salt water navigation to the heart of the country and affording, to a great extent, deep-water navigation to the heart of the continent and making the line of least resistance for the traffic of the one hundred millions of people who line that waterway. To illustrate the size of this traffic, let me give a comparison of canal tonnage. Take the great Suez canal which now takes the traffic of the entire continent of Europe and the British Islands through to Australia and the Orient,—that traffic which originally went around the Cape of Good Hope—and we find that in the year 1911 there were 5,200 vessels passed through that canal, with a freight tonnage of 25,000,000 tons. In the year 1911 there passed through the Sault Ste. Marie canal 25,000,000 vessels. In the year 1913, instead of 25 000,000 of freight, as in the case of the Suez canal, there went through the Sault Ste. Marie canal, 79,718,344 tons of freight. And I am proud to say that the quantity which went through the Canadian Sault Ste. Marie canal was 5,674,943 tons more than went through the United States canal at that point. Add to this the traffic that comes through from Lake Michigan on which are the great cities of Chicago and Milwaukee, and the traffic which comes from our own Georgian bay, and it will easily be seen that the amount in the year 1913 must have been over 100,000,000 tons. This immense traffic on its way to the lower lakes passes in front of the riding which I have the honour to represent. But it will be seen that the questions involved in this traffic are not local questions merely but are of national importance. On the 9th of last November, Sunday evening, while the people on shore were in church, there occurred on the Great Lakes, a catastrophe absolutely appalling, the greatest that ever happened either on the ocean or on the lakes affecting Canada or the United States. The gale that arose at that time wiped out of existence fourteen great steel steamships, eight of them disappearing absolutely, not a soul aboard being left to tell the tale. The loss was 205 stalwart young men. And the vessels, as I have indicated, were not old, unseaworthy hulks, but fine steamships. One of them had been on the ocean for years. Another had been built in a Canadian port. And when the representatives of the owners of that vessel in the city of Toronto were told that the steamship Carruthers had been lost they simply laughed; they said that no gale on the lakes could hurt her. She was a vessel over 600 feet long, and had been built by the best men on the continent. One steamship 505 feet long, laden with 9,740 tons of coal, turned over as if she had been a cork, without a scratch. Of the great number of young men who were lost in front of that port, sixty-four bodies were recovered. Only one of these had been drowned, the others had all died from exposure, and no bodies were recovered so far that had not life belts on. I refer to the vessels by name, the Carruthers, the Wexford, an ocean steamship which had been on the lakes for years, formerly in the Mediterranean trade; the Regina, a Canadian boat; the Price, the one of 505 feet long that was overturned with 9,700 tons of coal; the Argus, the Hydrus, the McBean, and Scott. These boats, Sir, could have been saved—I say so here from the evidence that was given at the inquest—not a soul need

have been drowned, had we been advanced in our aids to navigation. They have on the ocean a wireless call, I believe S.O.S., which gives notice when a boat is in distress, but this is an entirely different proposition. There is no boat in the world that could have lived or effected a rescue in that sea at that time with the heavy snow storm that then prevailed. To show you the force of the storm, I may say that one boat which was cast ashore on the American side, on which there was an insurance of $300,000, had a hole broken by the sea in her iron plates in the bow, into which you could put a barrel. Her inside bulkheads saved her until she went ashore—in fact all the boats that went ashore were saved.

Nothing could better illustrate the danger of the approach to Goderich harbour in a northwest gale than the fact that since the tragedy of November three steamers on three different occasions had attempted to enter that port in a northwest gale but had to put back to the open water. I contend that had the port which I represent and, which for the last ten years, the Government of this country have designated a port of refuge, and have been trying to make a port of refuge, had that port been a foul weather port instead of a fair weather port, and had there been a wireless station with a hurricane call, there was not one of those boats that could not have been in shelter inside of three hours. As a basis for that opinion, I give you the record as produced at the inquest of the weather bureau in the city of Toronto. On Friday morning, the 7th of November, the weather bureau sent out to the stations a warning that there was a strong northwest gale coming. The stations of all the upper lakes put up signals to that effect so that every captain had warning. That was on Friday the 7th. That storm continued through the 7th, and through the night of the 7th and on the 8th, but abated on the evening of the 8th. In the morning of the 9th of November the barometer on all the ships went up; the northwest storm signal was still up, but the storm had abated and the Kamanistiquia left Goderich for Fort William at seven o'clock on the morning of the 9th of November. At half past ten o'clock she met the Wexford thirty-five miles northwest of Goderich bound for that port, but that boat and her crew were never seen afterwards. At 10.40 o'clock on the evening of the 8th of November, the weather bureau in Toronto, according to the evidence in Toronto, had distinct information and evidence that there was a northwest hurricane approaching. They were asked why they had not sent out that notice. They said that the telegraph lines were not working. They were asked why they did not use the telephone. I think, Sir, that on one or two occasions since then I have seen telephone messages sent to the lighthouse after the telegraph service was closed, to bring word of a storm. We have at Goderich the highest point on the whole of the shore of 200 odd miles, it is 120 feet above the water. To the north and south of the town the shore declines. I have asked that we should have a wireless telegraph station there. Even with the harbour entrance protected as I hope it will be, there should be still this extra call, because of late years the captains have not placed much credence in the weather bureau reports.

As to the importance of this port which I have the honour of representing, and to show you that this is not a local or parochial matter, but a national matter, we are a link in the great chain of inland navigation from our great northwest to the sea, and you all know that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link. We do not compete with the great ports on the Georgian bay, Collingwood, Owen Sound, Depot Harbour or Meaford. Our trade is entirely different, although we are eight miles nearer to Fort William and have a straight open course from the entrance to Sault river. The port with which we do compete is the port of Buffalo. To show you how the grain which is grown in Canada and should go through Canadian transportation systems is drafted away, I merely cite that up to the first of last September, 31,483,952 bushels of wheat; 2,465,490 bushels of oats; 1,721,679 bushels of barley; 6,319,303 bushels of flax, making a total of 41,990,990,423 bushels, went through the port of Buffalo from Fort William and Port Arthur.

We have in Goderich two large industries, one an elevator of over one million bushels capacity, which this year and the year before made over 50 per cent of its total value in earnings. That elevator is owned by people in western Ontario; every miller, in almost every town in western Ontario, from Toronto, Guelph, and London, to the Great Lakes, has stock in that company. We also have a mill which is directed by and connected with the Winnipeg Western Canadian Milling Company, with a capacity of one million, and that mill grinds every day over two thousand barrels of

flour from Manitoba wheat. That flour is shipped to every place in Canada. The stockholders of that mill are in almost every place in Canada showing you what I said is the fact, that the matter is not one of local concern only.

To show you that the water traffic that passes through lake Huron is the greatest in the world I would cite the traffic of the great port of London which, during the year 1912, had 37,676,142 tons of freight and the great port of Liverpool which had 30,273,355 tons, the two together not making much more than two-thirds the amount which passes through lake Huron. All of this traffic is diverted to the other side of the lake because on our side of the lake there is no port with an entrance properly protected in case there is trouble from the northwest. We have a marine engine works in Goderich second to none in Canada engaged in building engines and repairing boats for this Dominion. Were that entrance properly protected a great trade would develop there. When I say we do not compete with the Georgian bay ports we do in this way: Every dollar that is spent on a port in the Georgian bay is for the trade that goes to that port, while there is no dollar spent in Canada on public work which can produce the result that would be secured if spent to protect this harbour on this two hundred and seventy miles of coast line, on the second largest lake in the world which has a depth of six hundred feet. I contend, contrary to some statements of one or two at the inquest—and the matter was gone into exhaustively, and all the marine evidence that could be was taken—that the plans as set out by the engineers of this Government are amply sufficient to make that a safe harbour. The only thing necessary is that it should be done at once, not piecemeal. This is not a matter of politics, it concerns one side of this House just the same as the other. There is only a certain amount that need to be expended and a great deal would be saved by quick completion because owing to the conformation of the harbour it now fills in each year, involving yearly expenditures for dredging. In the name of Canada, I ask this Government, and this House, in the interests of the country and in the interests of humanity, to make this port a safe port of refuge as it was formally constituted by this Government many years ago, and I ask that it should be completed at once.

It is to be noticed that after the recent disaster the United States Lake Carriers Association spent thousands of dollars in rescue work on our shore and paid for the rescue and other costs irrespective of whether the sailor found was a citizen of the United States or of Canada. Every dollar properly spent in public improvements is well spent. Too much cannot thus be spent.

In that connection I would like to recall to the House a Bill which I had the honour of introducing in Parliament some years ago. It was a Bill, a very proper Bill, I think, in reference to the load line on ships —Bill No. 98, January 20, 1911. I think our ships on the Great Lakes should have a load line. While it has always been contended by ship owners that a vessel properly built with proper steam capacity and properly loaded would be safe in any storm, the recent disaster proves the contrary to be the case. The only Canadian boat saved that went through the storm was the Kaministiquia. She was absolutely light and left the harbour of Goderich ten hours after the weather bureau in Toronto knew there was to be a northeast hurricane on the Great Lakes. The hurricane began at three o'clock in the afternoon of Sunday the 9th of November, and it was all over apparently that evening because the watches of all the men were found stopped about the same time.

There is another matter which seriously affects the people of western Ontario. I know more of western Ontario than other parts of Canada and I hope other parts of the Dominion are not affected as much as we are in the east. I refer to bank interest. Bank interest has recently been raised from 6 to 7 or 8 per cent. I know that because when I applied for some money to come down here to discharge my duties as a legislator I was told that I should have to pay 8 per cent on the money, although I believe the law says they cannot collect 8 per cent. But we cannot afford to go to law with a bank. I contend—and I ask the Minister of Finance to bear this in mind, for I have already brought this matter before the House—that when a bank raises its interest on loans from 6 to 7 per cent, it should also raise the rate it pays to depositors from 3 to 4 per cent. If they were compelled to do this it would benefit a great number of people because it is well known the farmers of western Ontario have many millions of dollars in the banks at 3 per cent. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways.

I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to another matter which has been called to my attention in several

communications and to which a great deal of publicity has been given in the press. I refer to some indemnity being given to a man or his family in the case of a man who has been imprisoned and afterwards found to be absolutely innocent of the offence with which he was charged. In the year 1907 I drew up a Bill at the request of some legal gentlemen in Toronto, men of large and kindly spirit, but on presenting the same to the law officers of the House I was informed that I could not present the Bill as it was a Bill including the expenditure of money and must therefore be introduced by a member of the Government. Here is one letter which I have just received in connection with this matter:

> Let the country know that Parliament had been given the opportunity to clean the skirts of Canadian justice, over this gross miscarriage of justice. It seems to me, that it is one of the strangest travesties of our laws, that there is absolutely no redress, from the State, in cases of the kind, where innocent men are punished, and imprisoned by the State, on the principle that 'The King can do no wrong' when every one knows that a cruel wrong has been perpetrated by the representatives of the King, in the name of justice. Surely a compensatory Act could be framed to meet just such cases. That the King can do no wrong is surely a survival of mediæval darkness, and the blind worship of an ancient fetish, that no legal redress can be obtained from the State, when the liberty of the subject has been subjected to gross injustice by the same State.

I do not believe that there will be very many cases requiring this kind of compensation. For eighteen years I was in charge of the criminal jurisdiction of one of the largest counties in Ontario, and I remember discussing this matter with the jailer who was a man of great thought. He stated that in the whole of his many years' experience as a jailer he only knew of one man who had been imprisoned and afterwards found not guilty.

The hon. gentleman who last spoke made some remarks in reference to the navy. I do not purpose entering into that question, but I would ask this Government if they could not see fit, in the interest of the sea-faring men of the Great Lakes and of Canada generally, to enter into negotiations with the mother country by which five or six large cruisers could be sent here at the Christmas season of the year in order that the young sailor men and fishermen of Canada, who have nothing to do from the end of November to the first of April, might be allowed to take a cruise from Halifax or St. John to the West Indies or other places, and to exercise with the big guns, they to be paid their wages by the Dominion of Canada during that period, and, after three years of such exercise and winter cruising, to be called naval reserve men, and paid a certain amount in consideration of the fact that they would be at the beck and call of the State when needed. I agree with Lord Fitzwilliam, and other authorities, that the one great need of the British navy is men, and as we have 80,000 odd fishermen and sailors who have nothing to do during this portion of the year, and who would only be too glad of the three months' training and service with the guns, I contend that this would be a very effective way of showing our loyalty to the empire. These men, I think, would be fully entitled to the amount which they would receive up to a certain age limit after passing through their three years of training. There is no more deserving class in Canada than these men who are fishermen or sailors on the Great Lakes or the sea coasts of Canada. The farmer in our fine country knows very well when he goes to bed at night that when he wakes up in the morning he will find his fields in front of him, and his barns in their proper places; or, if they are not in their places, he will find his insurance policy, and not be at any loss if anything occurs while he sleeps. But the poor fishermen, generally hardy men of no great means, when they go to sea, have no idea whether they shall ever return or whether they shall find their nets or what they are looking for. It would be a deserving payment to men of that class.

There was one more question brought forward by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt); that was in reference to immigration. You may remember, Mr. Speaker, that I had a Bill before this House at one time to restrict immigration from certain parts of Europe. I refer to the southern parts of Europe. I think we should take warning from the example of the great nation to the south of us. From the time of the formation of that nation until 1830 they doubled and trebled in population out of the loins of their own people. They grew strong in stature and intellect. From 1830 to 1880 they doubled and trebled with an immense immigration, but where from? From the proper parts of the Old World in which to get a good class of immigrants—from the British Isles, from the north of France, from Denmark, Germany, Sweden, Norway, and they still grew a nation of men and women strong in

stature and mighty in intellect. I do not say this of my own knowledge, but I take it from the report of the United States Commission appointed to investigate that matter under oath, and on the authority of that report I make the statement that from the year 1880 until the present day that nation has deteriorated, both in regard to the stature and intellect of its people. Why? Because of the immigration of nearly a million people a year from southern Europe. There is only one way to remedy the high cost of living, and that is to produce more. We do not want a nation of organ-grinders and banana sellers in this country. They will not assimilate with us, but they send the money they make back to the Old Country. All you have to do is to ask the Dominion Government post office as to how much is sent over every year. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that you will give due consideration to these matters that I have brought be-

5 p. m. before you. I think they are of great concern to the people of Canada, and I thank you, Sir, for the kind indulgence which you have shown me.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Guysboro): I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Lewis). He always makes an interesting speech when he addresses the House. I look upon him, Sir, as a sort of radical among the supporters of the Government, and I doubt not that his gaze pierces further into the future than does that of some of his colleagues on the other side of the House. I am not an expert in regard to steamers on the Great Lakes and the question of wireless telegraphy, but I wish to assure my hon. friend that we on this side of the House are very much interested in making traffic on the Great Lakes as safe as it can be made, and if it is necessary to have wireless telegraph stations built on the Great Lakes in order that the ships may be able to find their way safely, then I think I can assure him that the Opposition will vote for any measure of that kind that is proper and right. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) raised a question in regard to the traffic on the Great Lakes that I expected my hon. friend from Huron to make some reply to. He informed us that there is a combine controlling that traffic, and that the western wheat is compelled to pay some two or three cents a bushel more than usual on account of that combine. I expected my hon. friend to deal with that question and to advise the Government what he supports in regard to it. It will be necessary, I suppose, for the Government to send out an S. O. S. call to the farmers of this country within the next two years, and that question of traffic on the Great Lakes and the cost of conveying wheat from Port Arthur to Montreal ought to be a very interesting one to my hon. friend. In regard to the breakwater that my hon. friend wants built in his county, I scarcely know what to say. I am not able to get a breakwater for myself or for my constituents from this Government. I think that the best I can do for my hon. friend is to refer him to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers). If he can make out a case, if he has a close constituency, and if it is necessary that a breakwater should be built in order to win the next election, then I think he should have a pretty good chance of getting his breakwater.

In regard to the Speech from the Throne itself, there are two or three questions that we all agree about. We all agree with respect to the reference as to the pleasure the country feels in the restoration to health of Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Connaught. We all agree that the time has arrived when the redistribution of the constituencies should be dealt with. But, otherwise the Speech from the Throne appears to me to be an attempt to make the ship of state look seaworthy by plugging holes above the water line and paying no attention to the bad planks or the worm-eaten hulk below the water line where all the trouble exists. It is the duty of a leader to lead; it is the duty of a government presiding over the destinies of a country like this, in a commercial crisis such as we have to-day, to point the way, and when a government fails to point the way as this Government has failed, it is the duty of the Opposition to do so. I submit that my leader has not failed in this respect. In the very able and interesting speech he delivered on Monday, he indicated several ways in which relief could be given to the country; first, by granting wider markets; second, free wheat; third, lessening of the burden of taxation on the farmers; fourth, relief from the operation of trusts and combines; fifth, lessening the undue margin between what the producer gets and what the consumer pays. Any one of these reforms if brought about would confer untold benefit upon the people of this country, but we look in vain in the speech for a mention of any of them. There is not a word of cheer in this speech for the people

whom I have the honour to represent. There is not a single ray of hope for the fishermen of the Maritime provinces, who may be seen on these frosty winter mornings pushing out their boats into the surf to search for cod and haddock among the whitecaps on our stormy coast. There is not a word of cheer in that speech for the hard-working farmer; there is none for the man who swings his pick in the coal mines or the gold mines of my province, or for the man who swings his axe in the lumber woods. These are the kind of people I have the honour to represent, and any man ought to be proud to represent them.

In my view, the reason why this speech contains no word of cheer for the working men and consumers of this country is because the Government does not represent the people of this country. This Government was elected by the combines; it is owned by the combines and it does not now and never did represent the people of Canada. Some may think this is pretty strong language, but I do not mean to imply that all my hon. friends on the other side of the House are consenting parties to that state of affairs. On the contrary I know that many of them are high-minded public men and would not tolerate any outside influence on the Government if they knew of it. But the inside operations of this Government are only known to a few men who work the machine. This proposition that I am making is of its nature a very difficult one to prove. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, in New Testament times how difficult it was to distinguish the saint from the sinner, and a test was applied: by their fruits ye shall know them. That test holds as good to-day as it did nineteen hundred years ago. I submit, Sir, there is strong evidence to be found in the conduct of the Government since they come into power, to go to the jury, to show they are tied up with the combines and trusts in this country. In the first place, who were the 18 prominent men in the city of Toronto who led the revolt against the Laurier Administration in 1911? Was there a representative farmer, or a representative artisan, or a representative fisherman among these eighteen? Not one. Every one of these eighteen men were rich men, men of wealth, who left the Liberal party—I was going to say not for patriotic but for financial reasons. These eighteen men became protectionists and Conservatives, not because there was any advantage to the labourers and consumers of this country by their doing so, but because their safes were full of bonds and debentures and shares of corporations, and the profits of these corporations were flowing into their pockets. They were not thinking about the labourers and the consumers; they were thinking about the coupons on these bonds. These eighteen millionaires inspired by this coupon patriotism, were largely instrumental in bringing the province of Ontario into line for the Conservative party at the last election, and it is now up to the Government to do their part and to stand by the men who put them where they are. I must say that the Government is doing that to the best of its ability. My proposition is, that this Government is controlled by the big interests, and I want to be permitted to call witnesses to to prove that statement. The first witness I will call is the Toronto World. The Toronto World, as every hon. member of this House knows, is controlled and directed by a prominent member supporting the Government, a man occupying a seat in the front row on the other side of the House and who is a loyal supporter, I think I can say, of the present Administration. He does register a kick once in a while, but when the time arrives he comes back and as a rule he votes in support of the party measures of the Government. I think I can say he would be one of the last men to allow anything to be said in his newspaper in regard to the present Administration that he did not believe was true. My hon. friend from York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is a candid man and when he sees a shovel he calls it a shovel. The article I am going to quote from appeared in the Toronto World three or four days after the defeat of the Government candidate in South Bruce, and my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) was endeavoring to find some explanation for the defeat of the Government candidate in that riding. This is what he says:—

> But the most significant fact of the election is the lack of leadership in their province of the Ontario ministers.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that he does not indicate that there is any lack of leadership among the Ontario members; it is a lack of leadership among the Ontario ministers he emphasizes. (Reading):—

> Ontario won the lest election, but the Government is anything but an Ontario Government; it is a Western-Maritime-Government, controlled in Montreal and its policy and legislation is not Ontario-desired legislation but legislation desired by the banks, by the railways, and dictated from Montreal. Ontario which put up the lines of the fight of two years ago and won the seats is represented by ministers who were not able to hold South Bruce and

who are treated with some contempt by the more astute politicians who sit in the ministry from the plains of the fertile West. More than wheat grows there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very significant statement: more than wheat grows on the plains of the fertile West. We have some positive statements in this article. One is that this Government is controlled in Montreal. He goes on to say:

Not only the legislation alone, but the policy of the Government is dictated by the railways and the banks and the big interests in the city of Montreal.

Now, there could not be a more sweeping indictment against any Government, and I wish you to note that this indictment is made by a man who ought to know.

That is not all. In addition to the outside influences that we are told control this Government, there is a system of internal boss rule. Special reference is made to an astute minister from the plains of the fertile West, who not only controls the ministry, but treats with contempt the members of the Cabinet who come from the province of Ontario.

In Japan, before they adopted western ideas, some fifty years ago, we are told that there was an official called the great Shogun, who had complete control of all the legislation and of all the official business of the Empire of Japan. He was supposed to be second in rank to the Emperor; but he was not second to the Emperor in power; in fact, he had authority above the Emperor himself. He had complete control in the Empire of Japan. When the great Shogun said: Go, the people went; and when he said: Do this, they did it; for, if they did not do it, why, their heads were cut off.

To speak plainly, my reading of this article which I have just submitted to you, Sir, is that the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) suggests that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) is the great Shogun of this Government, and that this great Shogun goes so far as to treat the Ministers from the province of Ontario with contempt. I do not call this witness, however, for the purpose of showing that there are dissensions in the Cabinet. I produce this evidence for the purpose of showing that the policy and the legislation of this Government are dictated by the big interests. If any one on the other side of the House disputes that fact, I would ask him to fight it out with my hon. friend from South York.

The second witness I am going to produce is no less a gentleman than the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen).

We all know that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a man of very great ability and energy. When he took up the important portfolio of Marine and Fisheries, very high hopes were entertained of him in the Maritime provinces; and I have no doubt that it was felt on all sides that he would administer the affairs of the department for the development of the great fishing industry of this country. I feel sure that he would have lived up to those high expectations, if he had not in some cases been ruled by outside influences.

Let me give you an example of how the Department of Marine and Fisheries is dictated to by the big interests. There is an old regulation, which was passed, I understand, in the year 1894, prohibiting the export of sockeye salmon from the province of British Columbia. It was not a tariff regulation; it was absolute prohibition. The fisherman who caught the salmon could not sell them to the American buyers. If he did so he incurred the penalty of confiscation of his boat and his license, and he was put out of business. He must sell to somebody within the province of British Columbia, or not sell at all. That was a regulation which occasionally bore hard on the fishermen. I have been told by hon. members from British Columbia that often the price on the south side of the line was better than the price on the British Columbia side, and even on some occasions the canners in British Columbia would not purchase the fish from the fisherman at all, and that he had to dump them back in the sea. I am not dealing just now with the question as to whether that regulation is a bad one or a good one. It was passed by the old Conservative Government in 1894, and has existed throughout the whole period of the Liberal Administration up to the present time. It may be a bad regulation or it may be a good one; but the question that I am discussing is that the Conservative members from the province of British Columbia, when they were in opposition, took the ground that it was a bad regulation, and that it ought to be repealed. My hon. friend the member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) was the champion of the fishermen on different occasions for ten years during the time of the late Administration. I often listened to the speeches on that question and I used to think that he made out a pretty strong case. In order that I may give him fair play, I shall quote his own words as they appear in

'Hansard' referring to this regulation. They are to be found on page 8424 of 'Hansard' 1910-11. He was applying at that time for the repeal of the regulation. He makes the statement that there is an absolute fish combine among the canners of British Columbia. Then he goes on to charge Mr. Brodeur, then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, not only with preventing them from selling their fish on the Canadian side by limiting the number of licenses, but with prescribing an absolute prohibition of export so that when a Canadian fisherman has 400 or 500 fish in his boat ready to sell, and no Canadian canner will buy them, and when an American canner within a few miles away holds out his hand for those fish, the minister says, I prohibit you by force of law taking those fish across the boundary line. My hon. friend from New Westminster described the regulation as a cruel one. He goes on to say:

> We find the Minister of Finance standing up for the capitalists against the fishermen. The minister should be of all men the first to stand by the poor fisherman who is not able to protect himself.

Later on in the same debate, he speaks as follows:

> Under the law as it has stood the fishermen are absolutely prohibited from selling their fish on the American side. They are prohibited from exporting it at all, but the canners have not been prohibited from importing fish. Upon bringing it into the country, it is true, they pay a duty, but as they export the greater part of their product, that duty, minus a very small charge for office fees, is always refunded to them, so that the transaction costs them nothing more than putting up a cheque from the time they bring the fish into the country until the time they export it.

After the present Government came into power, I must say it is to the credit of my hon. friend from New Westminster that he endeavoured to carry out his promise to the fishermen. In the session of 1912, the matter was brought before the House. I think it came before the House on the motion of my hon. friend the member for Comox-Atlin (Mr. Clements). Several hon. gentlemen from British Columbia on that occasion repeated the old protest against this regulation. They said it was a bad regulation; that it should never have existed, and they demanded its repeal. They said it was not in the interests of the fishermen, and that it was altogether in the interests of the canners. They condemned the Laurier Administration for not having repealed it. After the discussion which lasted for a day, I think, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) summed up the debate. He denounced the regulation. He said he was surprised that such a regulation could be possible. He stated that he had already repealed it and that statement was received with tremendous cheers by his supporters from the province of British Columbia. We on this side of the House thought that our friends on the other side had scored a kind of victory over us. Let me read a part of the minister's speech on that subject. I quote from page 2492 of the 'Hansard' of 1912. This debate took place on the 5th of February, 1912. The minister said:

> The effect of that regulation was this: A boat might catch 300 or 400 salmon and on bringing its catch to the cannery would find a notice posted up to the effect that on that day the cannery would not take more than 100. One would think that the fisherman could then take his fish to the American or some other market; no, under the regulations he was absolutely prohibited from doing so, so that he had to dump his extra supply, in come cases 200 or 300 salmon, back into the sea.
>
> Acting on representations or representatives from British Columbia endorsed by the officials of my department on Saturday last I had that regulation repealed, so that now the fishermen can send their fresh fish to other markets than to the canneries.
>
> The regulation we have repealed was probably passed years ago, before the fisheries were properly understood, and when probably some wealthy men had sufficient influence to have this regulation made in their own interest. It was then continued in force from year to year until it became a serious scandal and a great subject of grievance to the fishermen.

I wish you to mark these words of the minister: 'On Saturday last I had that regulation repealed.' Now, Mr. Speaker, you will be surprised to learn that this regulation was not repealed at all and that it is still in full force. What is the explanation? No sooner was this declaration of the minister's sent abroad in the newspapers than the combine in British Columbia woke up and for the next day or two kept the wires hot with messages to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to the Prime Minister, to everybody who, they thought had influence with the Government. We had these telegrams placed on the table last year in response to an order of this House, and from that return I wish to quote. The first telegram which I will quote is addressed to Hon. J. D. Hazen, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and is signed by W. D. Burdis, secretary of the British Columbia Canners' Asociation. This association, I am told, represents all

the large canneries in British Columbia. There is evidence of this in the papers submitted to the House. Among these are the following: The Fraser River Canning Association, Limited, British Columbia Salmon Cannery, Canadian Canning, Limited, the British Columbia Canning Company, Limited, the British Columbia Packers' Association, Limited, the Anglo-British Columbia Packing Company, and the Wallace Fisheries, Limited. All these fish canning companies are in this combination, represented, we are told, by Mr. W. D. Burdis, who signs this telegram:

To Hon. J. D. Hazen, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Ottawa.

Repeal of fishery regulations prohibiting export of raw fish reported in the press. If correct, salmon canners in British Columbia desire respectfully to enter their earnest protest against the removal of the restriction, as it would be disastrous to the industry, already seriously handicapped. It would constitute a reversal of a carefully considered policy adopted by the Conservative Government in 1894, would promote piracy and dishonesty, and deprive citizens of this province of much labour, to the advantage of competitors in the United States. You are prayed to suspend action in this connection, pending receipt of a memorial setting forth the facts.

W. D. Burdis,
Sec'y B. C. Salmon Canners' Assn.

You will notice incidentally that this telegram says that it 'would promote piracy and dishonesty' to allow a British Columbia fisherman to sell fish to the Yankees. In eastern Canada, in the last election, we were told that it would be unpatriotic, and bad for the flag, if we were allowed to sell a barrel of fish or a bundle of shingles to the Yankees. But they go further in British Columbia; it would be piracy—which is punishable by death—in the opinion of the British Columbia Salmon Canners' Association, for the fishermen to sell their fish in the United States.

The next telegram I shall read is one to the Prime Minister, which that right hon. gentleman turned over to the Minister of Marie and Fisheries, in the following letter:

Ottawa, Ont., February 19, 1912.

Deputation from British Columbia salmon canneries arrive Ottawa Monday morning next to interview Minister of Fisheries and Cabinet regarding new regulations authorizing export of Canadian Sockeye salmon to American canneries, taking business away from our canneries and Canadians employed. Last year every man and boat was put into service. We were short sixty-five per cent of deliveries in actual sales. If exportation allowed it will be resented by Pacific salmon industry, wholesale grocers, consumers everywhere. Election decided against reciprocity. This new movement will reverse will of people by Order in Council. Cancelling of boat taking very objectionable. Hope nothing be done until deputation heard. Regret Hon. Hazen's departure for Washington before deputation arrives.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) R. L. Borden.

Hon. J. D. Hazen,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, Ont.

The third telegram is from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in Toronto. It appears that the canners' combine in British Columbia, fearing that they had not sufficient influence with the Government to secure the reversal of the Order in Council, decided to apply to headquarters. They went to the Manufacturers' Association in Toronto and asked them to send a message to the Government in regard to this matter. And here is the message:

Toronto, Ont., Feb. 20, 1912.

Hon. J. D. Hazen,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Ottawa.

Advisory Committee Canadian Manufacturers' Association, in conjunction with the Association's British Columbia Branch, strongly urge retention of regulation prohibiting export of raw salmon pending a thorough investigation of the situation by experts, believing that its cancellation at this time may injuriously affect the canning industry of that province. This association stands firmly by the principle of manufacturing Canada's raw material as far as possible in the Dominion.

G. M. Murray, Secretary.

To sum up the whole story, which is a rather long one for me to go through today, it comes to this: First that regulation was condemned by the Conservative members from the province of British Columbia year after year while they were in opposition. Second, it was an issue at the election in the province of British Columbia in the general election, and I am informed that hon. gentlemen opposite who were candidates in British Columbia, in that election pledged themselves that if they were elected they would have it repealed. The third point is that this was declared to be a bad and oppressive regulation by a number of British Columbia members who spoke after the election of 1911 in the discussion in the session of 1912 to which I have referred. In the fourth place, the minister consulted the officers of the department, and the officers of the department said that it was a bad regulation and ought to be repealed. In the fifth place, it appears from the statement of the minister himself that he consulted the British Columbia members supporting the Government—and it happens that all the members of this House from British Columbia are on that side—agreed that the regulation was a bad

regulation and ought to be repealed. The sixth point is that an Order in Council was prepared, and, as I am instructed, was passed, cancelling the regulation and declaring it repealed. The seventh is that the repeal of that obnoxious regulation was announced in the House by the Minister of Marine; and, after all this had happened, a telegram from the combine in British Columbia, and another telegram from the Manufacturers' Association at Toronto, were sufficient to send them all to the woods, and to hang up the regulation which the Minister of Marine declared was iniquitous, and it is still in full force. I submit that, in that case at all events, I have proved my case. But if it is necessary I can give you further proof. Let me refer you to the fact that when the fishermen on the Atlantic seaboard, in the session of 1912-13, applied for free cordage for their lobster traps, a privilege that had been granted to them for years by the late Administration, they did not get this privilege because the cordage combine had more influence with the present Administration than the fishermen had. Let me also refer to the fact that when the western settlers, after the election of 1911, applied for a proper construction to be put on the tariff clause relating to rough lumber imported into this country, the Government listened to the lumber combine of British Columbia rather than to the settlers, and the settlers had to fight their case through the highest courts of the realm before they could beat the Government out and regain a concession which had been granted to them by the late Administration. And last, but not least in consequence, let me refer you to the fact that when, a few days ago, a unanimous resolution was passed by the Legislature of Manitoba asking for free wheat, they apparently got the cold shoulder from this Administration because free wheat is not acceptable to the railway companies and to the millers. The member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), I understand, is to follow me. Perhaps he will tell us whether the Government are really in favour of giving free wheat to the West or not. We would also like to hear from him on the question of free agricultural implements. I understand he was the champion of the farmers some years ago in regard to free agricultural implements, and moved an historic resolution in regard to this question. I presume he did not accept the office of Solicitor General without some understanding about these two important questions, and it would be interesting to know just what attitude he and the Government he supports take in regard to these questions.

In the Speech from the Throne reference is made to the fact that there is a certain amount of depression in Canada at the present time, but no remedy has been suggested, and may I venture to say that there is no remedy possible without an attack upon the privileges of the big interests, and we can hardly expect that there will be any remedy applied by this Government; it would be a kind of suicide for the present Government to apply any remedy of that kind. But they have tried to administer consolation to us by telling us that we have in this country unbounded resources. No doubt that is a good thing, but such resources are not much good to a hungry man. Think what a comfort it would be to one of the poor fellows waiting in line to get into some soup kitchen in Montreal or Toronto to be told that in this country we have boundless resources! It reminds me of the story of the Bourbon princess who, when she heard that people in the streets of Paris were crying for bread, at the time of the French revolution, said: 'If bread is so scarce as that why do they not eat cake or biscuits?'

Reference has been made in this debate to the navy, although it does not form any part of the speech from the Throne. It is a strange thing that the speech does not refer to this important question. Hon. members who have spoken on the other side, or most of them, have condemned the Senate for their action in regard to the navy. Let me ask, what is the offence of the Senate in reference to that question? As far as I understand, the offence of the Senate is that they have adopted the Conservative policy. The Conservative policy was that no step be taken until first there was an appeal to the people. I suppose that every Conservative in this House who was here in 1911, in the preceding Parliament, voted for Mr. Monk's amendment that no steps should be taken in regard to that very important question of a navy until first there was an appeal to the people. How is it that these hon. gentlemen are in any position to criticise the Senate in regard to this matter when the Senate has simply adopted the policy they themselves laid down? Why, Sir, about twelve months ago, the Prime Minister himself proclaimed

that policy of an appeal to the people. Everybody remembers that in the citv of Montreal a banquet was given to the Prime Minister which was attended by four or five hundred of the leading Conservatives in this country, and that at that banquet the Prime Minister made a very impressive and eloquent speech which appeared in the press of the country with great headlines, and no doubt made a great impression on the people of this country. He said that there was a crisis in the affairs of the empire; he heard the German guns in the North sea, he had visions of trouble for the empire and he said that, so far as he was concerned, he would do his duty, he would clear his skirts, and he laid down a policy which he said ought to be adopted. He said: 'I will call Parliament together, and submit a vote to Parliament asking for $35,000,000 for the immediate help of the empire in regard to naval affairs; if Parliament refuses to vote the $35,000,000 I will appeal to the people of Canada. He carried out part of his programme. He called Parliament together, he appealed to Parliament for $35,000,000; Parliament refused it but he did not appeal to the people of Canada. He thought better of it. No man knew better than the Prime Minister that an appeal to the people of Canada on that question would meet with defeat and consequently he did not make the appeal and I submit that neither the Prime Minister nor anv of his supporters is in a position to-day to criticise the Senate for having adopted the policy that was approved of by the Conservative party and their leader. There has been a very large number of vagaries in connection with this naval discussion and when the history of it comes to be written it will be a very interesting chapter indeed. Two years ago or a little more, hon. members from the province of Quebec thought that the Naval Act ought to be repealed. I understand that many of them came here under pledge that they would repeal that Act. That was an absurd kind of pledge because the Naval Act deals with a number of other things in addition to the navy; it regulates the protection of fisheries on our coasts. We have always had a Naval Act in this country. Prior to Confederation, in the little province from which I come, seventy-five years ago, we had a Naval Act; we had regulations that are to-day in the Naval Act and if the Naval Service Act had been repealed by these gentlemen they would have had to enact immediately another one or else there would have been a great deal of confusion in the affairs on the coasts of this country. But you will remember that after the opening of the first session in the fall of 1911 my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Sevigny) put a question on the order paper: Does this Government intend to repeal the Naval Service Act? He did that very early in the session. This question was called over again and again for several months. I well remember the scene that used to happen every week when the Speaker called this question. A cloud came over the manly brow of my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel) and an extra wrinkle came into the face of my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier). The Prime Minister himself looked anxious, and the question was allowed to stand week after week, and it was only towards the end of the session that they mustered up courage to say: 'Yes, we will repeal the Naval Service Act.' But the Naval Service Act still stands, and there has been no further word from the Government so far as I know that it is to be repealed. That strikes me as one of the vagaries in regard to this question. A great deal of amusement was created amongst several members of the House at the position taken by my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) in his speech on naval defence. He was speaking about rivets and riveters. He said he had information that when a ship was approaching shore the rivets fell out in buckets' full, and as there were no riveters in this country capable of putting them in again, it would therefore be unsafe to have ships on the coast until we could get riveters. That seemed a very amazing statement to hon. members on this side of the House, and especially to my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) and myself, who live in a town where there are hundreds of as good riveters as you can find anywhere in the world. And New Glasgow is not the only place in Canada where you can find riveters. The latest phase of these vagaries on the part of the Conservative party is in regard to a proposal to establish a shop on the banks of the St. Lawrence somewhere about opposite the city of Montreal. It is stated in the newspapers that the British engineering firm of Armstrong, Whitworth & Co. have organized a company to start a shop at Montreal. Sir Percy Girouard, I understand, is president of the company, and there are a number of able financial men on the board. But the curious thing about it is that while this company is stated in

the newspapers to be building a shop for the purpose of making high grade steel tools and articles of that kind—and it is hoped later on to build ships—yet considerable alarm has been created in the Conservative press over this matter. The Ottawa Citizen has almost gone into hysterics over it. It thinks these people are going to come up here on the Hill and put the German bogey in front of the members, and we shall have to build ships whether we want to or not. That appears to be the idea of the Citizen on this matter. And I understand there are a number of old women in the Tory party who are losing their sleep at nights over the proposed shipyard in Montreal. I think we should be very much pleased to see a new industry coming to Canada. In the discussion of last winter, the argument that our hon. friends opposite used was that we could not build ships. And now they are afraid that we can build ships.

Reference was made in the Speech from the Throne to changes in the Civil Service Act. We are not aware of the nature of these amendments, but you will not blame us on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, if we are somewhat skeptical about what this Government will do on the question of Civil Service. My hon. friend the Prime Minister, when he was on this side of the House, was a Civil Service reformer himself. He laid down the principle that no man should be dismissed for partisan reasons, that all appointments should be made on merit and not as a reward for party service, that civil servants should be permitted to go on a political platform and make speeches in opposition to the government that was paying them their salaries, provided they did it in a decent and manly way. These are high sounding principles, but how have they been carried out? Will any one pretend that A. B. Morine was appointed on his merits as the best man in Canada for the high position to which he was appointed? Or that Captain Landry, that jailbird down in the county of Richmond, was appointed on his merits? These are only examples. Eighty officials were dismissed in my own constituency, and not one of the appointments made to fill the vacancies was on merit. The appointments were all made as a reward for party services. I do not know how many cases there are like this throughout the country, but there must be thousands of them. There have been so many of them that the Government have not been able to count them themselves. More than year ago a motion was made in this House asking for a list of these dismissed officials, and while no doubt officials have been working hard at it for a whole year they have not yet been able to give us the list of men turned out of office by this Government.

There are other questions, such as the road question, which is a very interesting one to the people I represent. I take the ground that the Government never intended to make a genuine road Bill. If they had intended to do so, they had an opportunity. There are only six clauses in that Bill, and five of them were passed by the Senate without any amendment. The sixth clause was the one giving the Government power to spend the money just as they pleased and in whatever province they pleased. We had the assurance of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways that this would not be done, but Prime Ministers do not last forever, and Ministers of Railways come and go, too. Changes may take place, and when we pass a Bill we expect it to be permanent. We expect a Bill that will be workable when we have another Prime Minister and another Minister of Railways. The Government refused to accept the amendment that was made by the Senate in regard to that matter—an amendment that made the Bill a perfect one.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman refer to the sixth clause? He says all the others were passed without amendment.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I refer to the amendment the Senate proposed to make in regard to the way the money should be spent. I will read the amendment:—

> The sum of money voted in any year to be expended under this Act shall be apportioned among and paid to the several provinces of the Dominion in proportion to the population of such provinces respectively as shown by the then next preceding census.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What clause is that in amendment to?

Mr. SINCLAIR: The sixth clause.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN: My hon. friend said a moment ago—and the statement has been repeatedly made—that five clauses were passed without amendment. Does he adhere to that statement?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is that not correct? I think I am correct in saying that in the end five clauses were passed. There might have been slight amendments but the battle was over the sixth clause. It is no use quibbling over the exact number of clauses.

The Senate proposed that the money should be distributed among the provinces according to population, and that amendment the Government rejected. If the Government had really intended to give a genuine Road Bill to the people of this country that was their opportunity, but they did not want a road Bill. What they wanted was a Bill for the outdoor relief of the Tory party.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SINCLAIR: At six o'clock I was referring to the Highways Bill, and I had pointed out that the issue between the parties was in regard to section 6 of that Bill. The Senate insisted upon a distribution of the money among the provinces in proportion to population; the Government refused to accept that proposal and the Bill was dropped. It has been often said that the Senate was to blame because the Highways Bill failed, but I place the blame at the door of the Government. If the Government had accepted the Senate amendments they would have had a working Act under which the money would have been expended to the advantage of all the provinces, but the Government absolutely refused to accept the principle of a fair division among the provinces according to population. Perhaps the best way for me to place this matter before he House is to read the reasons given by the Senate as to why they referred the Bill back to this House with their amendments attached. The Senate gives these reasons:

1. Because section 6 of the Bill empowers the minister to undertake the construction or improvement of highways in any province, which would be a contravention of the letter and spirit of the British North America Act, 1867, and of the uniform practice under that Act, for which contravention no sufficient cause has been shown.

2. Because the said amendment affirms in effect that it is undesirable that the minister or the Dominion Government should usurp the functions of the provincial administration in the building and maintenance of highways and bridges.

3. Because the said amendment will not hamper the Administration in carrying out its policy and in applying the funds placed in the Estimates for that object under conditions and regulations it may deem just and proper to make, sufficient provision being made in earlier clauses of the Bill for co-operation between the federal and provincial governments.

4. Because section 6 of the Bill is a violation of the principle of responsible government, inasmuch as the Dominion in expending provincial subsidy would not be responsible to either the provincial or Dominion legislature.

I invite the Solicitor General to take up these reasons one by one and to deal with them, and if he is able to answer them he will do more than has been done by any gentleman on his side of the House during all the discussions that have taken place on the Highways Bill. Is there any good reason why this money should not be divided among the provinces according to population? The reason why it should be so divided is obvious, and the Prime Minister pledged himself to the principle. But the whole question became a question of this Government wishing to hold on to the patronage of the road money and that is the reason the Government refused to agree to the Senate amendments. What they wanted was to have an opportunity of using this money in whatever way might seem best to them for election purposes or for any other purposes. And, Mr. Speaker, we have very ample reasons for making that statement. Everybody remembers the history of this transaction; everybody remembers that the Bill was introduced into this House at the first session of the present Parliament and that the ink was scarcely dry on the Bill when the by-election in South Renfrew took place. We all remember that four or five ministers of the Crown went up to South Renfrew to take a hand in the election and amongst others the Minister of Customs. I was not in South Renfrew at the time but there is a leading Conservative newspaper published in South Renfrew called the Renfrew Journal, in which an account of the several meetings is given. I wish to read to the House an extract from this Conservative newspaper setting forth the conduct of the Minister of Customs on the Highways Bill. The Journal says:

Dr. Reid then turned his attention to the good roads' movement advocated by the Conservative Government at Ottawa, and the bald way in which he handled this topic disgusted all decent men, who look for something higher than this kind of talk from a Cabinet minister. The burden of this part of Dr. Reid's speech was that South Renfrew should vote for Dr. Maloney and the Borden Government would then spend money in this district for good roads.

Mr. BRADBURY: What are you reading from?

Mr. SINCLAIR: From the Renfrew Journal. The inference was that if they did not vote for Dr. Maloney they would not get the money. That was the use the Government intended to make of this money and that was the reason why the Government took issue with the Senate and refused to agree to the Senate amendment,

which was to the effect that the money should be divided equitably among the provinces according to population. What a spectacle it was to have a Minister of the Crown in a Government that professed to be a decent Government; that came into power on a cry of purity, when the very first by-election took place rushing up to South Renfrew and peddling out road money to the people of that riding for their votes; and road money that he did not have. I am not surprised that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House took the ground that that Bill would not be a satisfactory Bill to the people of this country unless it contained a provision which would prevent this or any future government from using the money in that improper way. Again, we must not forget the fact that this question came up at the last session of this Parliament, and it came up in rather a peculiar way. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. J. J. Hughes) referred to the extraordinary way in which the Government dealt with this matter at the last session of Parliament, namely, that in the Estimates, after the Bill had been defeated, and when everybody knew there would not be any Road Bill, the Government laid before the House an item in the Estimates for $1,500,000 to be expended on roads under the Highways Bill. The Government was well aware then that there was no Highways Bill and that there could not be any Highways Bill. When that vote came before the House, my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) pointed out that this House could not vote the money to be expended according to the provisions of the Highways Bill when there was no Highways Bill, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) said: 'For this year let us vote to give this to the different provinces of Canada so that they may have the benefit of the one and a half million dollars on their roads'; and he moved an amendment to that effect. But every Conservative member of the House, including the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways, voted against the principle of thus distributing that one and a half million dollars amongst the provinces last year. This proved beyond doubt that with the Government it was not a question of expending money on the roads at all, but a question of having the patronage of spending the money themselves. If they had any desire to give that money for roads, the amendment of the hon. member for Carleton gave them an opportunity to do so and show their good faith.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman read that amendment?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I have not the amendment before me, but I remember very distinctly that the amendment was to strike out the words: 'to be expended according to the provisions of the Highways Bill.' That would give the Government $1,500,000 to be distributed amongst the provinces for road money, but the Government rejected that amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What provision would there be by which the Government could see that the money was so expended? That is the point I want to get at. As to the effect of the amendment, what provision would there be by which this Government could see how it would be expended?

Mr. SINCLAIR: It would simply have the effect of turning over that much money to the provinces for the year, to be expended on the roads of the province.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How could this Government see to the expenditure? Suppose the provincial Government did not so expend it, how could we enforce that expenditure?

Mr. SINCLAIR: They would have to trust the local governments if the money was voted by Parliament for the purpose of building roads in the different provinces, and distributed according to population, as it was put in the Estimates on that occasion, I see no difficulty in the Government's handing this money over to the various provinces to be used in that way. The provinces would see to its expenditure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Neither do I, but I see a difficulty in enforcing it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I cannot make it any plainer than I have endeavoured to do. There is a very marked difference in the way in which the Government have dealt with this question of road money as compared with the way with which they have dealt with the agricultural grant. I think it will be remembered that when the agricultural grant was introduced the same criticism arose. The Government agreed that the agricultural grant should be turned over to the various provinces according to population. That was done, and there has been no difficulty about it. Wherein is the difference between the agri-

cultural grant and the road grant that justifies the Government in taking a different position in regard to the road grant? We are back to the same old reason which I gave you before, the Government insist on retaining the patronage. There is no other reason. I would like my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) to deal with that when he speaks in regard to this matter.

My hon. friend from Kings county, Prince Edward Island (Mr. J. J. Hughes), in speaking of the extravagant expenditures of the Government, referred to the fact that the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) had given an order for 350,000 unnecessary padlocks. Perhaps the best way for me, in case there should be any misunderstanding, is to read what the Postmaster General said and what the hon. member for Kings said. The hon. member for Kings said:

> The Postmaster General last year gave a contract for 350,000 padlocks for $350,000—
> Hon. L. P. Pelletier: Never.
> Mr. Hughes: Well, perhaps he did not give the contract for them, but he ordered padlocks for the mail bags sufficient to last forty or fifty years, I am told.
> Mr. Pelletier: That is not a fact.
> Mr. Hughes: More padlocks than have been used in this country since Confederation.
> Mr. Pelletier: I have told the hon. gentleman that that is not a fact.
> Mr. Hughes: What are the facts in connection with the matter?
> Mr. Pelletier: My hon. friend should know the facts himself, since he is speaking about the matter.
> Mr. Hughes: The Postmaster General will not tell me the facts; I know that statement was made repeatedly in this House.
> Mr. Pelletier: It was denied repeatedly.
> Mr. Hughes: How many were ordered?
> Mr. Pelletier: There were 10,000 ordered, and not one delivered.

I had the curiosity to look up the record as to what was said by the Postmaster General on the 19th day of March, 1913, when he was asking for his post office estimates for the outside service. I find, on page 6294, the following conversation between the present Postmaster General and the late Postmaster General:

> Mr. Lemieux: How many new locks have been bought for the mail bags?
> Mr. Pelletier: 350,000.
> Mr. Lemieux: From whom?
> Mr. Pelletier: A firm in Ottawa of which Mr. Carling is the manager; they were the lowest tenderers.
> Mr. Lemieux: What is the price?
> Mr. Pelletier: One dollar per lock.
> Mr. Lemieux: Is it a great improvement?
> Mr. Pelletier: Oh, yes, first-class.

Mr. PELLETIER: Would the hon. member permit me now as a matter of fairness? Surely I think everybody should be good natured about this matter, as I have been. It has been mentioned repeatedly before this House; and I am sure the hon. member for Guysborough knew that this information was asked me at a moment when I had the assistance of the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General here, and he gave me the information. A few days after, a statement was read by me in the House from the gentleman who had given me that information, stating that he had made a mistake; that he had misinformed me about the matter. All this was put before Parliament. Does the hon. member for Guysborough think it fair to read that part of it and not read the following statement correcting that?

Mr. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. Postmaster General if the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General is still in the service of the Government?

Mr. PELLETIER: The Assistant Deputy Postmaster General is still in the service of the Government; but, if my hon. friend thinks he should be dismissed, I should like to have his opinion about it.

Mr. OLIVER: If my hon. friend does me the honour to ask my opinion—

Mr. PELLETIER: I do.

Mr. OLIVER: I think that any minister who receives such information from a responsible official is not doing himself justice in retaining him in his service and in the service of the Government, and is attempting to shield himself behind that official.

Mr. PELLETIER: That is not a fact. It is not true.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I think it is quite true that my hon. friend made several explanations in regard to this matter after he was severely criticised by the ex-Postmaster General. I quite agree that he withdrew and made a different arrangement. That is the way I understood it, that he abandoned the first arrangement and made a different arrangement altogether, but that took place after he was attacked by the ex-Postmaster General. These statements made by my hon. friend from Kings (Mr. Hughes) were justified. The answer that my hon. friend the Postmaster General gave to my hon. friend from Kings was not as polite and courteous as it might

have been under the circumstances, and I am glad to have my hon. friend's explanation. I knew the explanation would be forthcoming and I was not going to speak about it unless he was in his seat, but I wish to give him the opportunity to explain if he could, the attitude he took in this matter last night.

There are a number of other things that I had intended to deal with on this occasion, such questions as the branch railways which were promised by the present Administration and which have not been built, the question of high cost of living and some other questions which I may have an opportunity of dealing with at some later stage in the session.

I wish to say, however, before I sit down, that we on this side of the House are not hoisting any signals of distress. We are not asking for any quarter. We are in the best of good cheer, and we are quite willing to bide our time and take what the future has in store for us as a party. We are confident of one thing, and that is that the Conservative party were never less formidable as a fighting force than they are today. They need settled beliefs and a moral issue of some kind just about as badly as any party ever did. 'Canadians cannot build ships.' 'Canadians are not big enough to trade with their nearest neighbour on equal terms.' 'Hard times is the only cure for high prices.' 'Soup kitchens must needs come.' 'Let bad enough alone.' These are not inspiring battle cries, Mr. Speaker. The truth of the matter is, the leaders of the Conservative party at the present time have no convictions on any of the great questions that are now before the country. No man can tell what their permanent naval policy is to be. No man can tell what their policy is on so important a question as the British preference. No man can state what their policy is on the reduction of the duties on agricultural implements or the abolition of the duty on wheat. They agree on one thing, and one thing alone, and that is reckless expenditure—put the screws on the consumer—wring all you can out of the people and hand it over to the great Shogun to spend it where he can get most votes for the Conservative party—let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die. An end to all this must come sooner or later, and the sooner it comes the better for the people of Canada.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my only purpose in rising is to devote some time—I hope usefully—to the discussion of one special feature of the topics which have been referred to in the present debate. I do not believe it would serve any useful purpose for me to wander over all imaginary topics —giving a sentence or so to each—that, while interesting in themselves, are undoubtedly of very little value in making any substantial advance in our present discussion. As to the address to which we have just listened, I have only this to say, that the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) travelled so discursively over so many topics, and spent so little time—or at all events so little thought—on each, that he has said nothing that demands a very exhaustive reply. A great part of his address was devoted to certain regulations which he complains of as being in force as regards fishing in the province of British Columbia. It must be a matter of congratulation to the people of British Columbia that they have always in this House the hon. member for Guysborough to look after their interests as to fishing in the waters of the Coast. He then proceeded to make inquiries, and to invite myself to give them an answer, as to the position of this Government on the subject of certain items of the tariff. His request in that regard was implemented by a similar one from the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). There seems to be a general desire on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite that I should anticipate the duties of the Minister of Finance and announce the Government's position in regard to all items of the tariff. I am not surprised that the hon. gentlemen I have referred to should evince some interest in that regard. It may add interest to their speeches—and if so it is to be forgiven. But I was surprised to hear the request made by the hon. member for Guysborough, implemented by a 'hear, hear', from the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself.

The hon. member for Guysborough invited me to say, and apparently thought it was my duty to say, what the policy of the present Government was to be specifically as to the duty on wheat and the products of wheat. He also invited me to say here and now, anticipating that I was to follow him, what was to be the position of the present Government as to the duties on farm implements. Well, hon. gentlemen must know, and if they do not, certainly no member of this House knows better than the hon. leader of the Opposition himself,

that I should be giving incontestable evidence of my incompetency for my present post, that I should be showing once and for all that I had no sense of the responsibility of office, if I were, in a debate on the Address, to state what the duty on any article would be in the revision of the tariff. It would be interesting indeed if the right hon. leader of the Opposition—than whom no one knows better the duties of a minister or of a Solicitor General, who is not a minister, in regard to anticipating the Budget Speech—would inform the House what was in the back of his head when he said, 'Hear, hear,' in response to the request of the hon. member for Guysborough that I should announce the Government's position as to the duty on wheat and on agricultural implements. The time will come when both subjects will be fit subjects for discussion in this House. The revision of the tariff will be made in due course. When it is made, I, as associated with the Government, will do one of two things—I will accept full responsibility for the tariff as promulgated in that revision, or if I cannot do so I will sever my present association with the Government. When the tariff is revised, free wheat, agricultural implements and all other such matters will be fit and proper subjects for discussion. And I will be right in at the death; the hon. gentlemen's curiosity shall be satisfied to the limit.

I have heard considerable discussion of a topic on which I purpose specially to treat, a subject that now is first brought before the Canadian people and one which in its present form at all events has never yet before been the subject of discussion in this House—free food. Apparently many hon. gentlemen opposite see value in the free food cry. On the other hand, judging from the vagaries of hon. gentlemen opposite, there is a very powerful section of their party who see very little value in free food as a political issue. There is little to be gained, perhaps, in discussing the merits of the question, because we are not sure yet where the Opposition stands with regard to it. We are not sure whether this policy of free food is to be inscribed upon their banner or not. It was put there on the 26th of November, 1913, but it is notably absent from the amendment submitted in this debate by the leader of the Opposition. Therefore, in doubt as we are as to the adhesion of the Opposition to this cry, very little can be gained by extended discussion. But, as to those on both sides of the House who see at present in Canada nothing to be gained by the free food policy, those who would regret, and regret exceedingly, its adoption as a part of the tariff policy of the Dominion, I can give them this consolation,—that there is little to fear in that regard. In the speech that the leader of the Opposition delivered in the city of Hamilton when he threw out the gospel of free food to the people, he took care to warn them that he was a very cautious politician. He took care to tell them as regards his last cry, reciprocity, there was not much more to be said. He had no recriminations to make in regard to it, and the sentence with which he closed his reference to it was that it was his prayer that the dead past would bury its dead. He went on then to propound the new gospel of free food, but he added this very suggestive sentence, as quoted from his speech as reported in the Toronto 'Globe':

> During the fifteen years that we were in office we had been very chary in making any alteration in the tariff. The reason is that when we place a tariff of customs duties we create an atmosphere in which our manufactures and industries are developed and if you were to cut out or remove that tariff all of a sudden, the result would be very injurious.

Following out the principle of action that he there expounded, he admits that the Government retained virtually the National Policy with microscopic modifications, to use the very excellent vocabulary of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark); and the reason he did not put his changes into force sooner was that it would be too sudden and that it would cause a shock to the commercial mechanism of Canada. So to those who feel in their hearts that free trade, if it became a matter of practice instead of a matter of preaching and theory in Canada, would be something to be feared, for them there is this word of consolation, that the right hon. the leader of the Opposition has all the years to think about it between now and the time when he gets into office, and many may be the variations that he may decide upon in that time; and then, after he gets in, he will have fifteen years for deliberation, because if he should enforce it and so radically modify the tariff all of a sudden, it would mean disaster to the industries of Canada. So, at all events for this generation now living, we have little to fear from the new doctrine of free food.

What I purpose to deal with most is the question of the Highways Bill. It has been alluded to, I believe by all, or almost all of the hon. gentlemen opposite who have taken part in this debate, and a vigorous attempt

has been made to throw the onus of the rejection of that Bill upon the Government of the day. It has been said by the hon. member for Red Deer, and repeated or echoed by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) that all of the unfavourable impression that was made upon the country by its rejection by the Senate was entirely dissipated since they had an opportunity of thoroughly explaining it to the people. I wondered, as they talked, what explanation they gave the people. I wondered if they gave the innocent people the explanation they ventured to give this House. Was not the House struck by the careful study apparently that had been made of this Bill by the hon. member for Guysborough, who stood in his place and stated that five clauses of the Bill had been passed by the Senate and that because they rejected the last clause was no reason for blaming them for rejecting the Bill, or the statement made by the hon. member for Red Deer, usually a little more careful, that five clauses of the Bill had been passed by the Senate and only the sixth clause had been touched when, as a matter of fact, everybody knows that five clauses were never passed by the Senate either in 1912 or in 1913 and that the sixth clause was never passed at all, that the fourth clause was amended in both years and the sixth rejected in both years. The question before the House is whether or not this Government were justified in rejecting the altered Bill as it was brought down by the Senate or whether they should have accepted it. If this Government should have accepted it, all things considered, the onus is on this Government. If they should not have accepted it the onus is on the Senate and to that point I purpose directing my discussion.

What was the Highways Bill? The Highways Bill, as brought down in both years in the same form each time, was a Bill containing five clauses the effect of all of which was to empower the Government of the day to expend such money as might be voted in the Supply Bill through the agencies of the provincial governments upon a comprehensive system of highway improvement. The preamble of the Bill set out that it was desirable in Canada to enter upon a comprehensive and useful system of improvement of the highways in order that the general transportation facilities of the country might be made what they ought to be. The Bill then went on to say that the Government might divide among the provincial governments, upon such terms as might be mutually agreed upon between the two governments, a sum of money to be voted in the ordinary way in the Supply Bill. It further stated in clause six that in addition to that power the Government of the day should have the right, with the consent both of the legislature and of the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the province in question, to expend the money directly upon highways if they conceived such was the better course. That is to say, that such share or part of such share as might afterwards be voted in the Supply Bill to a province might, with the consent and approval of the Government of that province and of the legislature as well, be expended through the direct agency of this Government upon this general scheme of highway improvement. That was the sum and substance of the Bill. It was sought to be amended in this House. It was stated by hon. gentlemen opposite and argued most vigorously that a clause should be inserted binding the Government to divide that money proportionately between the provinces and further stated that clause six should be eliminated and whether or not both the provincial and the Dominion governments conceived it to be in the interests of the country that the money should be expended through the direct agency of this Government, they should be stripped of power to do so. These two were the contentions advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite. I would be the last to argue that this House should not have the say now and at all times as to the distribution of this money, as to the principle of its distribution and I should likewise be the last to argue that the general principle of that distribution should not be on the basis of population, proportionate to the population of each province. I propose to argue first of all that the Government was not only justified but was bound to reject the Senate amendment on the ground that these amendments were not in the interests of the Bill and were vitally antagonistic to the principle and purpose of the Bill and I shall argue that, aside entirely from the merits of the amendments a greater principle was in question, that of the power of the Senate to interfere by amendment in such a Bill and that, aside from the merits altogether, this Government would not have been justified; would have been truant to its trust and to the people of this country, had they accepted these amendments. Now, on the first point, I have acceded that this House must always maintain as part of its prerogative and part

of its duty the control of expenditures and its division among the provinces and that furthermore the general principle of that division should be under ordinary circumstances, a principle of proportion to the population of each province. Then why reject the amendment to clause four proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, which provided that the Government should be disabled from expending that money in any other method than by the hard and fast rule of expenditure in proportion to population. It must be remembered, first of all, and I cannot impress this too strongly upon hon. gentlemen here, that the Bill known as the Highways Bill did not set aside any specific sum of money from the treasury of Canada. It simply provided machinery by which, when the money was set aside or voted by this House, it should be used through the agencies of the provincial governments for the benefits of our common highways. That was the purpose and end of the Bill. It was essential because ordinarily the control of highways is not within the jurisdiction of this Parliament under the British North America Act, and if we chose to use the agencies of provincial governments, the Bill was essential that we might do so. This House might have undoubtedly, by simply declaring the improvement of this highway or that highway was necessary for the general advantage of Canada, (with the sanction of Parliament), expended the money when and where it liked without the agency of any Bill at all; but in order to secure the benefit of the machinery of the provincial governments and to avoid duplication and the frittering away of money on worthless machinery, the Government decided to put through a Bill to utilize the machinery already provided. Having shown that no money was specifically appropriated or set aside out of the treasury of Canada by that Bill, it will be apparent to all that the Bill did not require to be first of all premised by an introductory resolution, that it did not need to be anticipated by the sanction of the Governor General himself. By section 54 of the British North America Act that is essential in one circumstance and one only, that is when the Bill itself sets aside a specific amount of money for a specific purpose. When that is done, the sanction of the Governor General must be secured. That was not done by this Bill, but none the less the Bill, ordinarily speaking, was a money Bill, in that it designated the purpose for which money afterwards voted should be spent. It will be seen, therefore, that for the reason, and the very clear reason, that no money was voted by the Bill, a subsequent Bill would be necessary in order to vote the money, and that subsequent Bill would have to be introduced by resolution sanctioned by the Governor General of Canada; and in that subsequent Bill it would have to be provided how and on what principle the money should be distributed through the provinces. Now, it will be clear to the hon. member for Red Deer that the House of Commons of Canada, in refusing to specify in advance in the enabling Bill—the Highways Bill—that this money should for all time be distributed pro rata according to population, did not in any way alienate from itself the right to say that that should be the basis of distribution. This House still had the right to say in the Supply Bill which was to follow, and which alone was to vote the money, how that money should be divided, and upon what principle it should be distributed, and this House not only had the right, but was bound to say so in that Supply Bill which was to follow. Why then was it necessary, why then was it of value that the clause should be inserted in the Highway Bill itself? By what right do hon. gentlemen opposite argue that this House in the year 1913 or 1914 should bind the hands of the Commons for years and years to come in regard to the distribution of this money? So long as the right and the power is vested in this House to determine the distribution, then this House has reserved to itself every right it has or ought to have, and that right was reserved and was reserved to be exercised in the way it always has been and always should be exercised. Does anybody deny that?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: In the light of the explanation which the hon. gentleman has given, what is the use of the sixth clause?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am coming to the sixth clause and I am not at all surprised that the hon. gentleman should desire to get past his argument on the fourth clause. This House had the power and always has had the power to decide as to the distribution of the money of the people of Canada and this House never can, at all events never should, divest itself of that right and power. I ask again what right is there in the Commons of Canada of 1913 to tie the hands of the Commons of Canada of 1917 as to the method of distribution? Is it not the Commons of that day that should decide as to how the money of that day should be

divided? Does my hon. friend from Red Deer think that a superior wisdom is resident in the members of this House to-day over what is likely to reside in them five years from now? Why should we abbreviate now the power that we claim to be so valuable for the Commons of years to come? So that not only was no good object to be served but a very bad object would have been served and a bad principle would have been adopted if we had attempted to put in a general Bill that hard and fast restriction. I have admitted that ordinarily the principle of distribution should be that of pro rata according to population. Is that disputed by any one in this House? But does any hon. gentleman say that circumstances might not arise when he himself would vote for a different principle of distribution? Does any hon. gentleman say that he cannot imagine those circumstances? If so, then why does he vote to tie the hands of Parliament in this regard? Nobody rises to say he cannot imagine such circumstances. Why? Because every hon. gentleman opposite voted for a different system of distribution in a very similar Bill. That is why they do not rise. The hon. member for Guysborough says:—

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: You are not teaching school to-night.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member says we are not teaching school. It might be of advantage to him if some one would.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: That is very, very smart.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I say they know they have voted for a different principle of distribution and they voted for it in the same session. I may inform, though I am not teaching school, the hon. member for Guysborough that the principle of distribution according to population was not followed in the agricultural instruction Bill at all. A different principle was followed approximating to it, but not that principle itself. In the Agricultural Instruction Bill the principle was to distribute the first $20,000 of money to the provinces, and there was also to be distributed a certain fixed sum —$20,000 I think it was—to veterinary colleges—two inroads upon the principle of proportionate distribution; and all the hon. gentlemen opposite voted and voted without question for that distribution. Why then should they tie the hands of future parliaments from adopting a principle which they themselves have already adopted in the distribution of money? There are circumstances that one might easily imagine when it would not only be not the best but would be positively bad legislation to distribute the money according to population. In the year 1913 no such circumstances existed, and the Supply Bill, which was brought down as evidence of the good faith of the Government, did vote the money and did divide it on a population basis. But if that were followed as an inexorable law, if it were known to the various provinces that it was going to be followed, come what may, then it would be quite within the power of the province to say: 'We are going to get our money from the Dominion Government for highway improvements and we will restrict our own expenditure on highway improvements and let the Dominion Government do it. The result would be that, instead of this policy resulting in the improvement of the highways, it would simply result in the money being spent in some other way by the provinces and Canada paying for the highways of the provinces instead of the provinces themselves. I do not think that the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) will compliment me by saying that that is a very great stretch of imagination or of ingenuity. I think it will be plain to him that it is not only a possible but a quite probable result.

Mr. CARVELL: As far as I know, the several provinces in Canada will want to spend all the money they can get from this Government, or all the money they can get from any other source whatever, in order to make the highways what they ought to be. But my hon. friend is drawing on his imagination to the full extent if he thinks that if the Dominion Government and Parliament pay the money, and if they trust these provinces, they will refuse to do their proper share in connection with the improvements of the highways.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no doubt that they will be willing to spend what money they can get, but they might save their own money for other purposes. That being the case it will be seen that there would have been no object at all, and that a very bad principle would have been imbedded in our methods, if we had adopted the suggestion of hon. gentlemen opposite and put this hard and fast rule into the Bill. We reserve for this House of Commons all its powers and rights in this regard, we strip it of no part of its prerogative at all. We held for 1913, and all the years there are to follow, the right

to determine once and for all how the highway money was to be spent.

Now, for fear I might forget it, the hon. member for Guysborough referred to an amendment which he mentioned, but which he did not read, by the hon. member for Carleton to the effect that the Senate having stripped the Bill of clause 6 and having so amended clause 4 by this cumbersome method, we should have accepted the Bill, or that the Bill being dropped, we should simply have come forward in our Supply Bill and voted money into the treasuries of the provinces. I ask what power would have been retained by this Government to see that the money so voted into the provincial treasuries was expended for the purpose for which it was voted? No conditions could have been attached to the Supply Bill. The conditions in the Highway Bill were swept away. The money would have been simply spilled into the treasuries of the provinces and the provinces would have been depended upon to spend the money for highways. Is that fulfilling our duties as the Government of Canada? The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) will not say so, I know. The hon. member for Edmonton will not stand up in his place in this debate and say that this Government is relieved of its obligations to the people by voting money into the provincial treasuries.

9 p.m.

We know that there is a part of the moneys of the Dominion Government in respect to which we do relieve ourselves of all obligations of trusteeship by voting it into the provincial treasuries and that part is represented by the annual subsidies because that is a part of the framework of our constitution. But the words of the constitution apply to no other moneys whatever. As for all other moneys that are not so designated by the British North America Act and amending Acts we are the trustees, we can never divest ourselves of that responsibility, and we have no right whatever to vote that money into the treasuries of the provinces and not to follow it and see that it reaches its proper destination. We must, if we are true to our trust as guardians and custodians of the money of the people, see that the money gets to its ultimate destination and see that it is spent for the purpose for which it is intended and we must trust to the responsibility of no other Government but our own in that regard.

If I were to quote an authority in opposition to the contention of the hon. member for Guysborough, I would quote the hon. member for Edmonton himself, because he said in his place in the House just last session, and argued at some length, with great force and with correctness, that this Government would not be justified in so voting money into the treasuries of the provinces but that this Government was bound to follow this money and see that the money was spent for the purpose for which it was intended.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER: My hon. friend has been good enough to mention my name and to ask for my opinion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I have stated the opinion the hon. gentleman has given.

Mr. OLIVER: I would like to say that my hon. friend has not stated the opinion I gave in regard to the Highways Bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have quoted the hon. gentleman, and quoted him with approval, on the question of the responsibility of Parliament for the money entrusted to us and as to whether we can relieve ourselves of our trust by voting money into the provincial treasuries as suggested by the hon. member for Guysborough. I have quoted him against the contention of the hon. member for Guysborough, and I have quoted him with absolute correctness.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? I followed his argument very closely. What objection is there to increasing the subsidies of the provinces in order to help the provinces to get better roads?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am afraid my hon. friend has not followed me very closely.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, I have.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because I have stated that if it were done by the methods advised by the hon. member for Guysborough there would be no machinery and no method by which this Government could see that the money was spent to the best advantage of the people and that it was spent for the purpose for which it was intended. The responsibility to see to that would be shifted from the shoulders of the Government to the shoulders of the several provinces and we have no right to so divest ourselves of our responsibilities.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Might you not do that by amending the British North America Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps so, but that is not the suggestion of the hon. member for Guysborough.

Mr. LEMIEUX: No, but on general principles.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The British North America Act is not amended yet, but the hon. member for Guysborough comes forward and says we ought to do it without an amendment and that we are truant to our principles because we do not.

Mr. OLIVER: Under what authority has the constitution and practice of the Dominion of Canada placed the roads up to date?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I stated that in the early part of my address but I will repeat it more fully if the hon. member desires it; that is, I will give my own opinion for what it is worth. The highways of Canada are within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures, in so far as they are local. At the same time, the Dominion Parliament would have jurisdiction over a highway that had become of a national character say by reason of its passing from one province to another and we could exercise our jurisdiction over any highway if we adopted the method so often utilized of declaring that the improvements, or any special works upon a highway, were for the general advantage of Canada. But by reason of the general principle that highways are within the provincial jurisdiction, then, in order to enable us properly to act and at the same time properly to conserve the rights of the Canadian people and discharge our own duties to the full, we require an Act by which the machinery of the provinces may be used for the purpose of spending this money, but all the same, we are able, by virtue of the conditions imposed and plans devised and accepted, to follow that money to its destination in order to see that it is spent on a general, and uniform and useful system and that it does the greatest good to the greatest number of our people.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to state to the House what he considers to be the reason why the provincial governments cannot fully and properly be trusted with the expenditure of any money that is necessary and available for the improvement of the highways?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not the question at all. Whether they can be trusted or whether they cannot be trusted we have no right to lay upon them a responsibility that the constitution fixes upon us.

Mr. OLIVER: I understand my hon. friend to admit that the constitution places the responsibility regarding roads upon the provinces and not upon the Dominion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well, but so far as the expenditure of the money of the Canadian people in the Dominion treasury is concerned, be that expenditure upon highways or upon anything else, that trusteeship is vested here, and the hon. member for Edmonton is himself a most vociferous authority that we can never strip ourselves of that responsibility.

Mr. OLIVER: I see a very vast difference between expenditure by this Government on purposes for which this Parliament is responsible, and expenditure on purposes for which the provincial governments and legislatures are responsible.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman believe that expenditure for educational purposes differs constitutionally speaking from expenditure for highway purposes?

Mr. OLIVER: I certainly do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then the hon. gentleman must be informed and informed very quickly that education also is within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know that it is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures, or otherwise, this Parliament has gone out of its way to vote money for technical education.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And we have voted money for highways, and education is just as exclusively within provincial jurisdiction as the highways are within provincial jurisdiction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will ask the House to keep in mind that the discussion so far has entirely centered upon the merits of the amendments themselves. The argument, so far as I have been able to advance it, is, that on the merits, the amendment to clause 6 should have been rejected and must have been rejected by any government that remembered its duty to the Canadian people. As to clause 6: It will be recalled that the Senate not only amended clause 4 by fastening upon it this hard and fast system of distribution, but also entirely struck out clause 6 which provided:

> The minister, with the approval of the Governor in Council and upon such terms and conditions as are prescribed by order in council, may undertake the construction of any high-

way or the improvement of any highway in any existing province and may expend in such improvement or construction the whole or any part of the sums voted by Parliament for such subsidy to that province.

Provided, further, that the minister shall first obtain the necessary authority from the legislature of such province and the consent of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

That is to say, if, as a result of the joint wisdom of the Government of Canada and of the legislature and government of the province with which we may be dealing for the time being, it is decided that better results could be obtained by expending the money through the direct machinery of this Government, this Government should have the power to do so. It must be remembered that before that could be done provision must be made by the legislature of the province in question as well as the consent of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of that province obtained before the Government of Canada itself could exercise that right. That clause was reviewed in very alarming terms by the hon. member for Red Deer; he said it was meant to catch votes, and he proclaimed that it should never be allowed in this country, that this Government should be able to go and spend money here and there, because if they had that right they could make promises and catch votes. But his concern for the result of this clause was tame even, compared with the concern of the leader of the majority in the Senate. In order that the full import of this may be clear to the House, the name of the leader of the majority in the Senate should be mentioned, Sir George Ross, ex-Prime Minister of the province of Ontario. He feared the pressure that we would be able to exercise over the legislature; he said we would be able to put our hands upon the legislature and say, 'Do as we say or we will not give you money,' and the legislature in terror would submit. And that pressure, the leader of the Senate held to be a very great invasion of the constitutional rights of Canada. He said:

That means that the Dominion Government is putting its hand upon the legislature of a whole province to swing that legislature to its own ends.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: Hear, hear.

Hon Sir GEORGE ROSS (Middlesex): Now did you ever hear of anything of greater enormity than that? Suppose the Imperial Government put its hand upon the whole representation of Scotland, or on the one hundred and three members for Ireland, by some financial consideration, in order to swing them around to some policy of the government. I believe Lord Castlereagh did that in 1800. Ireland was brought into the union with England and Scotland.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: And he committed suicide afterwards.

So that the vocabulary of the hon. member for Red Deer is quite outdone by the vividly expressed fears of the leader of the majority in the Senate. He describes the Highways Bill as the greatest enormity he thinks he ever heard perpetrated since one hundred and thirteen years ago when, he says, Ireland was brought into the Union by a wholesale system of oppression and constraint.

One would think in the first place that hon. gentlemen opposite had never heard of any such pressure having been brought to bear before; that they never heard of the insertion in any Bill of a clause such as this. And it may be a matter of surprise to the hon. member for Guysborough—because I do not think he has spent a very great deal of time considering this subject—it may be a matter of surprise to him to be told that he himself and the other side of the House in general allowed to go through this House, without a division and I believe without debate, a clause on exactly the same lines in another Bill of similar purport. I refer to the Agricultural Instruction Bill of 1913. The Agricultural Instruction Bill of 1913 set by a specific sum of money, $10,000,000; $700,000 for 1913; $800,000 for the following year, and so on, until $10,000,000 should be appropriated for the purpose of agricultural education. The Bill went on to provide means by which this money should be spent through the agencies of the provincial governments along a system to be outlined by this Dominion Government, and by which the machinery of the provincial governments should be utilized for the purpose of the expenditure of this money and of getting the greatest results therefrom. And the Bill went on to provide a clause similar in terms, though not exact in terms,—and I shall point out the difference later,—it went on to provide a clause similar in terms to clause 6 of the Highways Bill, and that clause was passed by this House with the assent of hon. gentlemen opposite, and it passed the Senate as well. The Agricultural Instruction Bill, clause 7, voted money for education in agriculture in these terms:

The Governor in Council may make such regulations as are deemed advisable for giving effect to the object and purpose of this Act. And notwithstanding anything in this Act, the minister with the approval of the Governor in Council and with the consent of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of any province—

Hon. members opposite will remember that that is all the consent that has to be obtained.

—and upon such terms and conditions as are prescribed by the Governor in Council, may expend in any such province in any year the whole or any part of the grant provided by the province under this Act for the purpose set forth in the preamble to this Act.

If any hon. gentleman opposite can explain upon what principle he votes for that clause of the Agricultural Bill and denies his vote for a similar clause in the Highways Bill, I would like to hear that explanation. The only difference between the two clauses is this, that whereas in the Highways Bill this Government, in order to expend the money directly on agricultural education, must first obtain the consent not only of the Government of the province but of the Legislature as well; on the contrary, in the Agricultural Instruction Bill, this Government may spend the money directly without the agency of the province, but only upon the consent of the Government, and not of the Legislature at all. This Bill was voted upon and put through, after the similar clause in the Highways Bill was denied in 1912 by hon. gentlemen opposite and by the Senate at their dictation. So the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) should have explained upon what principle he believes this clause 7 not only innocuous but valuable and denies to the Government clause 6 of the Highways Bill. Why should clause 6 be in? Can hon. members opposite not conceive of circumstances under which it would be advisable and expeditious and economical to spend the money directly under the Dominion Government, in a special case, rather than through the agency of a provincial government? Presuming, for example, that it is a road that runs between the provinces, presuming that the machinery for improvement is more convenient, would it not be advisable so to spend the money without utilizing the machinery of the two provinces? The spirit of the Bill was to utilize the two provinces, but it was only right and proper that means should be provided in special cases, and if both parties should consider it advisable, the money should be spent directly. In the case of money voted for agricultural instruction it might be used, and the power might be used if a government saw fit in order to invite votes in special localities. They might go to a special locality and say: Here, we will establish an agricultural college here; we will establish an experimental station.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Not nearly so handy as roads.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. member came from the province of Saskatchewan I could understand his familiarity with the use of such clauses in respect of roads. At all events the hon. member's mind must admit that the principle is exactly the same; and if there is vice in one there is vice in the other; and that if he votes against one, to be at all consistent, he must vote against the other, but he did not do it. Now, I have pointed out that circumstances might easily be foreseen, under which it would be advisable and in the interests of Canada that the money should be expended directly under the agency of the Government of Canada. Consequently no purpose could possibly be served by the elimination of clause six. Why? If we are to act on the fears of hon. gentlemen opposite; if that principle is to govern our legislation in this House, what are we going to pass? We shall have to repeal the Public Works Act. The Public Works Act provides that the Government of this country, through the Public Works Department may spend money here, there and anywhere thoroughout the country, and presumably that money can be used for political purposes. If the principle is right that that power should be denied the Government, then I say we should repeal the main provisions of the Public Works Act. If this power should be denied the Dominion Government, it should be denied the provincial governments; it should be denied to all governments. Then I ask: How are we going to have our institutions built or controlled at all? We have to entrust such power to our governments but a principle of our constitution is that our governments are held directly responsible for the use of that power, and we would not protect the people by abridging their power. We protect the people by holding the Government alone accountable for the exercise of the power reposed in them. The Government has never in any way endeavoured to evade that responsibility, and I trust it never will. So much for the merits of the two amendments as they stand themselves.

I come now to a more powerful objection, an objection that to my mind appears insuperable, and that I venture to think will appear utterly insuperable to hon. gentlemen opposite if they will only give their minds fair play. I make the argument, that I now propose to make, with special con-

fidence to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), because I believe that if he fully apprehended the significance of the Senate's action in this regard, he would be the last to approve of their interference. The hon. member for Red Deer apparently has not read in the records of the Commons both of 1912 and 1913 the real reasons placed upon 'Hansard' for the rejection of the Senate's amendments. I have not heard them quoted, I have scarcely heard the main reasons referred to by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I am at a loss to understand the educating influences of those speeches that have been delivered by which they have switched the population of this country against the Government of the day and behind the matured wisdom of the Senate, because they have utterly ignored the main reasons stated by the Government for the rejection of the Senate's amendments. It is a matter which should be, at least in general terms, within the knowledge of all that the Senate of this country has no power either to initiate or to amend or to interfere with Bills appropriating money; nor have they power in any way, by methods direct or by methods indirect, to circumvent or in any way at all to affect the distribution of the public money. That is a principle of the constitution, not only of this country, but of the mother country, from which we derived it. It is not a new one; it has been in force there with growing strength since 1628. It has been affirmed and reaffirmed time without number, and violated in any important instance, yes in any material instance, never since that time. It is true the Lords of England, who are in a position analogous to the Senate of Canada, have ventured in certain instances to interfere with such Bills by methods sometimes indirect, sometimes direct, to affect the expenditure of money, to affect the conditions under which it should be expended; but they have done it by a direct negative of the Bill in question, and it is generally argued, and, I believe, generally accepted, that the Lords and the Senate of this country, while they have not the power to amend or interfere in that way, have the power of rejection. But I can point out even this in that regard, that the Prime Minister of Great Britain on the 2nd of December, 1909, argued with very great force, if not with resistless force, that the power of rejection as well as the power of amendment was dormant, moribund and for all practical purposes dead. It may be questioned even now if the power of rejection is as intact as it was years ago; and as to the power of the Lords in England or the Senate in Canada, it is generally accepted that, whether by methods direct or by methods indirect, they are without power to interfere by amendment and if they have the power to interfere at all they must take the full responsibility of rejection. I do not think that I shall be asked by hon. gentlemen in this House to support what I have said by quotation. Back as far as 1628, the Commons of England, on the advice of the law Lords, omitted from all such Bills reference to the Lords and made such Bills the Acts of the Commons alone. And in 1771, by a standing order of the House, the following was reaffirmed as the law of England:

> That all aids and supplies granted to His Majesty by Parliament are the sole gift of the Commons, and all Bills for granting such aids and supplies ought to begin with the Commons, as it is the undoubted and sole right of the Commons to direct, limit and appoint any and all such Bills, the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of such grants, which ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords.

This is as far back as 1671, or, to make it more easy to remember for the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), about one hundred years before Adam Smith was born, at all events before he wrote his 'Wealth of Nations.'

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Will the hon. gentleman permit me to correct him? Adam Smith published his 'Wealth of Nations' in 1776, and so the hon. gentleman has proven that Adam Smith wrote his book two years before he was born.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said, at all events before he wrote the 'Wealth of Nations.' I did not pretend to be exact, but I think I may pay myself a compliment, because, though I had not looked up the date, I guessed it within two years. It is the law of England as set forth in the words I have quoted that taxes and the appropriation of taxes, are the sole prerogative of the Commons and that the consent of the Crown and of the peers is necessary only to clothe it with the form of law. We in this country, by a standing order passed in 1873, reaffirmed the same as the prerogative of the Commons of Canada and as entirely beyond the jurisdiction of the Senate of Canada. That will be found in the Rules of this House, and, so far as I recollect, the rule is word for word with the standing order of the British House of 1671. So, not only have the

Senate no power to initiate, but they have no power to 'direct, limit or appoint' the 'ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications' of such grants. These are the words, taken from the standing orders of this House, always affirmed to be the law of Canada, and until this Bill was put through, never materially invaded by the Senate of Canada. Now, it may be said that inasmuch as this Bill does not specifically appropriate money from the treasury, it is not a money Bill, and the Senate therefore has a right to interfere. It is not a money Bill in the sense that it does not appropriate specific money, but it is a money Bill in that it directs, limits, makes conditions and qualifications under which money afterwards to be voted is to be expended; and the Senate of Canada have no power under the constitution in any way to limit or affect the qualifications under which money to be voted shall be expended. So, it is a money Bill so far as the power of the Senate to amend it is concerned. What purpose could it serve to say that they have no power to interfere with the provision of a Supply Bill and alter the purposes to which money voted in the Supply Bill shall be directed, if they have power, in the case of this Bill, to make alterations and in that way divert money to be voted under a Supply Bill? It is only a roundabout way of getting at the same thing; they are interfering with the conditions and qualifications of the appropriation of the money of the people of Canada voted by the people's representatives. It is clear that for three hundred years this has been beyond the prerogative of the Lords, and it has always been beyond the prerogative of the Senate of Canada. It would be an anomaly, an absurdity, if this House were to quietly accept amendments so made by the Senate in derogation of our rights, no matter what may be the merits of the proposed change. The greater principle is superimposed, for it is the duty, and one of the first duties of the Commons of Canada, representing the people of this country, to preserve to ourselves the prerogative that has been ours for generations, and that has been the protection of the British people for centuries, and not meekly to abrogate our powers in favour of any irresponsible body, or of any body whatever. That is the great duty imposed upon us, a duty from which this Government will not shrink. We are the custodians of that right, and we do not propose to have it robbed from us by any body of men. What would be the result, if we meekly sat down under this Senate amendment?

Mr. McKENZIE: I did not follow the hon. gentleman's arguments very closely. As a matter of the history of this Bill, will he please tell me whether it was dealt with as a money Bill when it was introduced in this House?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have already dealt fully with that. When the Bill was brought forward for the second reading, the right hon. leader of the Opposition objected on the ground that there had been no recommendation or sanction of the Bill by His Royal Highness the Governor General, and that the Bill had not been introduced by resolution, and the right hon. gentleman argued that it was a money Bill. The leader of the Government objected, not that it was not a money Bill, but that it did not appropriate specific money and therefore did not come under the rule which requires the preliminary sanction of the Governor General. The Bills that require to be so introduced are Bills appropriating part of the public revenue for a specific purpose, which this Bill did not do. Now, that must be clear. Whether the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) calls that a 'money bill' does not matter.

Mr. McKENZIE: Then it was not dealt with as a money Bill in this House?

Mr. MEIGHEN: 'Money bill' is only a name. This Bill did not appropriate any specific part of the public revenue, and for that reason it did not require to be introduced by resolution. The hon. member can call it a money Bill, or a silver Bill, or anything else he pleases. It did not possess that element of a money Bill, but it did possess another element. Let me get this into the mind of the hon. member for North Cape Breton, and then I am sure that every other member of this House will understand it clearly. I say it did possess another characteristic of a money Bill, as it proposed a purpose to which money afterwards to be appropriated should be put. It provided the conditions and qualifications under which money afterwards to be voted should be spent. That is a characteristic and element of the Bill, and the Senate cannot interfere with that Bill because if they do it they are running contrary to the standing order of 1678, one of the elemental principles of our Constitution. Surely that must be clear. The hon. member from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie)—

perhaps I do not do justice to his mind, it may be that he refuses to have this made clear to his mind. He is trying to follow the example of his elder brothers in the Senate and he is endeavouring to shelter himself behind the phrase 'a money Bill,' which has one of two characteristics, if it is to provide money it must be preceded by a resolution and if, secondly, it is to provide the manner and the limitations under which it is to be expended it comes under the second classification and in either case the Senate cannot interfere.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am learning fast. Does my hon. friend say that the authorities of this House made a mistake in allowing the Bill to go through without being preceded by a resolution or did they gloss it over and allow it to go through as a money Bill when it really is not a money Bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not the slightest question to make of the rectitude of the Speaker's decision when he decided that this Bill was not such a Bill as required a resolution, that it did not come within the clause of the rules of this House that describes when and under what conditions a Bill must be so introduced.

Mr. McKENZIE: Do I understand my hon. friend to say that it underwent a process of evolution in going to the other House and became a money Bill?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps I can address myself with confidence to the task of overcoming the clouds in the brain of my hon. friend, but I cannot, with confidence, address myself to the task of overcoming his prejudices. It went through no evolution between here and the Senate, it was the same Bill there as here, he can call it a money Bill or anything he likes; it is not a Bill that came within the clause of our rules, a special clause providing for the introduction by resolution of a money Bill; but it was a Bill that, as plainly as the nose on his face, came within the rules that prevented it being interfered with by the Senate. The hon. gentleman will perhaps admit that it is not the same clause at all that describes a Bill so to be introduced and the clause that describes such a Bill as is without the pale of the Senate of Canada. They are altogether different, and the hon. member does not deceive anybody, I do not think he even deceives himself by harping on the expression 'money bill.'

Mr. McKENZIE: That is unkind, the word 'harping' is not a nice one.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I invite my hon. friend to get away from the phrase 'a money bill.' The Senate appeared to think that no Bill should be allowed to pass through appropriating money to the provinces, unless they themselves see to it that the money is properly distributed. In the first place, they have no right so to interfere. What right have they to tie the hands of this House? What right have they to attempt to tie the hands of future Houses of Commons? If they can do this what is the position? After we have passed the Highways Bill we come to the Supply Bill, we go to vote this money to be spent under the provisions and subject to the qualifications set out in the Highways Bill. We have accepted the Senate amendment. We have allowed the Senate to dictate to this House how such money shall be distributed. We have allowed them to invade our prerogative to that extent. Then when the Highways Bill is under debate some hon. gentleman proposes: let us distribute this money according to the method followed in the Agricultural Instruction Act, let us divide so much money among all the provinces and let us distribute the rest according to population. Oh, some gentleman gets up and says, no, we cannot do that, we are forbidden to do that by the Senate amendment to the Highways Act. The hands of this House are tied by an amendment in the matter of the distribution of our money. Is such a course not an interference with the prerogative of this House to guide solely the distribution of our funds and the purposes to which the money of this country is to be put? The Senate has completely desecrated and has lifted entirely out of the Constitution the sole control of this House over the money of this country, if we permit the Senate to interpose as they proposed to interpose in the Highways Bill.

As I said before, one would imagine that it had been an immemorial principle of the Upper House never to permit a Bill of this kind to go through, appropriating money to provinces, unless it first of all dictated to this House the principle on which it was to be distributed. It will be a matter of surprise perhaps to hon. gentlemen opposite that just one year before the Senate fastened on this notion of inserting this amendment to clause 4, they allowed a similar Bill to go through with very little criticism and only twelve votes against it, which permitted money to be distributed among the provinces and did not stipulate any principle on which it was to be distributed, that was the Agricultural Aid Bill of 1912. That bill provided in very terms that the Government of

Canada might give the various provinces sums to be voted afterwards in the Supply Bill to be used to aid agriculture and no clause was inserted in the Senate tying the hands of this House or of future Houses in the distribution of such money. Consequently the Senate itself is on record as acceding to the principle that this House and this House alone has the control of the distribution of money, whether that distribution is effected by one Bill or by two.

Furthermore, it was argued in the Senate of Canada that the whole Bill was unconstitutional, that inasmuch as highways were within the jurisdiction of the provinces we had no power to interfere at all, whether we employed the agencies of the provincial Government or not, that the whole Bill was in direct conflict with the constitution of Canada; and the leader of the Senate majority argued for that principle and argued lengthily if not strongly. But he did not take the responsibility of negativing the Bill. The Senate had the power if it had any power to interfere at all, to reject the Bill. If the Bill was unconstitutional or if he so believed, it was his duty, if he had the courage of his convictions, to negative the Highways Bill altogether. Why did he not do it? Why did he not ask his followers to give a direct negative to that Bill, and not ask them to take the roundabout method, which is only an excuse, of making the Bill impossible legislation by encumbering it with vicious amendments? The reason is apparent to every member in this House. The leader of the Liberal party in that House knew that no matter for what excuse he negatived that Bill it would be clear to the humblest intelligence in Canada that they had killed the Bill and he preferred to do it by a more ingenious method, by attaching to it amendments which he knew could not be accepted by this House or any other that had in its conscience the duty of preserving the prerogative of the people's representatives. He took the roundabout and indirect method rather of fastening an amendment to clause four and eliminating clause six, knowing, as he must have known, that by doing that they were accomplishing their aim perhaps in a manner that would provide an excuse, plausible to those who did not fully understand the question; but he refused to go about it in the direct and manly way of negativing the Bill as was in his power. So it resolves itself into this, that the Senate fastened on the Bill amendments that they knew were not in their power to pass, they knew that in doing so they were flying in the face of one of the elemental principles of our constitution, they knew in doing it that no Government could possibly accept such an amendment, and they knew that the result would be to destroy the Highways Bill once and for all. Consequently it must be clear to anyone who does justice to his intelligence that their purpose from the beginning was to destroy the Highways Bill just as the result was to destroy the Highways Bill. There the responsibility lies. They took that responsibility knowing full well the result, and the responsibility being there we intend it shall remain there; and we do not propose that in the Highways Bill or in any other Bill the rights that have been the rights of the people's representatives throughout the history of this country and the mother country shall be invaded in any degree by the Senate of this country. If they attempt to invade those rights whatever may be their purpose, whether manfully stated or whether concealed, we propose to resist that usurpation and to maintain for ourselves the control over the expenditure, the control over the conditions, limitations, and qualifications of expenditure, which has been implanted in our Constitution and which has been there for many years gone by. For these reasons I say it must be clear to all that this House was not only well advised but this House was bound not only on the merits of the two amendments themselves but for a higher reason, for the reason that these amendments were brought down in violation of a principle of the Constitution which it is our duty to preserve—this House was bound I say for these two reasons to reject those amendments. It must be clear the Senate knew this House was so bound and the responsibility then is plain to all, and I believe it is plain to the hon. member for Red Deer. The responsibility for killing the Highways Bill is upon the Senate, and whether in a future Highways Bill or otherwise they attempt to invade the prerogative of the Commons of this country the Bill which they so attempt to mutilate will be rejected by this House for such has always been the practice of this House whether under Liberal or Conservative Government. But the Senate cannot by rejecting the Bill in this roundabout method get rid of the responsibility that we fix upon them now, and that will sit upon them for all time to come.

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, my first remarks will be directed to you: I say I am

satisfied and happy to see you back in good health ready to take up once more the labours of the session. I beg of you to accept my heartiest New Year's greetings for yourself and family.

I listened with pleasure to the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen), who has just taken his seat. As usual he has shown ability. He is a good lawyer, with a great deal of experience, but at the same time a hair splitter. He was well deserving of promotion.

I have not forgotten that during the session of last year, he succeeded in putting through the House a closure rule. He satisfied his friends that the members of the Opposition should be gagged, and thus attained his object. He was paid spot cash. He is now entrusted with the position of Solicitor General. He is doing well, let him keep on.

To-night he spoke for almost an hour and a half in an endeavour to make us believe that the Dominion Parliament has jurisdiction over our public highways. That is quite a feat. That is a money bill, he says. No, it is not a money bill, but it is a silver bill we passed. Those Senators are ignorant people. The leader of the majority in the Senate, Sir George Ross, who has spent his life in various legislative assemblies and was for a long time the prime minister of his province, does not know anything. The hon. member for Portage-la-Prairie (Mr. Meighen) is the only one who knows anything. He is the learned one. No one else is acquainted with the constitutional law of this country; as regards any others, it is absurd, farcical, a proof of ignorance to say so. You know nothing, he says, and I know all.

What a killer, what a smotherer of the members of the loyal Opposition. He got what he was after, a post of honour, and he chuckles over it. He used to brand us as patronage seekers; now he has slipped into our boots; he is there and we are here.

The hon. member for Red-Deer (Mr. Clark) is also an ignoramus. There are here grey-haired men who have spent their lives in this Parliament, but they are not any the wiser on that account. They are deaf, blind, ignorant, without any acquaintance with the laws of the country. I alone am acquainted with them, I am the only professor, a second Napoleon forsooth.

If we are to believe the hon. Solicitor General, the Dominion Parliament has the right to do anything it pleases. Now, who will believe it? According to his contention, the Dominion Parliament has control over the highways. Now that is rather startling.

The Solicitor General has set himself to the task of teaching a lesson to everybody. However, we also have studied the law of the land, we grasped its purport before he did, before he became a professor. And we know perfectly well that the Dominion Parliament exercises those powers only which have been conceded by the various provinces of Canada. It does not possess any other than those which were delegated to it. The Dominion Parliament has no control whatever over highways. According to the Solicitor General they would be under that Parliament's control, while at the same time it could not be compelled to say how much money was going to be spent on those highways, in what districts they were to be built, or under whose supervision. No one has any information as to that.

But the hon. Solicitor General finally sought salvation in the direct agency argument. We have heard of that before. The Senate who are better posted than you in respect to the constitution, have decided that there is no direct agency governing this country.

Mr. Chairman, it is getting late, and in accordance with arrangements made, I understand, I shall now move the adjournment of the debate, in case there should actually be, as I believe an agreement to that effect.

Motion agreed to, and debate ajourned.

On motion of Mr. Rogers the House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.

Monday, January 26, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the chair.

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL WATERWAY.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN: In the absence of the right hon. the Prime Minister, I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, whom we are very glad to see again in his seat, if the Government has had any communication with the Government of the United States in respect to the substance of an article which appears

in a Government organ, the Ottawa Citizen, of this date, entitled: 'Joint Waterway from Duluth to Atlantic Ocean; International Commission discusses plans at Washington and will bring project to attention of the Canadian Government.' I am not reading the whole article, but just a portion of it:

Washington, Jan. 25.—A project for the joint construction by the governments of the United States and Canada of a deep waterway for ocean-going steamers from Montreal to Duluth, Minn., has been inaugurated through the International Joint Commission, which has jurisdiction over the boundary waters of the two countries.

The discussions instituted through the International Joint Commission are the result of a recent conference in Washington, in which Secretary Bryan, Chairman James A. Tawney of the American section of the International Commission, and Senator Charles E. Townsend, of Michigan, participated.

It was arranged that the matter should be taken up first with the Canadian Government through the commission. Chairman Tawney will confer soon with T. Chase Casgrain, K.C., chairman of Canadian section.

The project for an ocean waterway from the head of navigation on lake Superior to the Atlantic has been agitated for many years. It was considered seriously at the time when President Taft entered into reciprocity negotiations with Canada.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I have not been in as close communication with the Government lately as I could have wished, and in the absence of the Prime Minister I shall have to ask my hon. friend to repeat his question later when the Prime Minister comes in. I myself am not aware of any communication having been had.

FUNERAL OF LORD STRATHCONA.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I am sure that the House would like to hear the following cablegram from Mr. Griffith to the right hon. the leader of the Government:

London, Jan. 26, 1914.

Rt. Hon. R. L. Borden,
Ottawa, Ont.

The funeral service for the late High Commissioner held in Westminster Abbey to-day was attended by representatives of Their Majesties the King and Queen, Queen Alexandra, the Duke of Connaught, Prince Arthur of Connaught, the Duchess of Albany, Princess Louise, and many members of His Majesty's Government. There were also represented a great number of the leading scientific, educational and other bodies, as well as the Royal Academies of Art and Music. Public sympathy was most marked. The event was a great tribute to Lord Strathcona's outstanding personality, and unmistakably betokened great good-will toward the Dominion of Canada which he so long and so well represented.

(Sgd.) Griffith.

BAY OF FUNDY NAVIGATION.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL: I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) to an article that has appeared in a number of papers. I am reading from the Ottawa Free Press of Friday, January 16, which contains a statement alleged to have come from one Captain R. F. Clift, a member of the Dominion Wreck Commission. This article says:

Captain Clift narrowly escaped being a passenger himself on the ill-fated Cobequid, and in recalling with some satisfaction the trouble he had escaped by his last-minute change of plans, denounced with outspoken bitterness the folly of compelling vessels of the type of the Cobequid to travel by the St. John route through the Bay of Fundy in winter.

'It is nothing short of manslaughter, no, it is worse, it is murder,' he said, 'to compel vessels to traverse the Bay of Fundy at a season when such terrifying hurricanes are likely to crop up and when fogs make it almost impossible to be certain of a successful battle with the dangerous racing currents.

'The Bay of Fundy has a rise and fall of tide of thirty feet, the greatest in the world, and the waters swirl through it at a perilous speed, so that when lashed into fury by storm, and obscured by fog, a shipmaster has not a fighting chance.'

The people of St. John, the captain continued, had used every kind of political pull to get the Royal liners to call, and had tried to coerce Sir Thomas Shaughnessy into allowing the Canadian Pacific railway vessels to come to St. John, but Sir Thomas had replied: 'No, I absolutely refuse to imperil my ocean liners by allowing them to go into the Bay of Fundy, with its dangerous cross currents.'

'It is absolutely jeopardizing the lives of captain, passengers and crew to send them across the Bay of Fundy in winter,' concluded the commissioner, 'and the captains only do so under protest and agains their judgment. Halifax is the safer winter port.'

I should like to know if this man, Captain R. F. Clift, is a member of the public service of the Dominion and an official of the Department of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If so, I desire to ask if this matter has been called to his attention, and if he proposes to investigate it, and, I would say, bring this officer to account for making such libelous statements as are contained in this article.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Captain Clift, whose opinions have been quoted by my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) is not an official of the Marine and Fisheries De-

partment. He is a retired sailing master, as I understand, residing in Montreal. From time to time, for a good many years past, the Wreck Commissioner, in investigating wrecks on the St. Lawrence route, is assisted by two nautical assessors familiar with the conditions of navigation. The Wreck Commissioner has on several occasions called Captain Clift in for such purpose and he has acted in the capacity of a nautical assessor. But he is not an official of the department; he is not in the pay of the department. The impression, which, it would seem, he himself tries to create, that he is an official is entirely without foundation in fact. I had read the unfair and unjust statement to which the hon. gentleman refers, and, knowing what a slander it was against the Bay of Fundy, at once called the attention of the Board of Trade of St. John to the matter and suggested that it would be desirable that steps should be taken to place the facts fairly before the public. Inquiry has been made into the wreck of the Cobequid by the Wreck Commissioner, Captain Lindsay, assisted by two nautical assessors. I understand that the report and judgment of that court has been prepared and in a few days will be given to the public through the press. While I have no right to forestall the conclusions which the court has reached, yet, having followed the evidence given at the inquiry with a considerable degree of care, I venture to express the belief that it will be found that the Wreck Commissioners are not of opinion that the wreck was due to any inherent danger existing in the Bay of Fundy, but to other causes altogether.

I think it unfortunate, that, in connection with a disaster of this sort, any one should attempt to make capital against any special locality or any special waters over which navigation into Canada has to take place. Charges from time to time have been made with regard to the navigation of the Bay of Fundy. While there are dangers in the Bay of Fundy, as there are dangers to be found in all waters which ships navigate, yet I think it has been demonstrated in the past, time and again, that the dangers which exist in the Bay of Fundy are no greater than those which exist in many other navigable waters of the world. A good many years ago, when the late Senator Ellis was a member of this House, some charges of this character were made on the floor of Parliament when the question was being discussed of subsidizing steamers from Ports in Great Britain to Canada. This was in 1887 or 1888. Senator Ellis put upon the record of 'Hansard,' where it can be found by any one who is interested, a statement carefully prepared by the Board of Trade of St. John, showing the ships coming to and going from the Bay of Fundy and going in and out of the Port of St. John, and specifying the number of casualties occurring over a long period of years. The facts demonstrated beyond question that the Bay of Fundy was not a particularly dangerous water to mariners, and that the casualties during a number of seasons occurring in the Bay of Fundy are less than the casualties in many other ports of the world, upon which no such attack was made. It would be improper for me to reflect on the dangers of navigation of the St. Lawrence; these also have been much exaggerated. Of late years, with the aids to navigation provided and the means taken so far as possible to develop the means of protection to the mariner, a very great improvement has been made. It will be found, I believe, if a comparison be made—and no one attacks the record of the St. Lawrence—that the record of the Bay of Fundy is quite equal, if not superior, as far as casualties are concerned, to the great St. Lawrence route from the sea to Quebec and on to Montreal.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think this is going rather beyond what is allowed.

Mr. CARVELL: It is very important, Mr. Speaker. Let the hon. gentleman go on.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it would be a rather dangerous precedent to allow this debate to proceed at this stage.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN. I must bow at once to your decision, Mr. Speaker. But perhaps I may take a more fitting occasion to refer to the question raised by my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., which was a most proper one to ask. I must content myself now with saying that the casualty under discussion did not occur in the Bay of Fundy. I think that the inquiry by the Wreck Commissioner into the causes of the wreck of the Cobequid will be found to have been of the fullest possible character, and the result will be given to the public as soon as it is possible to do so.

MARITIME MAIL SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmorland): I invite the attention of the Postmaster

General to the condition of the mail service between Sackville, in Westmorland county, and the eastern portions of the county over the line of the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway. I have just received a telegram from the eastern part of Westmorland, stating:

No train over this route since 19th. No mail 19th to 23rd. Mails now coming by team. Road could easily have been opened 23rd or 24th. Inquiries at railway office meet with no information given no remedy.

The railway referred to runs from Sackville to Cape Tormentine. It connects at certain seasons with a mail service to Prince Edward Island at Summerside. I would ask my hon. friend the Postmaster General if his attention has been called to the fact that the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway is snowbound, that the mails have been interrupted since the 19th of this month. This is a very important section of the country, and naturally the people are very much interested in having a mail service. They have a daily mail service when the trains are in operation, but, apparently, they have no such mail service now.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General): These things very often come to the notice of the department. The unfortunate part of the matter is that although the Post Office Department has a contract with the railway companies to carry the mail, it has no means of forcing them to do what they ought to do under certain circumstances. In this case there is a standing order from the department at once to get out teams or employ other means of transportation for the purpose of taking proper care of the mails. The particular point to which my hon. friend refers has not been called to my attention, because, I suppose, the officers of the department have instructions to do at once the next best thing in order to ensure a proper delivery of the mails to the public and it will be done in this case.

THE OCEAN LIMITED.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. EMMERSON: On Friday last the general manager of the Intercolonial railway sent notices to the newspapers of the Maritime provinces to the effect that the operation of twenty-three trains of the Intercolonial railway system, including the Ocean Limited, would be discontinued on Monday of this week, that is to-day. Has this matter come to the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and, if so, have instructions been sent out cancelling any such order, and providing that the operation of the Ocean Limited be continued as heretofore? Has the hon. minister any knowledge as to the other trains in question, and if so, what trains running over the Intercolonial railway are to be discontinued?

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE: I have no knowledge of any twenty-three trains being taken off. The Ocean Limited is to continue to run, and I shall be able to inform the House to-morrow or the next day as to whether that train will continue to run during the next two months.

Mr. EMMERSON: Do I understand the hon. minister to say he has no knowledge of the discontinuing of the twenty-three trains mentioned?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON: Such an order went out.

Mr. COCHRANE: I never heard of it.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. H. F. McLeod for an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, resumed from Friday, January 23.

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, at the time of the adjournment, on Friday night, I was referring to the remarks the hon. Solicitor General had just made in regard to the policy adopted by the Senate in connection with the proposal of a grant towards the improvement of highways. The hon. Solicitor General contended, in good faith, no doubt, that the Senate had no right to amend the Bill which the House had passed, because, he said, in respect to a money Bill, to a Bill providing for the expenditure of a certain amount of money, the Senate cannot effect any amendments, additions, curtailments, or alter the nature and object of this Bill. He contended, moreover, that this Bill, though not intituled 'money Bill,' actually was a money Bill, and that the Senate should have kept their hands off it.

I said the other night, and I repeat it, there are dozens and dozens of eminent men in this House, and even in the Senate, who

certainly are as learned and as wise as the Solicitor General. The latter has, of course, the right to give his opinion; he is entitled to put almost absolute faith in the truth of his contentions; but he should leave the same freedom to others.

The leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Sir George Ross) is a man not to be trifled with. He has spent his life in parliaments, having long been the Prime Minister of his province, and to-day he has at his side to lend him a hand, men of long experience, men who are just as well acquainted as the Solicitor General with the laws and constitution of the country. I deny to the learned Solicitor General the right to deal in such high-handed fashion with whoever is of a different opinion, and to say: It is childish, it is laughable, it is preposterous! We have in this House large numbers of hon. gentlemen who have devoted their lives to study, who are perfectly in touch with our constitutional law and parliamentary usage, men who were members of this House long before the Solicitor General ever set his foot here, and who have disagreed with him. When I had an opportunity of addressing the House, the other night, I did so knowing where I stood, after looking up the points of law raised by him. and I was satisfied that he had no grounds justifying such sweeping conclusions as he arrived at. The learned Solicitor General should know one thing, and it is this: Whereas it is possible to make a nice little book with the things he knows, a very large one could be made out of what he ignores.

I have looked carefully into the Speech from the Throne. It appeared to me well prepared, well made, perfect in form, but terribly deficient in ideas. It contains nothing worth mentioning, save some expressions of sympathy to the Royal Family. Apart from that there is very little.

I smiled on reading the paragraph which heralded an increase in the number of senators. Why should the number of senators be increased previous to any increase in the membership of this House? As a rule, new senators are appointed only after the matter has been passed upon by the representatives of the people. In this instance, the first step is towards increasing the number of the senators. That is the way this Government goes about it. We style that putting the cart before the horse. Common sense would require that the number of members who express the will of the people should be first increased. In any case, I am anxious to see that Bill before the House.

I was surprised to find that the Speech from the Throne does not make any reference whatever to the navy, or to the thirty-five millions voted in spite of us during the last session. However, that legislation, according to hon. gentlemen opposite was the most important of all. It was so urgent that everything else had to be set aside to allow of its being passed. The hon. Solicitor General, as I stated a moment ago, is particularly well informed, and he endeavoured to make us believe that two and two make five. He it was who undertook to get a closure rule passed without submitting it previously to a committee for its overhauling and subsequent consideration by the House. Nothing of the kind was done. Nevertheless, that closure rule had been imagined for the purpose of getting the Navy Bill passed through the House. There is not a word in reference to it in the Speech from the Throne. I was greatly surprised to find that the members of the new Government had given up the navy which has caused so much trouble, and done so much harm. That navy, though, was a very desirable thing, since it was destined to save the British Empire. Now, there is not one word about it in the Speech from the Throne, not one.

The presence here of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), whom I greet with pleasure, suggests to me the idea that possibly he may have been recalled purposely to answer me. Where has he been? No one answers. Was he in China, in Japan, in Australia, in Asia? No one has informed us of the fact. I am beginning to think that I am a very important man, considering that the most experienced, the most wary, the best informed man in the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite has been recalled to answer me. Besides, it is stated by the big guns and in the Government organs, that the right hon. Prime Minister may go to London to represent us in Great Britain as High Commissioner. It is announced at the same time that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) may proceed to London as our High Commissioner there. If all the big guns depart, it is not surprising that others should be recalled to take their places. As for me, I would be glad to keep the Hon. Mr. Rogers here; it is so amusing when he tries to gag us, that I am intent on retaining him in our midst.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has become of the navy? What has become of that pressing necessity of a thirty-five million grant

to avoid an impending war with Germany? According to these hon. gentlemen, it was of absolute necessity to forward those thirty-five millions, otherwise bankruptcy was staring England in the face. We were told that the Laurier navy was only tin-pot and no good. We could easily afford to grant those thirty-five millions, because the country was prosperous, they said. We have surpluses every year; it is an easy matter to forward thirty-five millions, to make a wedding present, without the country being any the worse for it. In spite of the Opposition, in spite of its most determined efforts, the House voted those millions. The Bill was forwarded to the Senate. The hon. gentlemen in the other House were suppose to swallow that pill without much protest, provided it was slightly sugar-coated. But it is not such an easy matter to have the veterans of the Senate to swallow those pills. The man entrusted with the interests of Canada was no tyro; he said to the ministers: You have cried high and low, you have contended and repeated in the House, and a number of your friends who are representatives of the people have stated in every quarter: No navy without a previous consultation of the people; no expenditure for that object previous to the holding of a plebiscite which the people have to be called upon to vote. These members of the Cabinet hailing from the province of Quebec, all of them, were especially outspoken in their denunciations of the navy, that confounded navy, we will not have anything to do with it, they would exclaim. We would rather cut off a hand first, start a revolution, if necessary, rather than have a navy previous to consulting the people.

By the time they get into Parliament, it is a grant for the navy that must be voted, and in quick time. But the hon. leader of the Senate (Sir George Ross) is not easily fooled. He stated to the hon. Prime Minister and his friends: You stated that there would be no Navy Bill passed previous to consulting the people; you are bound to stick to your word. What a pity, Mr. Speaker, that men who are entrusted with the affairs of a country as important as ours should thus change their minds from one day to the other. Is it not painful to have to acknowledge to the people that those who are in power are not keeping faith, make light of their promises as soon as they reach power, passed from one side of the House to the other, and accepted portfolios? Should a poor man act so, he would be dealt with pretty harshly. The man who does not keep his word is not of much use. A public man has no right to do on the next day the opposite of what he promised to do the day previous.

I am glad to see that there is to be passed through the House a Bill in respect to the navy which is of a kind to secure my approval, I must admit, especially if its promoter is acting in good faith, as I presume he is. I mean the Bill introduced by Mr. Lesperance, of Montmagny, repealing the Navy Bill. If that hon. gentleman is acting in good faith, and is, as I believe, an honourable man, for he occupies a very high social position, I think I shall vote for the repeal of that Navy Bill. But, it may be objected, are you not stultifying yourself, after voting in support of that Navy Bill? Quite right, I voted in support of that measure, but at the time the country was prosperous, and we had millions galore, and besides we were told that it was necessary to pass such a measure and that the revenue was sufficient to meet any expenditure it would entail, without having any detrimental effect on the nation's credit.

But, in the meantime, matters have taken quite a different turn. The Minister of Finance has been forced to admit that we are facing a serious crisis, that our finances are greatly embarrassed, that commerce is no longer prospering, and that we must not think of changing the tariff because trade might suffer in consequence. I am wondering whether we are still in a position to undergo the expenditure entailed by the upkeep of a war navy. Thus in supporting a Bill providing for the repeal of that Act, I would not be going against my past record. The financial conditions of the country having changed in the meantime, the German peril having vanished, order and peace being restored, why should we have a navy? Since we have no one to fear in any quarter, why should we uselessly spend so many millions?

I may decide to build for myself a mansion at a time when I have the means of doing so. But supposing I undergo heavy losses on my stocks, or supposing I am under the necessity of making some unforeseen expenditure, have I not the right to say to my architect: Pray discontinue; I am short of funds, my financial position is not what it was when I made up my mind to build that mansion; I am no longer in a position to make such an outlay. Am I not just as justified to-day in voting for

the repeal of that Navy Bill, which the Government was not willing to carry out when the country's finances were still in their past state of buoyancy and we were in a position to do things such as those?

I am at a loss to say what the leader of my party is going to decide, what position he will advise us to take; but if I am free, as I usually am, if I am at liberty to act in accordance with my views and decision, I say to the hon. member for Montmagny that he may rely on my support. However, I must add: Be candid about it, and let not that Bill be mere trumpery.

The hon. member is usually straightforward in everything he does. If I have the assurance that this Bill is introduced in good faith and in the best interest of the country, I shall very likely support it.

The navy was a necessity in days gone by; all were agreed as to that. I just now see in his place the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). Assuredly he is not the first comer. He as well as all his friends in 1909 joined hands with the Liberals to say to the then Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) it is necessary that we should build a navy. The Hon. Mr. Monk was the only one not to give his approval to that expression of policy. But I was pleased later on to hear that gentleman say: I was not in the House in 1909 at the time that resolution was voted, but had I been present I would have voted in its favour.

So it is certain, indisputable, that both political parties agreed at the time in approving what the Laurier Government did later on. I mean the purchase of two ships as models, and the carrying on of those naval building operations as fast as the financial conditions of the country allowed it.

But later on hon. gentlemen on the other side changed their minds. They said: If we let that Navy Bill pass, Mr. Laurier will remain in power so long as he wishes. There is a fine opportunity to embarrass him, to impede his progress; let us change our policy and try something else. So these gentlemen went to the people with altered views; as a result we were beaten on that issue, mixed up with another of as great importance, that of reciprocity.

So I have the right to-day, in the presence of those facts, to say that hon. gentlemen on the other side have not been sincere in the stand they have taken; they have not kept their word; but when they have to appear once more before the people for a renewal of their mandate, they will be called upon to render a strict account of their stewardship. The people will exact a true and faithful account, with vouchers attached. They will say. What have you done in connection with the navy? You had agreed never to spend a cent on that acount before submitting the matter to the electors, a promise which you have broken in voting those 35 millions.

I now pass on to another viewpoint. The hon. Solicitor General stated the other night that the Senate had not the right to effect that amendment to the Highways Bill. I have previously discussed that question, and I do not wish to cover once more the same ground. But I say that this House had no right to provide any expenditure for that purpose without specifying what highways were to be improved and where, what amounts were to be expended in the various provinces, in what manner and under whose authority. The majority of this House having refused to point out the particulars which I have just given, I say unhesitatingly that the Senate had undoubtedly the right to vote the amendment it did vote. And while listening to some hon. members during the last by-elections, who contended that if we had not the highways proposed by the House, it was the fault of the Liberal Senators, I could not help thinking that these gentlemen were in bad faith.

When it is stated to farmers: You did not get the highways promised you, or the money voted for those highways, but that is owing to the Senate, that is owing to the Liberals who refused to accede to the wish of the House of Commons, you did not get the protection you were entitled to because the Senate killed the Bill, I say such language is grossly insulting to the members of the Senate, for it is attributing to them motives and intentions which they did not have.

Then there is the appeal to the people. That famous plebiscite, not a word is said in reference to it in the Speech from the Throne, and the Nationalists themselves did not dare introduce a Bill providing for an appeal to the people However, they stated time and again, and on every husting, that what they wanted was an appeal to the people. Not a single meeting was held in the course of the last election without the Nationalists exclaiming: We want an appeal to the people, we want a plebiscite, and we shall oppose every demand made by the new Government if that de-

mand is not preceded by an appeal to the people.

Those gentlemen are in power since 1911; this is the year 1914, and it is the first time an effort is being made to redeem the pledges given in 1911.

Then as regards reciprocity, it was stated at the time: 'Let well enough alone.' The country was prosperous and as a result it was not necessary to make any changes, these gentlemen would say. To-day they are unable to say: 'Let well enough alone'; they must be content with saying: 'Let bad enough alone.' Public confidence is impaired, the cost of living is higher than formerly, and when the Government is called upon to apply a remedy, they answer: 'Let bad enough alone.' Hands off. That is a sign of a change in the times. Another sign is the fact that business is at a standstill and that the old-time prosperity has disappeared. I see that the hon. Minister of Finance stated, according to the Star of Saturday evening, that public opinion was not asking for a change in the tariff. To be able to express such a view, the minister must have sought that expression of public opinion among interested people, among manufacturers who are intent on continuing to draw those large dividends for themselves. But let the Minister of Finance come down to the people, let him inquire as to their views, and he will acknowledge that public opinion requires a change in the tariff. Let him inquire from the workingmen, from the farming class, he will soon find out that those two classes require more protection. But if he is content with gathering opinions among his own people, I dare say the result will be slightly different. I say that an enlightened public opinion requires a change in the tariff, in order to ensure greater protection to those who are entitled to it.

Mr. Speaker, at Montreal, the chambers of commerce, the most important business corporations are clamoring for the immediate building of the Georgian Bay canal, and I am surprised not to see any reference to it in the Speech from the Throne. How is it that so little deference is shown to the wishes of such an important community as that of the metropolis of Canada? There is not even an answer forthcoming to the numerous petitions which have been forwarded to the Government. Not a word, not even a refusal. Not a single reason given why the Government should not start at once the building of that canal. Reference is made to the appointment of a commission. But for fifty years commissions have succeeded one another. For fifty years past, engineers and other experts have been at work investigating the possibility of building that canal, and in every instance favourable reports were made stating that such undertaking could not be dispensed with.

If there is no intention of carrying out the Laurier Act in regard to the building of ships, if it is not intended to continue spending 35 millions, which amount the House granted against our will, to be spent on the British navy, then let us build that canal; the funds which these gentlemen proposed to apply to the development of the navy, let us apply them to the building of that canal. No, these gentlemen are unwilling to do anything, except folding their arms and managing the Government.

When it comes to spending money on the militia, though, to have them drill and exercise, expenditure follows expenditure, trip follows trip, millions follow millions; there is no cheese-paring about it. The people are not consulted, and funds are spent lavishly. I say the Government is not accomplishing its duty in not listening to the appeal of the great corporations for the immediate construction of this canal.

Mr. Speaker, the other day I read in the papers that the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) had been under the necessity of negotiating a loan of 20 millions in London. The amount was large, and he had not succeeded. England advanced only ten millions. Just think of a country like Canada making to England a gift of 35 millions just before applying for a loan of 20 millions for the carrying out of urgent and necessary work within the Dominion. That is an odd situation. Is it not an humiliation for our country to have to beg for a loan of millions from Great Britain, while at the same time making her a gift of an equal amount, simply to show our generosity. Previous to buying a piano or a silk dress for one's wife, the baker, the grocer, the cobbler and all other suppliers of primary necessities should have been settled with.

I regret that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) should not be in his place; I would have something of interest to him to give out. I suppose he was appointed Minister of Agriculture because he knew something about agriculture, because he was conversant with the needs of the farming community. If he was here, I would enquire how it is that there is no reference whatever in the Speech from the Throne indicating the least concern for the

welfare of the farming community. It is nevertheless an important industry, and in this connection, I may refer to a crop on which the people in my county largely depend, I mean tobacco. Why should not the Government increase the rates on foreign tobaccos in order to further protect our Canadian growers. Our tobacco growers have to stand the competition of the foreign leaf. In days gone by the Government went to a large expenditure for the purpose of encouraging and developing the growing of Canadian tobacco, but the time has come to go a step further. A duty of five cents per pound should be imposed on the foreign leaf in order to help the farmers improve their methods as well as the soil itself. Those who are the least conversant with agriculture are aware that a depleted soil must be enriched. Our farmers might easily enough stand the competition of foreign imports, if they were in a position to restore to the land its original fertility. It is necessary to restore to the soil those elements of which continuous cropping has deprived it, and accordingly to buy potash which costs fifty dollars per ton. How do you expect farmers to go to such an expenditure without the Government coming to their assistance? Put on a further duty on foreign tobaccos imported from Havana, Kentucky, and other parts, in a word, on all tobaccos competing with our home grown leaf.

That would enable our growers to maintain the soil in the proper state of fertility; instead of obtaining a thousand pounds an acre, they would possibly get fifteen hundred.

I was discussing the question with a Government official, a man of great ability and experience, of French origin, Mr. Charland, chief of that section of the Department of Agriculture. He stated that if tobacco were properly grown in Canada, on well prepared land, it should yield 2,000 lbs. per acre, while it barely yields half that quantity. That is, he says, on account of the deficiency in potash. Too much has been taken out of the soil by tobacco growing; it has to be enriched in that particular.

Now, the Minister of Agriculture has not a single word in the Speech from the Throne to show that he takes an interest in the farmer's welfare. Under the previous Administration, I had called the attention of the then Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), to the necessity of encouraging agriculture. I had requested the establishment of experimental stations in the principal districts of the province. He had given me his word that he would promptly see to it. But to-day there is no reference whatever to the subject. What would be the effect of the establishment of these stations from the point of view of the farmer? We have at Ottawa an experimental farm which has cost millions. I am not finding fault with that expenditure; but I do not say that there should be a dismemberment of the experimental farm. Farmers from the neighbouring districts in Ontario and Quebec come yearly to the central farm to collect new information. They reach Ottawa about noon, take lunch, and proceed to visit the farm. That takes two or three hours time and they return home practically not knowing any more than if they had never visited the farm. I say that the best departure would be to decentralize the experimental farm by establishing experimental stations in the various rural districts of the province. A station might be established at Three Rivers to begin with, then at St. Hyacinthe in the districts of Richelieu, Joliette, Terrebonne, St. Francis and elsewhere. These stations would be illustration stations, for the purpose of putting object lessons under the eyes of the farmers, and imparting to them the information they are in need of. I was disappointed to learn some time ago that the farmers of the province of Ontario had obtained 53,000 samples of seed grain last year, while the province of Quebec had applied for 9,000 only.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that there were numerous stations for the distribution of that seed grain. Let the samples be handed out at the church door on Sundays; let them be taken from house to house, if required, so that our farmers of the province of Quebec may be in a position to compete with those in the other provinces. We have strong arms, endurance and a fertile soil; we have industrious and temperate men; they are not sufficiently protected in that respect. We are taking good care of the industrial classes of the manufacturers, but the farmers are not looked after, they are a negligible quantity.

As regards by-elections, I shall say a word concerning them presently. I would like the Government to take proper measures to enable our farmers to secure large profits. Experts should be appointed to visit the various counties, examine the

soil, find out what are its deficiencies, teach the proper methods of cultivation, the way to cut, dry and cure tobacco and so forth. Is that not what the Government did for butter and cheese factories? Why could we not do the same to help on tobacco growing? There is a complaint about people leaving the country and the cost of living increasing all the time; but apparently nobody suspects that all that is because farmers do not get the encouragement they are entitled to. Farmers abandon their farms, give up farming and come to the cities to take up trades. That is all very well, but what remedy is there for it? The remedy is to give a greater measure of protection. If we had an experienced Minister of Agriculture, anxious to get posted concerning the requirements of the situation by obtaining information from those who apply to him for protection, he would soon realize the truth of what I say.

The intention, it seems, is to increase the representation of cities and correspondingly diminish that of the country districts. Is that a proper means of encouraging farmers to remain on the land? It is contended that cities have not a sufficient number of representatives, and it is proposed to grant them larger representation at the detriment of the rural constituencies. Whether a member from Montreal represents 100,000 or 20,000 people, it does not make much difference, because the territory covered is the same; a city member may in five minutes call a meeting at a given place, and he may be sure that there will be thousands of electors to go and listen to him. But that is not my case, far from it, and in order to meet my constituents I must travel for weeks, or even a whole month, through rough roads, cross the Laurentian mountains, to inform them of what I have done or applied for in their interest.

It is not so much a question of population as a question of territory to be covered. Though my constituency has not a very large population, it is more difficult for me to get in touch with my electors than it is for the representative in a large city to communicate with his constituents. In the cities there are newspapers, there are public bodies, there are large corporations to keep the electors posted. It takes them five minutes every morning to read the report of the world's progress; while my constituents, who are settled in the mountains, where it is difficult to have access, are ignorant half the time of what is going on elsewhere. A part of the world might disappear without their knowing it; the pope may die and they will find out only long after. There is no longer any talk about the Laurier navy, but they have not heard of it.

So I say that instead of increasing the representation of large cities, it should be left as it is, and the representation of rural districts remain where it is. But it is objected that the population of cities is increasing enormously. Take for instance the division of Maisonneuve, the population of which exceeds 100,000 souls. Well, my acquaintance with the hon. member for Maisonneuve is such as to permit me to state that he is not worrying over that. He is free to call meetings any day at some point or other of his constituency, and even two or three every day, and thus come in contact with his electors in very short time. In cities, an auto is summoned, committee rooms are visited in no time, and everybody is interviewed. But just go in the Laurentides with an auto, and keep me posted as to your progress. If you are anxious that the population of rural districts should diminish further, ill-use it as you are threatening to do by depriving it of its representation in Parliament. You will find that farms will be deserted, and that it will be difficult to get your supply of cabbages and radishes, for which even to-day you have to pay pretty high prices.

To my regret, I do not find anything in the Speech from the Throne in reference to a very opportune move which the Government should make. The hon. Mr. Foster, who has travelled over Europe, should have seen to that while he was in London; I mean the doing away with the embargo on Canadian cattle. The Speech from the Throne is silent on that point. It is all very fine to trade with the empire, but our cattle, after being shipped across the pond, are looked over and slaughtered on the wharves, under pretence of tuberculosis; people eat them all the same. In that way our best animals are sold at a sacrifice, under pretence of safeguarding the public health, but it sells cheaper per pound than if it was classed No. 1 when still on foot.

Have any steps been taken by the hon. Minister of Commerce (Mr. Foster) to do away with that state of things, with that embargo on Canadian cattle? Supposing we are told that the Laurier Government has not done anything to relieve the situation, do you think the people will be satisfied with such an answer? Do you think the

people have put in a new set of men without expecting an improvement in the condition of things? The people will soon realize that matters are not so well managed as they used to be. I shall charge the Government with sluggishness, with gross negligence in their dealings with the interests of the farming community, and for having neglected so far to take steps towards doing away with that embargo regulation affecting Canadian cattle. You propose granting 35 millions for the benefit of Great Britain, when your cattle are being slaughtered on the wharves in such fashion.

I am a farmer, I go in for the breeding of animals, and I say it is a crime to thus neglect taking steps towards putting an end to this state of things. You are aggrieved at seeing the people quit the land; protect us, help us, to begin with, and then we shall advise our children to stick to the homespun in preference to the silk hat of the city swell. But, in the first place, grant us the protection we are entitled to. We constitute 70 per cent of the population of the country, and that class which is so numerous is the very one which is ill-protected or not protected at all. We shall remain in the country, but under condition that you fulfil yourself your duty.

I charge with neglect the French-speaking members representing in the Cabinet the province of Quebec, for not making a better fight to obtain for us the measure of protection to which we are entitled. Not a line, not a word, absolutely nothing to show that they take some interest in the welfare of the farming class. For instance, petition after petition is forwarded, the newspapers in all the provinces are filled with expressions of opinion in regard to a world's fair to be held in Montreal. Resolutions passed by boards of trade, banks, insurance companies, large trans-Atlantic companies, etc., all go to state that, as a foregone conclusion, a world's fair should take place in Montreal. And there is not a word forthcoming from the ministers representing the province of Quebec; not a word showing that the Government are disposed to assist; they remain silent. It would seem that they hold portfolios with the firm resolve of avoiding all exertion, and that they are successful in attaining that object. Why do they not express their views as to the appropriateness of doing something in connection with the fiftieth anniversary of Confederation? One might think they have nothing to do with such matters. Well, I live on the island of Montreal. We have there some highly valuable property. We have the right to know what will be the stand taken by the Government, what will be their position in regard to the fair.

Recently I read something in a newspaper which caused me much surprise; I could hardly believe my senses. It was stated that the right hon. Prime Minister, while in New York, had represented that he was not opposed to reciprocity. To read in a newspaper that the Prime Minister stated in New York, as being his ipse dixit, that he was not opposed to reciprocity, that comes rather as a surprise. And the right hon. Prime Minister has allowed that report to be circulated throughout the Dominion!

There is no one but knows that the Prime Minister has been the instigator of the movement against reciprocity. Good Heavens, what is this country we are living in! Who are the deceivers, and who are the deceived? The Prime Minister leaving uncontradicted the statement made in a newspaper that he was not opposed to reciprocity! Well, Mr. Speaker, it is time for the sake of the dignity of this House that there should be a question put challenging these gentlemen to give an account of the views attributed to them by newspapers.

There is still another question that puzzles me. I mean the famous Ne Temere Bill. Poor Mr. Laurier, many capital sins have been charged to you, when it was stated in Ontario: 'If the Ne Temere exists, it is Laurier's fault; he is unwilling that Canadian women of the Catholic faith shall marry Protestants. Put us in power, and I, Mr. Borden, will see to it that Protestants and Catholic intermarry.

How is it that nothing more is heard of it? Has it been forwarded to Jerusalem? During the last election the abolition of that Ne Temere decree had been promised. The intention was to legislate so as to do away with the enactments of the Ne Temere. The former Minister of Justice, Sir Allan Aylesworth, an eminent man, the most distinguished lawyer which I have ever met, gave his opinion concurrently with his leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He stated that the constitution did not allow us to deal with that question, that it was not within the purview of the Dominion Parliament, but remained within the jurisdiction of the Provincial legislatures. Subsequently, the Hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), a former judge, an eminent jurist, was called upon to express an opinion, and he agreed

with the views of Sir Allan Aylesworth and Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Those gentlemen were not satisfied with that. The matter had to be submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada, in order to ascertain whether the stand taken by such eminent authorities was well grounded. So the question was submitted to the Supreme Court, and it was decided once again that this House has no jurisdiction. But the matter was not allowed to drop and was carried before the Privy Council in England. Here again the opinion expressed by the former Minister of Justice and Sir Wilfrid Laurier was upheld. All that resulted in an expenditure of fifty thousand dollars for the country, while Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Allan Aylesworth did not charge anything. In that way they succeeded in throwing away fifty thousand dollars, and the question is dead and buried.

There still remains the school question. that famous question. The Speech from the Throne does not say a single word about it, does not that make the least bit of reference to it, after all the talk on the matter we have had from the mouth of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I would like to enquire from him, if I saw him in his place, whether he is still of a humour to call Sir Wilfrid Laurier a renegade, a perjurer, an unworthy French Canadian, a coward, as he did on the hustings, taunting him for not having settled that question. He had not enough insults to hurl at the head of the former Prime Minister, branding him as a renegade, a knave. Later on, being questioned as to the intentions of the Government regarding that school question, he answered from his seat that this school question had been settled by the Greenway-Laurier agreement, an agreement which I concurred in. Was he sincere when he was slinging mud at the former Prime Minister, or was he sincere when he had succeeded in getting in the manger himself? The member for Jacques Cartier condemned the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, adding that the policy propounded by Mr. Borden was even worse. That did not prevent him from accepting a portfolio in that same Government headed by Mr. Borden. True, he did not stay there very long after saying that he was bolted, riveted and padlocked to his ministerial seat. However, there was no padlock strong enough to retain him, and he unbolted, unriveted and unpadlocked himself; he broke loose and ran away, and since has not been seen.

That is a well fettered man who runs away on the day following only. Since his resignation a very odd thing has been going on to my surprise; he has not in the meantime set foot in this House, and at the close of the year his friends passed a piece of legislation granting him his parliamentary indemnity. A man whom we meet every day in Montreal, on the street! He delivers lectures, but does not show up in the House. However, at the close of the session he gets his sessional indemnity all the same. We of the common fry, when we are absent one day, we are docked fifteen dollars; but as for this gentleman, he has the right to take it easy at the expense of the State, and at the close of the year small items will be inserted in the estimates for the benefit of those who have absented themselves. Well, I take exception to that way of managing things. You have sworn to protect the country's interests, to fulfil your duty as members of this House, to render your accounts and to give to Caesar whatever to Caesar is due. I deny you the right of pilfering the public monies and throwing them to the winds.

During our tenure of office, when we asked for subsidies amounting to $140,000,000, to meet the requirements of the country, we were branded as dishonest or incompetent administrators. But when hon. gentlemen opposite reach power, $140,000,000 are no longer sufficient. Last year it ran up to $250,000,000. What have you done with those millions? You have not a single word in the Speech from the Throne indicating the use they were put to. It may be objected that it is a little early to call for the estimates. That may be so; but should I wait a little longer, all will be dissipated, wasted.

I say that those men are not worthy of the confidence of the country, the confidence reposed in them by the people in 1911; they are not worthy of occupying seats on the Treasury benches. The Minister of Finance did not even state that he proposed taking steps towards voiding the sale of that $300,000 property situated in Winnipeg, which has been given away for ten dollars.

Such are the deeds perpetrated in this twentieth century, in the capital of the Dominion. Have these hon. gentlemen lost their heads? One might come to that conclusion. No steps whatever have been

taken towards voiding that scandalous bargain. I shall charge the Government with sluggishness and deceit, if they do not take action in the matter. The poor man is summoned before a jury and sent to the penitentiary for having committed some petty theft. I have had the honour to represent the Crown in my district for the last eight years, and I have had convicted several people for petty larcenies. Are we to let go scott free thieves and sharpers, when thousands of dollars are at stake? I say that is a scandal which is leading the country to bankruptcy in short order, and when we are in debt to the extent of millions, the people will be taxed to pay off those millions. All of which show that these hon. gentlemen were not sincere.

In my constituency, dismissals have been effected right and left. There was a poor man who could not make a living for himself, having but one arm left, through an accident in operating a threshing machine. Well, he has been dismissed as postmaster, a position which I had succeeded in obtaining for him. He was deprived of his post office, because he had dared to say: I voted for Mr. Lafortune. He was thrown out of employment, though no complaint had been lodged against him. But he was guilty of having voted for me. The post office which bore my name was abolished. My constituents requested me to give my name to that post office. I answered in the affirmative, thinking it might be the only testimonial which my children might eventually be able to point to. But that testimonial was short-lived; to-day the post office is called 'Marion,' the name of the candidate I have defeated. At the same time, that poor man who had been appointed postmaster was thrown out. And that is what people term justice in a civilized country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the same thing has occurred in hundreds of cases; deceased people have been dismissed, and deceased people have also been appointed. Some have even been taken out of jail to occupy positions. Will it be contended that this is good management, that this is fair play? Such are the misdeeds of the Government. 'Oh, justice, what crimes are committed in thy name.'

You are right, Mr. Speaker, in finding that the advisors of the Crown are in no hurry to meet the electors. However, while the same man may be deceived several times, and all men be deceived occasionally, all men cannot be deceived all the time, and when the tenure of office of hon. gentlemen opposite has expired, they will have to render their accounts. And then will the cripple, such as the one-armed man I have referred to, rise in condemnation, and when the people kick, it is a mighty kick.

I am sorry, as well, to find no mention in the Speech from the Throne of any proposed change in the Bankruptcy Act, though boards of trade, banks, great corporations have passed resolutions in that sense.

In concluding, I shall refer to the election in Chateauguay. The Prime Minister chuckled over the result of that election. I took a hand in the fight, and I saw with my own eyes and heard with my own ears what went on in that election. The Government, to secure that election, promised bridges, a bridge between Montreal and Caughnawaga which was to cost nearly a half million. Elect our candidate, they would say, and you will get that bridge. The river will be deepened and broadened, so as to facilitate navigation. You will get a post office at St. Jean Chrysostome, an electric railway between the latter place and St. Antoine Abbé; you will have a driveway, but vote for the Government candidate. Fine wharves will be constructed, etc.

They would enter farm houses and inquire: Have you any sheep?—Yes. How many?—Five. How much do you want for them?—Five hundred dollars for them all. Well, that is rather high, but we will give you twenty-five dollars cash and the rest when we come for them. A collie dog was paid $50, $10 down, the balance to be paid on taking possession. Cattle were bought in that way in the county of Chateauguay, either to prevent the electors from voting, or inducing them to vote in favour of the Government candidate.

No wonder we lost Chateauguay, but that election is controverted, and the facts I have just mentioned, as well as many others, will be proven. Then we will have the chance of getting back at them, and you may be sure the old trick will not work this time. Chateauguay was won over through fraud, corruption, the open breaking of the law, in the same way that the general elections of 1911 have been won. But these things will not be tolerated a second time, and the people will hand justice to whom justice is due.

Before resuming my seat and concluding my remarks, I must say that I have barely skimmed over the various questions which these hon. gentlemen have omitted to mention in the Speech from the Throne. We shall, nevertheless, bring them up in this

House. By omitting to refer to them in the Speech from the Throne, it was hoped possibly that the session would be shortened. But we are going to make the programme for the session with the help of Sir Wilfrid Laurier; for he is still, as always, the master of the House; he still leads the country which he has governed so long. While he was in office there was no depression, and there was work for all. There was nothing too dear, as there was lots of money in every home. Until he is carried back to power, we shall fight those who are so grossly mismanaging the affairs of the country; and I for one shall not be afraid to appear before my constituents and to tell them what I have done, what I wished to do, and I shall be returned once more to this House, for I have always done my duty heretofore, and I have to deal with honest and intelligent electors.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas): I am sorry I was not able to follow the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lafortune) as fully as I would have liked. Perhaps in some respects I may be considered somewhat lucky. I do not wish to detain the House long, but there are a few things with which I wish to deal. In the first place, we have heard a great deal about emergency; whether there is an emergency or no emergency. It is all very well to argue about the relative positions of Germany and England, but whenever Great Britain has a serious rival on the sea we have an emergency, no matter who that rival may be. That being so, our responsibility must be apparent. Furthermore, I think that before we attempt to build a navy in this country we had better decide whether we are going to swim or fly. We all know that the question of an aerial fleet is a very prominent one in Europe to-day, and until we have decided whether we are going to swim or fly why not let Canada use Great Britain's plant, costing hundreds of millions of dollars, for building her warships. There is another consideration which every right-minded Canadian should think of. If we lay out this enormous amount of money on a plant to build vessels in Canada, there will be a large bill to pay annually to keep that plant up to date; otherwise it will become obsolete.

Another matter which has been brought up quite frequently is the Highways Bill. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition and his friends have been very eager to tell us that they do not want to hurt the Highways Bill. In other words, they want the child to cry but they are afraid to whip it. That is the position they are in. The Senate, whether at the instigation of the right hon. leader of the Opposition or not, saw fit to change that Bill so that the Government could not accept it, and whether they so amended it for party reasons or otherwise, the fact remains that the Senate stands between the people and this great enterprise. The people do not wish to be deprived of this great benefit because of some technical opinion that some hon. gentlemen in this House may have. If we are to keep the people on the land in this country we must improve rural conditions, and any one who considers what the Highways Bill or a similar outlay properly expended as it has been in other countries would do for Canada, must admit that it would be a very great factor in keeping the people on the land. So long as they get good roads, it is a very small matter to the country what the opinions of any public man may be in reference to the effect of the Bill; and, while this proposal of the federal Government to assist the farmers of our country and the people who are interested in building roads is a new deparure, it is one which is justified by the conditions in this country. Up to now the farmer has had to bear this great burden himself. But the burden has become too heavy for him, and hence the necessity of help from somewhere. One objection urged by hon. gentlemen opposite was: You would make political use of this Bill. I say that the federal Government, unless it declared these roads to be interprovincial roads, or in the general interests of Canada, could not go into any municipality or province and lay out one dollar of that money without an agreement on the part of the province and municipality as to how the money should be expended. The real trouble is that the measure is popular among the people, and hon. gentlemen opposite do not want us to get the credit. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition has told the country that his body politic is very sick or that it is seriously ailing. Let us see what kind of a prescription he suggests for a patient so seriously ill. It seems to me a very mild one, it is not heroic treatment anyway; in fact, he does not propose to prescribe anything at all. He says:

> We regret to have to represent to Your Royal Highness that in the gracious speech with which you have met Parliament, whilst it is admitted that business is in a depressed condition, yet there is no indication of any intention on the part of your advisers to take any steps towards relieving such a situation.

He then called in the consultation the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael

Clark), and he has he same prescription whether the patient is sick or well—free trade. That is all he can recommend. If that is the kind of treatment this patient is going to receive at the hands of the leader of the Opposition and the prominent doctor whom he has called in, in consultation, I think the patient will have to get along without the help of these gentlemen. They tell us that there is a stringency in this country, but I say this: outside of the large cities and towns—where undoubtedly there are unemployed, perhaps because the towns have been overspeculating in building—the people, and I am speaking now for the farmers of Ontario, were never better off. Some years ago when our Liberal friends were in power hard times commenced in the country and stayed in the country—not only in the rural districts, but in the cities and towns; but the conditions to-day are entirely different. And these hard times cannot last for long when the rural districts are prosperous and making money as they are to-day. I am not able to give a correct statement as to the unemployed. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition estimated the number at 100,000; but his figures have been criticised by those who seem to know, who say they are away beyond the mark. What would it amount to if the figures were correct? It would simply mean that 100,000 people from England, Ireland, Scotland and other European countries came into Canada in three months in the year 1912-13, that is, at the rate of 1,200 a day or 400,000 a year. Everybody knows that these people cannot get employment the day they land here. They have to wait for positions. So this calamity of which we have heard so much does not really exist.

We have heard a great deal about the high cost of living. I know a man can live cheap because I have had to do so all my life. There is this to be said about the high cost; it is largely in the mode of people's living. I met a man the other day who said, 'Look what my bread costs me, it is terrible.' I said: 'You are a young man, about 35 years old, are you not? Well, when you were a boy wheat was $1.50 a bushel, and your mother used to make her own bread. But now wheat is $1 a bushel. Your wife makes you go out and buy your bread, and I will bet you the wife does not know where the clothes line and the scrubbing brush are in your own house.' Let us look these things squarely in the face. I will give you another instance. A man goes down town and pays 50 cents for a bushel of potatoes, and then pays $1 carriage to get them home, so that they are costing him $1.50 a bushel. As long as the people have money to spend they will continue to raise the standard of living and increase their expenditures. There is only one remedy for that condition. My right hon. friend and the Government, if they wish, may pass all the resolutions they like in this House; but they cannot make that hen running around the barnyard lay one egg more; they cannot add a pound to the bullock in the stall or the pig in the sty. The man who feeds these animals is the only one who can do that, the producer must do it, and if we get down to the producer we will remedy this trouble if the common sense of the people comes into play. My right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, speaking in Hamilton on the 29th November last, said that he was going to put the farmer on the free list. That is free food. The farmer has been working for hundreds of years and feeding the world cheaply but now that his pork and beef, his mutton, his poultry, his dairy produce, his tub of butter and his grain are getting up a little in price my right hon. friend says: We must stop this, we must put him on the free list. I noticed that when he got down to Montreal he modified his attitude; he was not so strong upon this question down there. He met a very cautious gentleman down there, one who had made a bad bargain, the ex-Minister of Finance, and he told my right hon. friend that he must be very careful on this question. So he was, and he was also careful in the resolution which he introduced here the other day.

The right hon. gentleman must realize that Canada is not producing the quantity of dairy produce that we might expect from it, an agricultural country. How can we justify this? Just last winter a gentleman sat down to his breakfast in the city of Ottawa and he had for his breakfast eggs from Russia, potatoes from Ireland, bacon from Denmark and butter from New Zealand. That should not happen in this country. There is only one remedy and that is to get the people on the land. I do not say that you must restrict the liberty of a boy and say that he must stay on the farm, but the people who are coming to this country should be induced to go on the land. The farmer may be a sinner in some respects; he must give his hired man a home and if the hired man wants to marry and raise a family he should be allowed to do so. If this principle is carried out we

will solve the question of agricultural production and of the high cost of living all over the country. There is no other legitimate way to do it. If we get down to the common sense of these things we must let the man who comes in from Europe or anywhere else feel that he is a part and parcel of the state, he should enter into our social conditions, be associated with our churches and schools and in this way become a living factor and a useful citizen in the neighbourhood in which he lives.

Then, we had a speech from our hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark). They had him at school but he has not improved any. They sent him down to Nova Scotia and they put him up against those big industries to see if they could break up that Cobden platform of his, but he came back as bad as ever. The hon. gentleman who took him down there is not in his seat just now, but I would say: Do not give up hope; there is hope as long as there is life. Take him down again. I was very much pleased to see and to hear that there was some possibility of amendment. The hon. member for Red Deer never seriously moved against the tariff while his own friends were in power although he is finding fault with that tariff to-day. I do not know that he has ever moved a resolution upon the subject. It is a strange thing that hon. gentlemen opposite now want profane hands to be laid upon that sacred edifice that they built. It was the greatest thing that ever happened in this country, it gave us all this enormous prosperity and now they want the thing torn down. They want profane hands to be laid upon it. The only thing that has been done with it so far is that it has been cut down a little but they are finding fault with it still. They thought it was a blessing five years ago, three years ago, eight years ago; it is a question whether it should not still be considered a blessing. That it may be improved we all know, but the last people who should find fault with it are the men who designed it and put it upon the statute book. But I suppose they must say something to the people and in a few years they will say it is a Tory tariff, that the Tories made it. That is what is going to happen. I will tell hon. gentlemen opposite that there is no doubt it will be improved and improved in the interests of this country. It is quite right that any tariff should have a certain degree of permanence about it, but conditions change and the tariff must change to suit the conditions. I am willing to go that far and to tell my right hon. friend that I have not the slightest doubt that it will be properly dealt with when the proper time comes.

There has been a good deal said about free wheat. I am not going to say much about that question because I cannot discuss it from the viewpoint of the western man, but I desire to say that the future of our western country is largely bound up in the fact that they must enter upon mixed farming. If they enter upon mixed farming they will get the bi-product of the wheat and the bi-product of the wheat is a very important factor in mixed farming. It is the life-blood of the dairy industry of Ontario and Quebec to-day. It is of the utmost importance that we should see to it that we have our wheat ground within this country and the flour exported to England or to any other country, because if the bi-product of the wheat is transferred to England or to some other country the dairy industry suffers very materially as a result. This bi-product can be shipped on the wheat at a less freight cost than it can after it is ground; hence the necessity of grinding the wheat in this country. Instead of being able to grind wheat into flour for about 14,000,000 people we should be able to grind for 50,000,000 people. How is it that with wheat shipped from Manitoba to Ontario, the millers can sell the flour cheaper to the Ontario man than to the man in Manitoba—simply because the bi-product has to be shipped out of Manitoba at a very heavy freight rate. This bi-product is virtually the profit of the miller and it is cheaper to ship the wheat down here, grind and sell the bran and shorts than to grind the wheat into flour in Manitoba and to ship the bi-products down here in bulk.

The men who look upon this question from the mere advantage of a few months hence are not perhaps looking at it from the proper standpoint of the future of this country. Every Canadian must feel that what I say is a fact who reads the statement made by Mr. Ruddick, the Dairy Commissioner, only the other day in addressing the Eastern Dairy Association at the town of Cornwall. I happened to be present and heard the statement and he was good enough to give me a copy of it. I wish, through the House, to present it to the consideration of the country. Before reading it I would like to explain that there is a great difference between cows and milch cows; there are a great many non-milkers. In the county of Dundas, within a radius of 20 miles, we had four years ago 30,000 milch cows and 13,000 non-milkers; to-day we have 26,000

milch cows and 19,000 non-milkers. What is the explanation of that?—the difficulty of getting competent hired help to do the dairy work. The statement is as follows:

Milch Cows in Canada.

	1901.	1911.	Decrease.	Increase.
Ontario	1,065,763	1,032,979	33,784	
Quebec	767,825	753,134	14,691	
New Brunswick	111,084	108,532	2,552	
Nova Scotia	138,817	129,302	9,515	
Prince Edward Island	56,437	52,109	2,484	
Manitoba	141,481	155,337	.....	13,856
British Columbia	24,535	33,953	.....	9,420
Saskatchewan	56,634	181,146	.....	124,512
Alberta	46,101	147,687	.....	101,586
Totals for Canada	2,408,677	2,594,179	.....	

Total increase in 10 years, 185,502.

In the older provinces, as will be seen, we have a decrease in the number of milch cows. We should not be going backward in this respect, in Ontario and Quebec especially; we should be going forward. I call the attention of the House to the increase in the number of milch cows in the western provinces as shown by the above table, and I am sure every honest Canadian will be glad to know these facts. The number in the western provinces has increased very materially which is very welcome news indeed. These figures show a decrease in the number of milch cows in eastern Canada and an increase in the western provinces, which gives a net increase in the whole Dominion of 185,502. We lost in the old provinces 62,026 milch cows, and we gained in the new provinces, 249,374. It is a good thing to see our western provinces taking up the question of raising milch cows and going into dairy products. We should have enough of these products to satisfy our own people. While the number of our milch cows has fallen in the older provinces, Mr. Ruddick shows that we have not decreased our output. That looks inconsistent, but the fact is that the improvement of the stock, the culling out of the poor animals, and the better system of feeding, have increased the product per cow. The average product per cow in 1901, was 2,850 lbs. of milk, and in 1910 it was 3,805 lbs. of milk, or nearly 1,000 lbs. per cow more than it was ten years previously. But that does not justify the falling off in the number of our cattle, because if we had the same number of cows in the older provinces in 1911 as we had in 1901, our product would be equal to the domestic consumption, and we would be exporting as well. The serious thing is that we are exporting no butter and we have lost our place altogether in the British market for that commodity. A few years ago I was bold enough to make the statement in this House that in the near future Russian Siberia would be a serious rival to us in many of the important products of our farm, and at the time my Liberal friends ridiculed the idea of Russia interfering with our market in England. But what is the fact to-day? Russian Siberia is second of all the countries of the world in the quantity of butter she ships to the English markets; Denmark is first. We have lost our butter trade there, and it is taken by others, and it will not be an easy matter to regain our position. Now there is another important consideration that I wish to point out, and that is that if the other counties in Ontario equalled in the number of cattle and the dairy output a few counties in Ontario, some in eastern Ontario and one or two in western Ontario, we would have double the number of cattle we have in the entire province at the present time. This shows the possibilities before the people of this country if they conscientiously enter upon the problem of knowing what an acre of land is worth. If it be possible, the Government should endeavour to show the people of Canada the possibilities of 100 acres of land. The boy or the man who goes into a corn field and sees but the weeds and the corn, is living far short of his privilege; he should see nature unfolding her designs to feed the world. That is his business. He should feel he is a factor in doing so, and if he does not

realize it, he is falling far short of his duty. Supposing this country were a finished country as some countries of Europe are, what would it mean to the world? Canada would be standing in the gateways of the world, holding out food to the hungry, so to speak; taking her great share in supplying the food of the world and doing her duty as an agricultural country. We are this year exporting enormously over what we were exporting last year. I have a little clipping here from the Star, and it quotes from the report of the United States Department of Agriculture Report, and it says this:

Canada is the largest purchaser of American automobiles according to figures compiled by the United States Department of Commerce. The Dominion took 5,824 automobiles from the United States in the first eleven months of 1913, valued at $7,870,000.

We can not be very hard up when we can do that; we bought nearly $8,000,000 worth of automobiles from the United States in the eleven months, to say nothing about those made in Canada. I believe the farmer should have an automobile; no man in the world deserves it better than he if he can afford it, but when he is able to buy automobiles at this rate, he cannot be so terribly straitened in circumstances. I read further:

During the month of December, according to figures issued by the Department of Customs, the exports of Canada underwent a remarkable increase. The export of domestic produce during December 1913 amounted to $55,803,642, as against $38,658,625 in December 1912, the increase thus being $17,145,017 or 44%. By far the largest item in the total was the export of agricultural products which stood at $35,367,942 as against $22,859,325—

This would seem to back up my statement that the farmers are well off, at least in Ontario.

—which stood at $35,367,942 as against $22,859,325 in the corresponding month of 1912, the increase being a trifle over $12,800,000 or nearly 55%. There also was a heavy proportionate increase in the export of manufactures, the figures being $5,599,086 as against $3,800,805, the increase being within a few dollars of $1,800,000 or more than 47%.

This does not prove there are so many unemployed.

There was also a heavy increase in export of animals and their products, the figures standing at $4,744,056 as against $2,791,550, the increase being $1,952,506 or nearly 70 per cent.

That no doubt is accounted for to a large extent by the shipments of cattle from this country to the United States. Taking the nine months, however, in which these shipments did not occur, there is still a large increase.

During the nine months' period ending December 31, 1913, the exports coming under the head of agriculture showed an increase of about 50 per cent over those of the corresponding period of 1912. They stood at $177,706,169 as against $119,209,170 in the earlier period, the increase being $58,696,999 in the nine months.

That does not look as if there were very hard times.

Animals and their produce also showed a substantial increase, from $36,740,883 to $43,568,859.

That shows an increase during the nine months when there were no shipments of cattle from Canada to the United States, owing to the fact that such shipments could not be made until the tariff was changed.

In regard to the products of the fisheries, the imports alone have fallen off to some extent during that period, no doubt because merchants were cautious as to buying owing to the talk of stringent times throughout the country.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be permissible for me to tell a story that was told the other day in the American Senate, because our friends here, who are so fond of reciprocity, would surely let me reciprocate in this respect. Our friends on the opposite side of the House are looking all the time for calamities, financial crises and financial panics. The leader of the Republican party in the American Senate is like my right hon. friend, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in that respect. The leader of the Democratic side of the House told this story. He said that a man with an eye out came along one day to the doctor. The man said, 'Doctor, I want an eye put in. I don't want no glass eye; I want a flesh eye, one I can see with.' The doctor said, 'All right, I can put in a cat's eye.' The man said, 'All right, go ahead;' so the doctor fixed the man up. Some time later when the doctor saw the man again, he said, 'How are you getting along?' 'Oh,' the man says, 'all right, but that eternal thing is looking for rats and mice all the time. Our friends are looking for rats and mice all the time. Of course, they are not going to find them, but I shall leave them in that position when I take my seat.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: I have followed with great interest and great pleasure indeed the very witty speech which has just been delivered by my genial friend the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder). After having listened to him last

summer in his own good constituency, where I noticed that he was friendly with Tories and Grits alike, and that he could tell a good story to both and thus be elected by large majorities, I can only repeat what I then said, namely, that the hon. gentleman should be transferred to another chamber. He has deserved that from his party for the many services which he has rendered the cause in the many townships and back concessions of Ontario, where he has been able to roll up the Tory majorities by his witty stories. There is a vacancy at present, and, speaking in all frankness, I am quite sure that the farmers of the province of Ontario, the farmers of Canada generally, would be proud to see my genial friend in the Senate.

In regard to the Speech from the Throne, I can only re-echo what has been said on all sides of this House, that the people in Canada, and I might say in particular the people of the province of Quebec, whose reverence for the Royal Family is well known, were most happy to learn that Her Royal Highness had so speedily recovered.

I have listened with great pleasure to the speech delivered by the new member for the county of York, N.B. (Mr. McLeod), and I must compliment him upon the very good impression he has made on the members of this House. He succeeds a member who for many years sat with us, and played quite a part in the debates of Parliament; I refer to Mr. Crocket, now Mr. Justice Crocket. By the way, I see that my good friend the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) is in his seat. Would he explain to the House how it is that under his benevolent eye appointments to the judiciary are made from the House of Commons, when some years ago the voice of my hon. friend rang in tones of indignation against the appointments made by the right hon. the leader of the late Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), because, forsooth, he appointed members of the House to the judiciary? My hon. friend from York has been elected to this House by acclamation, and I congratulate him upon this; but he has come through one of the broken pledges of the right hon. the leader of the Government and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, namely, that no appointments should be made from members of the House of Commons. The hon. member for York, his countenance beaming with optimism, told us that this country was but slightly touched by a wave of adversity. In New Brunswick, he said, money had never been so easy as it was last year. I wonder what is the opinion of my good friend from Carleton, N.B., about the easy money in New Brunswick.

Mr. CARVELL: Not so easy now as it was two years ago.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was surprised when my hon. friend from York made that statement. Oh, blessed Arcadia! Who owns the magic wand by which money is made so easy in New Brunswick and so stringent in poor Quebec and poor Ontario?

I have listened also with interest to the speech delivered by my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Lavallée). He spoke with eloquence, and I hope that some day he will repeat in the English language what he said so well in his own mother tongue. Evidently the hon. member for Bellechasse has seen the light. I have known his parentage in the province of Quebec. He comes from good old Liberal stock, and I noticed that when he spoke the other day there was quite a tremor in his voice. He had evidently filled a gap, because, if I mistake not, at the last general election in the county of Bellechasse he ran, not as a Conservative, but as a Nationalist. Evidently, as we say in French 'Il y a fagots et fagots'—there are Nationalists and Nationalists. Listening to the speeches of my hon. friend I find it departs from the red hot Nationalism to deep azure blue Toryism. 'Il y a fagots et fagots'—there are Nationalists and Nationalists. He may claim to be still a Nationalist; but I say that he belongs to the insincere school of Nationalists. For there are a few sincere Nationalists in this country to-day—oh, very, very few indeed! I would like to know what his leader of yesterday, Mr. Bourassa, thinks of his opinions to-day. I am sure that if Mr. Bourassa were to write to the hon. member for Bellechasse he could not sign his letter as of yore with the subscription 'Yours sincerely.' But then, my hon. friend in his new Tory venture, has outrun himself, it seems to me. He has evidently delivered himself to my hon. friend the Postmaster General, who listened, yes, listened attentively to his enlogy. In his new zeal, the member for Bellechasse went so far as to compare the present Postmaster General with Sir George Etienne Cartier. Yes, he said that the present Postmaster General is the political heir of the great Conservative chieftain. If it were mine to give advice to my hon. friend from Bellechasse, I would give him the advice given by Talleyrand, the master of cynics and diplomats, to a young undersecretary who intended to enter the career

of diplomacy. He came to Talleyrand for counsel and Talleyrand said to him 'Et surtout pas de zèle!'—above all, no zeal! This is the advice I would give to my hon. friend when he compares his new leader, the Nationalist of yesterday and the Tory of to-day with Sir George Etienne Cartier.

Now, coming to the Speech from the Throne, if I consider it in the constitutional light, I see it as a lever to put the parliamentary machinery in motion. The Speech from the Throne has to be delivered annually, just as a certain Chinese daily gazette which was published under the Ming dynasty had to be issued, with or without news. One day the newspaper appeared blank. The editor was asked: 'But why do you publish your paper—there is no news in it, there are no articles in it?' He answered: 'But it has to be issued; it is a daily gazette.' So with the Speech from the Throne: it has to be delivered, it is the lever which puts the parliamentary machinery in motion. But, Sir, that speech is a blank; it is barren of any legislative proposals; it bears the evidence of hard times, notwithstanding my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder). It is as meagre as Canada's last Christmas dinner; it is as empty as the workingman's pail; it is as bare as a church plate at times; it is as nude as the spite wall on Elgin street. Its nudity borders on indecency.

But, before going into the few announcements which the speech contains, let me, for a moment, take a glance at it. First of all, I see that there is general satisfaction expressed at the fact that there has been a great expansion of trade. Indeed, we all know that, since 1897, there has been a tremendous expansion of trade. And my hon. friend the leader of the Government stated the other day that the expansion of trade which began in 1897 was not due to the fiscal policy of the leader of the Opposition, but that it was due to the old National Policy, and that the Liberal party on assuming office, had not altered that policy by one jot or tittle—that it had remained unchanged and that indeed the country had prospered notwithstanding the Liberal party. May I read the speech, or part of it, which was delivered by the old stalwart, the veteran of the Conservative party, Sir Charles Tupper—and we rejoice to know that he still enjoys perfect health—on the morrow of the introduction in this House in 1897 of the British preference, a policy coupled with the tariff resolutions introduced by the then Minister of Finance, Hon. Mr. Fielding? We all remember that Sir Charles Tupper, speaking from the seat now adorned by the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), prophesied that the manufacturers in the various industries of this country would suffer, and suffer lamentably, if the Liberal policy propounded by Mr. Fielding were maintained. He said:

> The result is that this tariff goes into operation and the hon. gentleman knows that the industries of this country are already paralyzed in consequence, while hon. members gloat over the destruction of Canadian industries. I was reading the wail, the sorrowful wail, of these industries in the Montreal Gazette, where one manufacturer after another declared that those industries were ruined, that their mills must close, and that they saw staring them in the face a return to the deplorable state of things that existed when the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House was in charge of the fiscal policy of this country. I say that a deeper wrong was never inflicted upon Canada.
>
> I feel that so far from rejoicing at it from a party standpoint, I deplore from the bottom of my heart the ruin that is going to be inflicted upon the best interests of Canada, and upon its great industries. Still, I unhesitatingly say that, from a party point of view, the hon. gentlemen are doing our work; they are showing the people of this country that no reliance can be placed upon the most solemn declarations that they make either in the House or out of it; they are showing the people of this country that, having obtained power, which was all they wished for, they are now prepared to abuse that power at a cost of sacrifice of the industries of Canada.

I am glad to say that the sad predictions of this great veteran were not fulfilled. Under the fiscal policy of the Hon. Mr. Fielding, coupled with the British preference, with the abolition of all the specific duties and the altering the duties on two hundred and fifty-five items of the Budget, I am glad to say, the country has prospered and expanded.

But we were told something else in 1911. We were warned that our trade should not be fostered with our big neighbour, the United States, that we should instead cultivate an interprovincial trade, and that we should maintain our connection with the mother country by still increasing our trade with Great Britain. Mr. Speaker, not later than the month of May last, I had the privilege of being present at a dinner given by the Government of Canada to the American bankers then visiting the city of Ottawa. Will you listen to the language of Mr. James J. Hill, a gentleman born in Canada, who has become in the United States a great railway magnate, as we know. Speaking about the trade relations between Canada and the United States, Mr. Hill

made the following statement in the presence of the Minister of Finance and of the Prime Minister of Canada:

Most countries have been accustomed to value their relations with one another by the total money value of the commerce between them; and, rightly or wrongly, they have laid special stress upon that difference between imports and exports which is known as the balance of trade. Without asserting any theory as to its value as an indicator of prosperity or the contrary, both of which views have ardent champions, both sides will agree upon the fact that it is an important measure of commercial intercourse. In spite of all obstructions the commercial relations between Canada and the United States have grown to proportions that astonish even those familiar with the official figures. According to the report of the United States consul in this city, the foreign trade of Canada reached a total of over a billion dollars for the calendar year 1912. The increase over 1911 was 23.5 per cent. Of the total, 56 per cent was business done with the United States. For that same calendar year the balance of trade for the whole United States was $581,000,000; and of this $255,000,000 was due to our commerce with Canada. It supplied 44 per cent of the balance rolled up by our commerce with the whole world.

It is usual to speak and think of Europe as the best customer of the United States; and in so far as this refers to the United Kingdom, it is true. But the Dominion of Canada is far and away the second-best customer we have. The statistics have been brought down to cover the first ten months of the current fiscal year, which began on the first day of last July. During that time our exports to the United Kingdom were $524,000,000; to Germany, $291,000,000; to France, $131,000,000; to Canada, $338,000,000, and to all Europe combined, $1,294,000,000. No other country except Great Britain and Germany even approaches Canada as a buyer in the markets of the United States.

Mr. Hill talks common sense; he does not mix up loyalty with business.

This business has been done not by reason of any sentiment whatever about it on the part of either country, or of any artificial favouring conditions, but simply because it is more profitable for both to deal with each other than for either to deal anywhere else in a large percentage of its commercial transactions. And nothing can reverse or annul that condition which nature herself has established.

Further on, Mr. Hill compares the trade of Canada with the total trade between the United States and South America. He concludes thus:

Swing the net still wider, and take in both American continents, from the Arctic Circle on the north to Cape Horn on the south, add Cuba and all the West Indies by whomsoever controlled, that nothing between the two oceans may escape. We did, in these ten months, a total export business of $630,000,000 with this western hemisphere; and of the whole Canada furnished fifty-four per cent. It seems to me that a connection so immense and so valuable to both parties is the central and controlling fact of every occasion like the present, when business men from both sides of the line get together to take stock of their present and their future.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Just before recess, Mr. Speaker, I was quoting a few sentences from a very elaborate address delivered in the city of Ottawa by that great Canadian, James J. Hill. This speech of Mr. Hill's, telling of the immense expansion of trade between Canada, our country, and the great republic to the south of us—and especially during the two years of the present Administration—only shows this cold fact: that you cannot legislate against geography, and it furnishes the best rejoinder to that nonsensical slogan of the last general election, 'No truck and no trade with the United States of America.' As I stated a moment ago, there are many things which should appear in the Speech from the Throne but which are not to be found in it. I have been reared in a school which, for many years, taught that there was no possibility of establishing a mutual preference between the mother country and Canada, but during the fifteen years that our hon. friends opposite were sitting on this side of the House, we were repeatedly told that as soon as the Conservatives came into office, steps would be taken to have that famous mutual preference established between Canada and Great Britain. I did not expect that the right hon. gentleman the leader of the Government would implement the promises of his party at the first session of this Parliament. We gave him time. The second session came, but not a word about mutual preference. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I have a vague suspicion that the centralization policy advocated last year so earnestly by Mr. Bonar Law on the one hand, and by Mr. Churchill on the other, was perhaps the first step towards mutual preference. At all events nothing came out of it. But now in this third session of the Conservative Administration, when things have found their level and when the Conservative party is in a position to accomplish something, we find nothing in the Speech from the Throne to indicate that steps will be taken at the earliest opportunity to establish mutual preference in trade matters between the mother country and Canada. I for one, do not believe in that policy. I think that if mutual preference were established, far from uniting the Dominions to the mother country, it would

estrange them. And further, in my humble judgment, it would estrange Great Britain on fiscal lines from the other countries of the world. But it is the policy of the Tory party in England, or at least the policy of one section of it, and it has been the policy preached by one large section of the Imperialist party of Canada. I do not argue that the Government should implement its promise in that regard. In my humble judgment such a policy would not be advantageous. I believe in the close relations of the mother country with Canada, but not on such a basis. 'History,' to quote Webster, 'is not only the record of events; it is also the record of human experience.' In days of yore there was a preference between the mother country and the colonies. Every student of Canadian history will remember that before the repeal of the Corn Laws there was a British preference for colonial products, for Canadian products. But when, under the leadership of the two greatest men of the last century, Richard Cobden and John Bright, England espoused the cause of free trade, and when Sir Robert Peel, the Conservative Premier, repealed the Corn Laws, the British preference was abolished. What was the result as regards Canada? As soon as that preference was repealed there was discontent, there was rancour, there was bitterness and soreness of heart, and the first thing our political ancestors heard of was the famous annexation manifesto. The repeal of the British preference in favour of Canadian products was the cause of the issuance of the annexation manifesto of 1849. At the last general election I heard some of my hon. friends opposite repeating again that old story, that the reciprocity programme of the Liberal party would bring about the annexation of Canada to the United States. Some people had enough brass to repeat such a fairy tale. What was the cure of the annexation spirit which manifested itself in 1849? What were the words of wisdom spoken by that great Governor General Lord Elgin (the scion of a great Tory family) in 1849, after the repeal of the British preference and the announcement of the annexation proclivities of Canada? Listen to this language. Surely it is applicable to-day. On November 8, 1849, in a letter to Earl Grey, the ancestor of our late Governor General, Lord Elgin wrote as follows:

> So long as this state of things continues there will be discontent in this country; deep growing discontent. You will not, I trust, accuse me of having deceived you on this point. I have always said that I am prepared to assume the responsibility of keeping Canada quiet, with a much smaller garrison than we have now, and without any tax on the British consumer in the shape of protection to Canadian products, if you put our trade on as good a footing as that of our American neighbours; but if things remain on their present footing in this respect, there is nothing before us but violent agitation, ending in convulsion or annexation.

History repeating itself! Oh, certainly, Mr. Speaker, we do not expect to hear of any annexation movement in Canada just now. We are not now in the midst of a general election, so we may all proclaim our faith in British citizenship and in Canadian citizenship. There will never be any question as regards the deep and intense loyalty of every Canadian, whatever may be his faith on fiscal matters, but there will be agitation in this country, and very serious agitation, particularly on the western prairies, as long as the present serious discontent exists.

Sir, the Government takes credit in the fact that the moving of the crops from the western prairies to the seaboard has been made easy and smooth. The Government thinks that our transportation facilities are adequate. Sir, I take that as the greatest compliment to the policy of the Liberal party during the last sixteen years in which they held office. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) know that ten years ago, eight years ago, seven years ago, at the fall of every year, there was the fear that there would be a car shortage at the head of the Great Lakes. There is no more dread of a car shortage and I wish to pay here my compliments to the three great transcontinental railways of Canada. The Liberal party are not responsible for the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway system, but as my hon. friend from Edmonton pointed out the other evening, the double tracking of the Canadian Pacific railway was the direct consequence of the transportation policy of the Liberal party whilst in office. They are responsible for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway without the degrading of the same line. The statement was made, by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) that the Liberal party was primarily responsible for the construction of the Canadian Northern system. We know, and I am in the judgment of my friends who represent the Great Lakes districts in this House, that the harbours of the Great Lakes have been improved by the immediate predecessors of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. The St. Lawrence channel system was rushed to completion from 1896 until 1910. It was made

free from tolls by the Liberal party which was a bold policy, but the Liberal party did it. The ship channel between Montreal and Quebec was deepened; the port of Montreal was equipped as no other on the North American continent; and the port of Quebec was also equipped. I am glad to hear that the Government are going to complete that equipment. I hope that my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) is in earnest in the promises he has made to his Quebec supporters that the equipment of the port of Montreal will be completed.

Speaking of transportation, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised, after the many speeches that have been delivered especially around Montreal by hon. gentlemen of the Conservative party, some of whom I see before me now, to find nothing in the Speech from the Throne about the Georgian Bay canal. I am in favour of the Georgian bay canal, but if I mistake not, the moneys which were voted last year will be spent for just one link of that great international route. I believe that the Georgian Bay canal will be completed as soon as the improvement reaches a certain point on lake Nipissing. I hope I may be wrong, but, Sir, I am told by many that it is not the intention of the Government, in view of the intense rivalry existing between southern Ontario and northern Ontario, to proceed any further than lake Nipissing with the Georgian Bay canal.

While speaking about transportation, my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) was taken to task after prorogation, because, forsooth, he had not found it possible to settle the vexed question of ocean rates. Articles were published in the Tory press, and a statement was delivered even by the talented young man who is now Chairman of the Railway Commission, that with regard to this question of ocean freight rates the guilty man was my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. Well, the Chairman of the Railway Commission has gone to England. He has interviewed the mighties in England, the heads of the great navigation companies, and he has returned to Canada. What success has he obtained? What work has he accomplished? If he had accomplished something, if he had achieved any success, surely mention would be made of it in the Speech from the Throne.

We are informed that there will be a Civil Service Bill. I am told—I may be mistaken—perhaps my hon. friend may correct me—that it has already been distributed; but, if so, it has not been my good fortune to read it. At all events, it is the beginning, I suppose, of that much desired and much talked of civil service reform. Is it, Mr. Speaker, to be based on Sir George Murray's report? Are we going to have an army of under-secretaries? I know that many of the young talented bloods of the Conservative party have been promised under-secretaryships. Perhaps it explains why some amongst my hon. friends of the Nationalist party have become rabid zealots of the Tory party. Are we going to have under-secretaries, or is the Conservative party going to improve, if it can be improved, the Civil Service Act introduced by the ex-Minister of Agriculture—I refer to the Hon. Sydney Fisher? We may differ as to Mr. Fisher's politics. I regard him as one of the ablest men who ever sat in this Parliament, and, with all due respect to my hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Morris), the new member whom I am pleased to see seated here this evening, I think that the loss of Chateauguay was Canada's loss, that the defeat of Mr. Fisher was the defeat of the House of Commons and of Canada. Mr. Fisher was the first one to introduce a real Civil Service Bill based on the competitive system; that is to say, the British system.

It is universally admitted, that whether he serves at home, or in the Crown colonies, or in the Indian Empire, the British civil servant is the most efficient in the world. And, Sir, that is because the spoils system is unknown in England and because the man who enters the British civil service knows that he has a career in that service. But the great Conservative party in this country, always so ready to speak ill of American politics, has since it came to power applied to the Canadian Civil Service the worst feature of American politics, namely, the spoils system. The Liberal party, following the lead of the Hon. Mr. Fisher, adopted the first Civil Service Bill based on competitive examinations for the inside service, and although I have asked the Postmaster General for the last two years if he intended to apply that beneficent system to the thousands of employees in the outside service of the post office, I have been able to elicit from him only smiles and vague answers. I trust that the Civil Service Bill which is promised in the Speech from the Throne, will extend to the outside civil service of Canada, the protection and benefits now conferred on the inside service.

We are informed in the speech that at last a Redistribution Bill will be introduc-

ed this session. There are not many members in this House to-day—there are none with the exception of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition and yourself, Mr. Speaker—who were present in 1882 when the first Redistribution Bill was introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald's Government. But, though we were not present we all know what scars the gerrymander of 1882 left on the hearts of the Liberal electors of Ontario. We know that in 1882 and again in 1892 an attempt was made, to use an old Tory expression: to dish the Grits, and we know that by picking out a township here and a township there, the Tory gerrymander created a few Grit hives to serve the purposes of the Tory party. But, Sir, what was done in 1882, and what was perpetrated in spite of Liberal protests in 1892, is no longer possible in this year of 1914. Let us not forget what the Hon. Edward Blake suggested to Sir John A. Macdonald. He told him that although he could not successfully prevail against the advantage he had to carve the constituencies as it suited him, yet he should at least respect the historic boundaries of Ontario and Quebec. In 1902, when in turn it fell to the lot of the Liberal party to introduce a Redistribution Bill, what was the policy pursued by the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, then Prime Minister? Some young Liberals of that day, animated with an undue party spirit, expected that the Conservatives then sitting in opposition would get a dose of the same medicine they had served out to the Liberals in 1882 and 1892. But, the great leader of the Liberal party, always fair, then gave a lesson not only to his opponents but to the too fervid partisans of his own party, and he introduced a Bill with a schedule in blank, leaving it to a joint committee of the House to delimit the constituencies. And, on the report of that joint committee the Bill was introduced, which, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, was never criticised and was adopted unanimously. That was the Liberal method in 1902 as contrasted with the Tory method in 1882 and 1892.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Was the report submitted by the committee concurred in by all its members?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The question is a fair one and I shall answer it. As I remember, when the Bill, based on the report of the Committee, was introduced, it was suggested that the two ridings of Hastings had been improperly dealt with and that they should be divided differently, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier acceded to that request and the Bill was amended in that respect and made unanimous.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: The hon. member is mistaken.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I shall be glad to hear the hon. gentleman correct me if he can, but I appeal to his spirit of fair play, and I ask if it is not a fact that the Redistribution Bill of 1902 was considered, even by the opponents of the Liberal party, as a fair measure giving justice to Liberals and to Conservatives alike. With my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), I do trust in the spirit of fair play and the sense of honour of the right hon. the Prime Minister of Canada. Why should we not rely on the honour of the Prime Minister of Canada, and who will believe for a moment that he would descend to mean tactics to dish a political opponent? I do not believe that the Prime Minister of Canada would descend to dishing the Grits, and neither do I believe that public opinion would stand for it in this year of grace 1914. I am told, I may be wrong, and I shall be glad to be corrected if I am wrong, that there are sinister influences behind the Prime Minister of Canada. I am told, for instance, that my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), whom I regret not to see in his seat and my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) have been consulting their friends around the country in the province of Quebec, to know whether this or that parish, this or that ward on the island of Montreal, should not be better annexed to this or that county. I am not positive about it. It is rumoured, and if it is not true I would be only too glad that it is not.

A Bill will also be introduced to increase the representation in the Upper House. The notice is already on the notice paper. Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that in this connection there is an undue haste to pour new blood into the august chamber? Where is my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster)? Why, to increase the representation in the Senate Chamber, to think of reforming the Senate by deforming it! Where is the hon. member for Lincoln? Mr. Speaker, do you remember his speeches against the Senate? His silence at the present time, to say the least. is very ominous. I was reading the other day the memoirs of a woman of genius, Madame de Staël. In the preface of that work, I came across a sentence. Madame de Staël had been expelled from France by orders of the Emperor Napoleon; she was sojourning in Germany and was writing to a

friend. She said, 'Since Bonaparte has been crowned Emperor of France, a great silence has been heard in Europe.' I found the expression 'to hear a silence' rather strange. It must indeed be a very ominous silence. Sir, I hear the silence of my hon. friend from Lincoln when mention is made of an increase in the number of the Senators. Is he dreaming, peradventure, of a Senatorship or is he sleeping on the woolsack expectations?

This is briefly the bill of fare for this year. There are several courses of platitudes for the party heelers, but there is a diet of negations for the Canadian people. There is nothing about the economic conditions of the country. What is the chief topic to-day in the cities, in the rural parts of Canada, in the homes of Canada? The high cost of living, the fiscal revolution created by the unemployment of the labouring masses and the agitation in the West for free wheat. The Government answers with words to the clamours of the people. My hon. friend the Minister of Play—he describes himself as the Minister of Play, and I hope I am not libelling him when referring in this way to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers)—was asked the other day his opinion about the present high cost of living. What was his answer given at Halifax, the capital of Nova Scotia, represented by the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Borden) and by that able gentleman the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean)? Oh, he offered a cure to the ills of the high cost of living. Here is what he said:

> To my mind the high cost of living is an indication of the prosperity and expansion of the country. If you want cheap living, give us a few years of hard times.

This is what fell from the lips of my hon. friend the Minister of Labour. There are more than words in this answer. It is adding insult to irony. It reminds me of what happened three or four years ago when the Clemenceau Government was defeated in the French Parliament. It was after a speech delivered by the Prime Minister, by that old tiger, Mr. Clemenceau, who had made quite a witty speech; but his speech was in a way rather unfortunate, and as a result a vote was taken and the Government was defeated. Some one went to that caustic journalist, Henri Rochefort, to get his opinion about the fall of the Government. Mr. Rochefort's quick retort was, 'The Government has committed suicide by firing words into its brain.' When I read the answer given by the hon. Minister of Labour, that hard times are a good thing for the country, I say that the Government is committing suicide by firing words into its brain.

Sir, what is the situation to-day after two years of Conservative rule in Canada? It is admitted that when the Liberal party left office three years ago we had enjoyed fifteen years of abundant prosperity, so much so that, when the elections of 1911 took place, our friends on the other side traversed the country and preached to the people of Canada the wholesome gospel of 'let well enough alone.' The trade of Canada was buoyant and our credit in the financial world was excellent. Canada's loans were at that time considered as the leading and best securities on the London financial market. What is the situation to-day? Is it not a fact that we are facing a most terrible industrial unrest in this country in spite of the high protection which the manufacturers of Canada are enjoying? Who on the other side of the House speaks of the strike at Nanaimo where Canadians were ordered to shoot on Canadians? Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, the speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Hughes) two years ago when he said: 'What is the best form of patriotism for young Canadians? Learn to shoot, learn to shoot.' Well, Sir, the British Columbia soldiery are very patriotic. They were ordered to fire on the strikers of Nanaimo. Many of the strikers are in jail to-day. Let us come now to Vancouver. I am informed that in Vancouver there are 17,000 people out of employment. Let us come to Regina. There the mounted police are obliged at this moment to put down bread riots. Think of it; in the great wheat-growing district of Regina we actually have bread riots and the mounted police are obliged to protect citizens against the rioters.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the hon. gentleman permit me a question? Will he kindly inform the House the authority for his statement that there are 17,000 out of work in Vancouver? And will he permit me to make a very brief statement?

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend will make his statement later on, but I would like to put to him a question at once. How many men are out of employment in Vancouver?

Mr. STEVENS: I can give that exactly. We had a very careful investigation of the matter by the best authorities in that city,

including the Trades and Labour Council, the Mayor, the Relief Organization, the Board of Trade and every other prominent organization of that type, and also the employers; and the outside total of those unemployed is 2,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX: So much the better for Vancouver. My information is to the contrary. That, however, is a matter that can be ascertained. The Board of Trade and the Relief Organization, the Mayor and councillors—the powers that be in Vancouver—are investigating the question. Two thousand five hundred—it is not difficult to investigate that number. I suspect there is a little more than that. At all events, I take the word of my hon. friend. We shall get the facts, I am quite sure, after the investigation by the Relief Committee, the Mayor and other authorities.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman tell us when the bread riot occurred in Regina?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I read it in the press only a few days ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was only a joke.

Mr. LEMIEUX: No joke in that. It has not been contradicted in the press. We have the members from the West on this side of the House, and I am assured that the mounted police have been ordered to patrol the streets of Regina in order to prevent a riot.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was in Regina myself on the night to which the press refers, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that there was no bread riot or any other riot.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In Winnipeg we have, according to the Mayor, three thousand men unemployed. In Toronto, I suppose, everybody is working? But I happened to be in the city of Toronto on the 12th of the present month. It was the day of the inaugural address delivered by Mayor Hocken. If my hon. friend will take the trouble—for me it is always a pleasure—to read the Toronto News of the 12th instant, he will see a big headline, something like the great 'scare heads' that we had in the last election, showing that Mayor Hocken said: Before proceeding to business, gentlemen who have been newly elected, we must proceed to the relief of the 15,000 people who are out of employment in the city of Toronto. Now, in Montreal, whither I go occasionally—Montreal, which is represented by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville)—there are 40,000 people out of employment. I know as a matter of fact that the hours of labour have been reduced in the Angus shops, in the Grand Trunk shops, in the Canada Car shops. I will not name other shops where the people are simply put out of employment for the whole winter. In Quebec—I appeal to my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) as to this—were it not for the Government works this winter there would be serious trouble in that city. Is it not a fact that the principal trade of Quebec, the shoe trade, is now locked up? Is it not a fact that we have had strikes and lockouts all along the Intercolonial railway from the city of Lévis to the city of Halifax? Last year the Government boasted of the prosperity of the country. This year, unfortunately, we are the sad witnesses of a declining trade, a shrinking revenue, and unemployment. And the excuse given by the Minister of Finance for this sad condition of things is: Oh, well, in 1907-08 there was also a temporary check. Yes, it is true, in 1907-08 there was a temporary check in the prosperity of the country. But concurrently with that temporary check there was a cut in the expenditure of the Dominion. Under the Liberal Government, in the last year that Government was in office, the expenditure amounted to $120,000,000. This year, in the day of adversity, the national expenditure amounts to $250,000,000 in round figures.

The credit of Canada in the financial world has been impaired, I do not wish to be unduly severe with the Minister of Finance; I have a good deal of sympathy for him. If he were now in his seat I would ask him permission to say that he may well raise his standard and his ideals to the height of the standard and ideals of Hon. W. S. Fielding, his predecessor as Minister of Finance. With Mr. Fielding, statesmanship was more than empty words; it was character, it was conviction; it was sincerity of purpose; it was service and fitness. I say again, the Minister of Finance may well look up to his predecessor as an exemplar.

The Minister of Finance complains that the Liberal London press has been inspired—as if the London Tory press last year during our debate on the $35,000,000 tribute had not been daily inspired from this country representing the Liberal party as a party of disloyal men. Leaving aside the London Chronicle, which, according to its standard of ethics does not publish anything except the truth about our financial condition, let us take the Pall Mall Gazette,

a Tory paper in London which shrieks its jingoism daily. What did the Pall Mall Gazette say about the last loan venture of the Minister of Finance? It said that it was the greatest fiasco which ever took place in England in the case of a Canadian loan. What about the Daily Mail, a paper with a large circulation, devoted to the jingo party in London? The Daily Mail on December 16 used the following language:

> **Canadians, until recently, stood easily highest** amongst the Colonial securities and not many **months ago the Dominion of Canada's 3½ per** cents (there was no 4 per cent then) stood some **half a dozen points higher than corresponding western Australian stock, whereas now, the western Australian 4 per cents recently issued at 97 stand at 2 premium, while Canadian 4 per cents issued at the same price stand at one-half discount.**

Sir, the financial stringency of 1907 affected the whole financial world, but during that period Canada, under the financial leadership of Mr. Fielding, the ex-Minister of Finance, was never branded as it was of late by the jingo Tory press of London, England. Sir, Mr. Fielding preserved the credit of Canada not only at home but abroad during the stress of 1911.

I now come to that vexed question of the high cost of living. In Canada, a young country rich in resources, it is abnormal that during the last ten years the percentage of increase in the cost of living has reached the figure of 57 per cent, as against 15 per cent in Great Britain and 17 per cent in the United States. I know that the causes of the high cost of living are many and diverse. I know that we can attribute this condition partly to depreciation in the value of gold, partly to the desertion of land, to the increased urban population, to uneconomic methods of marketing, to a wrong system of cold storage, and to the trusts and mergers. Speaking about cold storage, I observe that my genial friend across the way (Mr. Bradbury) has a Bill on the Order Paper to regulate the cold storage trusts. I hope this Bill will be taken into consideration as soon as possible, and, for my part, I intend to give the hon. gentleman the best support I can. But, apart from those causes which are well known, and which are not objected to because they are clearly self-evident, is it not a fact that

9 p.m.

the drainage of our Canadian products southward is also a cause of the high cost of living? At present milk, cream, fish, beef and potatoes are drained out of Canada by United States consumers. We were told, it is true, that the United States market was of no consequence to Canada, but if we look at the exports to the United States during the last three or four months, we can see what are the effects of the jug-handled reciprocity which we are enjoying at present. I grant, Mr. Speaker, all the other causes of the high cost of living, but I say there is another, and that is the tariff—the food taxes. That cause is apparent; we can deal with it, and we can deal with it at the present session. Here are a few of the taxes which the Canadian consumer has to pay every time he sits down to a meal: Canned meats, 27½ per cent; bread stuffs, 17½ per cent; flour, 60 cents a barrel; fresh meats, 3 cents a pound; rice, 75 cents a quintal; sugar, $1.08 a quintal; oatmeal, 60 cents a quintal; eggs, 3 cents a dozen; butter, 4 cents a pound; cheese, 3 cents a pound; condensed milk, 3½ cents a tin. This tariff on the food products appearing on the table of the workingman is a direct cause of the inflation of prices. Besides, the customs revenue tells the tale. We import foodstuffs from at least fifty countries. During the year ended last March, Canada imported from the United States foodstuffs to the value of $23,072,100, on which duties amounting to $4,816,000, in round figures, were collected. From Great Britain foodstuffs to the value of $5,355,000 were imported, even with the British preference, the duties upon which amounted to $1,075,000. With respect to France and Germany the same applies, with a lower percentage of duty. So we are face to face with the fact that we pay duties on foodstuffs to the amount of more than $11,000,000 yearly, and this is one of the self-evident causes of the high cost of living. Speaking for myself only, and committing no one with whom I have the honour to be associated, I say that I am ready to stand for the wiping out of all duties on the foodstuffs consumed in Canada. What has been good for the mother country; what is good for the American consumer at the present time, is good enough for me, a Canadian.

But we are asked: Are you going to deprive the farmer, who is, after all, perhaps the greatest producer in our country, of the little protection which he now enjoys? But is he not also a consumer? The articles of which I have given a list, and on which duties are paid, are consumed as well by the farmer as by the workingman, and if the duties on these articles are wiped out, the farmer will benefit by it. But, Mr. Speaker, when protection is concerned, you can always make an argument if

you wish to fasten and tighten around the neck of the farmer the collar of serfdom. In this conflict of opinion as to the removal of food taxes, who is the best judge, after all? Canada, thank Heaven, is a great farming community; Canada and the Canadian West is one of Nature's greatest farms and the Canadian grain growers and grangers fairly represent, I think, those classes of industry. What did the grain growers advocate, the farmers of the great prairie provinces west of Lake Superior, and even the farmers of the province of Ontario? First and foremost, larger markets for western wheat. Next, free interchange of foodstuffs and agricultural implements, free cement, free lumber, increase of the British preference to fifty per cent, and free trade with Great Britain within five years. I, for one, do not say that all this can be granted at one fell swoop, but I do say that free wheat, at least, which is being sought by both the political parties in Western Canada, should be granted by the Government. We were told this afternoon by the genial member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) that, like that American with the eye of a cat, we see nothing but rats and mice around us. Let us see what rats and mice the grain growers saw, the men whom you are so anxious to protect? Let me quote a few crisp sentences from the memorial presented by the grain growers when last they came to Ottawa.

Expansion in farming operations has ceased. Less than 100,000 acres has been broken in 1913, as against an estimate of 4,000,000 two years previous; and this in the face of the fact that upwards of half a million immigrants have been brought into that western country within the last three years.

The last two years have demonstrated that western farmers are not going to continue to grow crops at a loss. They cannot grow grain at a profit in larger quantities without other markets and alternate route for shipment. So long as our grain is forced to go for export through one channel that lends itself so readily to the manipulation of grain speculation, and the imposing of excessive freight charges by combinations of transportation companies, we need look for no great increase in production.

In the four years, 1908 to 1911, when the growth of the West was at its height, the crop area increased from 8,312,956 acres in 1908 to 17,488,117, in 1911. The next two years showed a decrease of 1,259,617, and it remains with this Government to say whether we revert to this rapid growth of the decade ending 1911, or remain as we have since.

We submit that the wider market afforded us by accepting the offer of the United States for free interchange of natural products would have the same effect in stimulating the raising of wheat, oats, barley and flax as free access to the United States market for cattle has already done for that line of farm enterprise. Not only because it would provide another market for grain, but also because it would provide a competitive route for transporting grain to Europe.

We ask that all food stuffs be placed on the free list as we believe that the taxing of food is a crime against humanity.

The sensible thing for the Canadian people to do is to stop borrowing money, pay for what we buy and produce for export to meet our obligations.

Wherein should we tax the benefit of money invested in agriculture for the benefit of capital invested in manufacturing?

A few men become millionaires, while the masses become poorer; a few live in mansions, while many are forced into slums.

Manufacturing is unduly expanding, while the farming industry languishes because of being drained of its life blood.

Farmers do not object to pay their share of the cost of Government. They are willing to submit to any system that will be of equitable taxation, levied for revenue purposes only.

That is the situation as described by the very farmers whom the Government is so anxious to protect. I was reading the other day a Life of John Bright, written by a nephew of Macaulay, Mr. Trevelyan. It is the latest biography of John Bright, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a short passage from that work, describing the condition of the people in England at the time of the repeal of the Corn Laws. It seems to me that there is a close analogy between the condition he describes and the one described in the memorial left in the hands of the Government by the grain growers and the grangers of the West. It reads as follows:—

We your petitioners, dwell in a land whose merchants are noted for their enterprise, whose manufacturers are very skilful, and whose workmen are proverbial for their industry. The land itself is goodly, the soil rich, and the temperature wholesome. It is abundantly furnished with materials of commerce and trade; it has numerous and convenient harbours; in facility of internal communication it exceeds all others. For three and twenty years we have enjoyed a profound peace. Yet, with all these elements of national prosperity, and with every disposition and capacity to take advantage of them, we find ourselves overwhelmed with public and private suffering. We are bowed down under a load of taxes; our traders are trembling on the verge of bankruptcy; our workmen are starving; capital brings no profit and labour no remuneration; the home of the artificer is desolate, and the warehouse of the pawnbroker is full; the workhouse is crowded and the manufactory is deserted. We have looked on every side, we have searched diligently in order to find out the causes of a distress so sore and so long continued. We can discover none in nature or in Providence. Heaven has dealt graciously by the people; but the foolishness of our rulers has made the goodness of God of none effect.

As I said, the description of the conditions of life among the farmers and work-

ers of England prior to 1846 bears a striking resemblance to that description of the present conditions among the farmers of Canada, so vividly depicted by the grain growers at the beginning of December last. Sir, how can we protect the farmer? By giving him wider markets—he is not afraid of the world's competition—and by decreasing the burden of taxation on the things he consumes. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) said the other day, and with reason, that we might well take an object-lesson from the great country to the south of us. Conditions in the United States two years ago were about the same as in Canada to-day, and their experience is also ours. When Mr. Wilson, that great and simple statesman, perhaps the greatest the United States have had since Abraham Lincoln, took office on the 4th of March a year ago, he delivered on that occasion one of the most impressive speeches I have ever read. What pledge did he take on that occasion, Mr. Speaker? He said that he would convene Congress and that Congress would not be prorogued until the tariff should be so adjusted as to bring relief to the farmers and consumers of the United States. He said further that he would regulate the currency of the United States, and that he would deal with the trusts, the combines and the mergers. Mr. Speaker, let us review for one moment the action taken by the great President of the United States. As regards the tariff, let us see if we cannot take an object lesson from what he did during the strenuous year which has just elapsed in American politics. Let us come to cold facts, let us take, for instance, the case of housing. You wish to protect the farmer, you wish to protect the consumer; let us see what Mr. Wilson has done. The rates under the Underwood tariff and under the Canadian tariff on a number of important articles entering into building and structural work are as follows:

Article.	Canada.	U. S
Bricks	12½ to 20%	10%
Cement	8 to 12½c. per 100 lbs.	Free.
Structural Iron-steel	$2 to $7 per ton.	10%
Manufactures of wood for furnishing houses and furniture itself	20 to 30%	15%
Paints and varnishes	30% to $1 per gal.	10 to 15 p. c.
Nails	30 to 50 cents per 100 lbs.	Free.
Earthenware	20 to 30%	15%

All this means for the American farmer, for the American consumer, cheaper houses and cheaper rents.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Let us take now the necessities of the table. Meat and eggs are on the free list in the United States. In Canada we pay duty and we have to import these articles from England, Australia and New Zealand. In the United States bread, biscuits and wafers are on the free list, while in Canada there is a duty of from 50 to 20 per cent. In the United States the duty on sugar will be gradually reduced until sugar is made free in 1916; in Canada we pay $1.08 per 100 pounds. Let us now take clothing. I will freely admit that the reduction here is not very striking, but still there is a marked contrast. In the United States boots and shoes are free, while boots and shoes coming into Canada pay a duty of 17½ to 25 per cent. Some years ago the Americans were invading the boot and shoe market of Great Britain. But the British shoe manufacturers got at last the better of the American manufacturers and to-day English made boots and shoes are exported to the United States. It may seem strange but the boots and shoes manufactured in Great Britain are successfully competing to-day with American shoes in the American market. That is a lesson from a free trade country.

Mr. BURNHAM: May I ask the hon. gentleman—?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Not for the present. I am quoting figures, but after I am done my hon. friend may put his question. Now, let us take the figures in connection with the great fundamental industry of agriculture. In the United States agricultural implements are free, whereas in Canada the farmer, whom the Conservative party is so anxious to protect, has to pay from 12½ to 25 per cent duty for his machinery. The table of figures is as follows:

Article.	Canada.	U. S.
Agricultural implements	12½ to 25%	Free.
Shoe machinery	15 to 27½%	Free.
Sewing machines	20 to 30%	Free.
Type-setting machines	12½ to 20%	Free.
Typewriters	17½ to 25%	Free.
Steel manufactures	20 to 35%	5 to 15
Bituminous coal	35 to 53% per 100 lbs.	p.c. Free.
Leather belting	10 to 15%	Free.
Patent leather	15 to 25%	Free.
Harness	20 to 30%	Free.

Having dealt with the tariff, and successfully, we will see the result before long in the United States. Mr. Wilson also dealt with the currency. I have nothing to say on this subject as I feel, and I know, that in Canada we have probably the best currency system to be found anywhere.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend, the radical, does not seem to be a great believer in what I am expressing now. He may have occasion to speak later on in the debate, but, this, at least is my opinion. Having dealt with the currency system President Wilson is now dealing with the trusts and mergers, one of the causes of the high cost of living. It is useless to mince matters, it is just as well to speak plainly and honestly to the privileged class, who, since 1879, have been enjoying their privileges. Contrast the attitude of the President of the United States as regards trusts and mergers with that of the Canadian Government. The President presented the case, he said 'as it lies in the thought of the country,' reiterating 'that private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable,' and declaring that conscientious men throughout the nation would not be satisfied until practices now deprecated by public opinion as restraints of trade and commerce were corrected. 'We are now about to write the additional articles of our constitution of peace', said the President. 'The peace that is honour and freedom and prosperity.' Besides suggesting the scope of legislation, the President made a personal appeal for an atmosphere of friendliness and co-operation in Congress while handling the problem. Then the points of the new legislation are given, but I need not recite them, because they appear in the public prints. Contrast, Sir, the attitude of the President of the United States as regards the trusts, combines and mergers with the attitude of the present hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers). We have in the memorial of the Grain-growers' Association a direct attack on the combines, the mergers, and the monopolies existing in Canada; we heard last year authoritative statements with reference to them from the hon. the Labour member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville); we heard the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) the other day unveiling the famous lake steamship merger, and we all remember the case of the United Shoe Machinery Company. Some years ago the Liberal Government passed a Combines Investigation Act and the first combine to come under the operation of that legislation was the United Shoe Machinery Company. In May, 1910, the Hon. Mackenzie King, then Minister of Labour, introduced the legislation, and some time afterwards various complaints were made by the manufacturers of boots and shoes in Canada, that their business was hampered and made unduly costly by the trade methods of the United Shoe Machinery Company of Canada. It was alleged that the company, which was an adjunct of the United Shoe Machinery Company of the United States, was a perfect sample of a combine in restraint of trade. A board was appointed over which Mr. Justice Laurendeau (now the city attorney for Montreal) presided, and on October 20, 1912, that board reported:

> The United Shoe Machinery Company is a combine, and by the operation of the clauses of the lease quoted in the foregoing, which restricts the use of the leased machinery in the way therein set forth; competition in the manufacture, production, sale, and supply of shoe machinery in Canada has been and is unduly restricted and prevented.

To make a long story short, the board reported against the United Shoe Machinery Company, and the company was liable, according to the law passed in 1910, to a fine of $1,000 per day. In the month of November last, I find in the Labour Gazette, the report of the Deputy Minister of Labour dated July 15, 1913. After citing facts it concludes with the following significant statement:

> The Board's report having been published in the Canada Gazette of October 26, 1912, the date on which the company would be subject to the operation of section 23 was advanced to May 6, 1913 and thereafter. At the date of writing the department has not been made aware of any action taken as a result of the board's report.

I do not see the Minister of Labour in his seat but I am quite sure the United Shoe Machinery Company is still at liberty to uphold its combine, and to restrict trade and supply in Canada according to its sweet will. Again, I say: contrast the attitude of the President of the United States with the attitude of the Canadian Minister of Labour—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman state that the United Shoe Machinery Company has done nothing in pursuance of the finding of the board?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I take it from the report published by the Deputy Minister of Labour that they have not. That is the authority I have, and I will read it again:

> The board's report having been published in the Canada Gazette of October 26, 1912, the date on which the company would be subject to the operation of section 23 was advanced to May 6, 1913 and thereafter. At the date of writing the department have not been made aware of any action taken as a result of the board's report.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That date is prior to the date up to which the board had extended the time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The limit is fixed by the legislation; it is automatic. Then, after that date had been reached, it gave the United Shoe Machinery Company another delay, and after that nothing was done. The United Shoe Machinery Company did not pay the fine of $1,000 a day. If it has paid since I would like to know from the Solicitor General.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman does not seem to understand me. The time was extended by the Board, and the article he quoted from was written before the expiration of that time. The company is not under obligation to pay. A prosecution in the criminal courts would be necessary, and the finding under the Act, to which my hon. friend has referred, would be of no value whatever in the prosecution. The criminal courts would have to assess the fine after proof of the facts having been given. The hon. gentleman can scarcely state that the company has done nothing, up to the expiration of the time stated, namely the 5th of May, to comply with the finding of the Board.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Solicitor-General can supply me with the information. The Deputy Minister of Labour says the company has done nothing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But that was before the time had expired.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have given the date of the report published in the Canada Gazette. What have they done since, anyway? I am told that they have done nothing, and that the combine still exists. If the legislation passed by the ex-Minister of Labour, Mr. Mackenzie King, is not elastic enough, and the Solicitor General—representing the West as he does and representing it very creditably—is anxious that this combine should be destroyed, why does he not employ his legal acumen to implement that legislation? I am sure that when the Solicitor General has a little conversation with the Minister of Labour he will find that there are influences at work in the Department of Labour, and that the United Shoe Machinery Company has some friends in office, and, that nothing will be done. But, if the legislation is not perfect, I hope the Solicitor General will see that it will be made perfect.

The Minister of Finance, after surveying the whole situation, gave rather drastic advice to the farmers of this country. He said to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald): Do not be a bear on Canadian conditions, and he told the farmers to be possessed of rational optimism. The Minister of Finance told us: We are going to educate the farmers; we will make the farmers increase their production, and everything after that will go on smoothly. Sir, I can anticipate the answer of the farmers to the candid advice given by such a candid friend as the Minister of Finance; I know that the answer of the farmers will be: Give us wider markets; give us free food, free wheat, free agricultural implements, and make war on the trusts and the combines and the monopolies. The Minister of Finance spoke with sarcasm about the famous Cobden metal, but I would point out to him that Cobden and Bright captured England some sixty years ago by appealing to the common sense of the people, and not to prejudices. I for one do not care to catechise in this House, but it is not bad, perhaps it is even quite opportune that we should retain the fundamentals on this question of the producer and the consumer. In reading the diary of John Bright on the existence of monopolies in England, I find the following wholesome truisms. He says:

> Monopoly presupposes some advantage to those who possess it. It gives to them the protection of the market and excludes foreign grown corn in order that in a market insufficiently supplied they may obtain a higher price than their corn is really worth. This higher price can only be obtained by preventing the food market being as abundantly supplied as it would be if the regular laws of commerce were not interfered with. This higher price therefore exists and is procurable only from the existence of scarcity intentionally created by law.

This is a wholesome truth propounded by John Bright, quite an authority on the matter and quite a friend of the common people who, to use the words of Abraham Lincoln, must be really loved by the Almighty as they are so numerous. Mr. Bright goes on to say:

> This increased value places the food out of the reach of those whose means are most limited, whilst the most wealthy classes are still able to procure as much as they require. The pressure of scarcity comes then upon the poorest portion of the people. In a besieged city the rich and powerful can hold out longest—

For instance, the noble eighteen could hold longest against the fifteen thousand asking Mayor Hocken for free bread and free soup.

> —the poor and defenceless feel famine soonest This law-made famine is unequal, sparing the rich and crushing the poor.

That is the story of the bread rioters in Regina.

> Famine on board a ship at sea would be equally borne by all. Admiral and cabin-boy would share the biscuits, but as the Corn Law scarcity is created for the special benefit of one class, it is but likely that all the suffering should be averted from that class. The scarcity affects various portions of the community, in the inverse ratio of their power to endure it. The labourers probably are the only class that feel it in a positive insufficiency of food, and of these the weakest and poorest, whose labour is least valuable and least skilled, bear the greatest intensity of suffering.

Perhaps this may appear a little out of date, and I hear sneers from some of my hon. friends on the other side. But who will dare deny that in this young country of ours we are face to face, in Winnipeg, in Vancouver, in Toronto, in Montreal with slums and with people underfed? If you read the morning press, you will find that clergymen from nearly all the great cities are clamouring to-day in favour of the underfed and against the slums. Though the fundamentals may be a little out of date, though I may appear a little archaic in my economic notions, yet I believe that it is well for Canada that someone should rise in the House of Commons and speak the language of truth, commonsense and justice to the monopolists who have enjoyed their privileges during thirty or forty years. Oh! but we are told, that the right hon. the leader of the Opposition has changed his policy. He was first of all for free trade as we have it in England. Then he was for a continental union. Then he was for unrestricted reciprocity. Then he was for readjustment of the tariff; finally he became in favour of restricted reciprocity, and now he is a free fooder for the moment, as said with smile the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White). Say what you like, take the whole course of the right hon. gentleman's career, whether he advocated continental union—and it is not proven—whether he fought for unrestricted reciprocity—and unrestricted reciprocity found favour even in Ontario in 1891—though he was for free trade as we have it in England, for restricted reciprocity, though he is to-day in favour of free food, there is something of consistency in his stand—he is for the reduction of taxation. He is not for the increase of taxation and the consolidation of monopolies, combines and mergers. Permit me to quote one phrase of Sir Robert Peel's letter to a friend of his. He, too was considered as a great apostate, because he stood for the people against the big interests. Some of the masses even were against him as they were against Cobden and Bright. In a letter, which a friend of mine read in the British Museum and which he copied three or four years ago, because it was in his own handwriting, I found the following phrase which applies very well to the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier):

> I have many difficulties to contend with: much misrepresentation and obloquy to encounter on the part of those whom I verily believe I am protecting from evils and dangers of which they seem little aware.

When the right hon. gentleman disappears from public life—and I trust that this is a far-off contingency—he may well say, with Sir Robert Peel:

> I shall leave a name execrated by every monopolist who maintains perfection for his own individual benefit, but it may be, I shall leave a name sometimes remembered with expressions of good will, in those places that are the abodes of men whose lot it is to labour and to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow.

Nothing has been said about the naval question, and possibly this is the cause of the nervousness of the Postmaster General. The naval question, much to your surprise, Mr. Speaker, perhaps much to your comfort, is now amongst the departed. The hearse that took the Naval Bill from this House to the Upper Chamber left the corpse where it should remain. The naval question has been shelved by the Government. I will not recite the various phases of the naval question, although I am tempted to do so by the presence in this Chamber to-day of the author of the far-famed resolution of 1909. We know, first, that this motion was introduced in 1909 in favour of a Canadian navy. We know, further, that it was made unanimous. We know, also, that the right hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Borden) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) in their speeches in the House of Commons, in England, at Halifax and in Ontario, favoured a Canadian navy as per the resolution of 1909. We know that the Drummond and Arthabaska election took place in 1910. It was found out, perhaps by the former Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), that the Liberals' difficulties were the Tories' opportunity. We know that it was through the election in Drummond and Arthabaska that the Tories had their first vision of a victory. We know the contradictory attitudes taken by the ex-Minister of Public Works in the province of Quebec, and by

the then leader of the Opposition (Mr. Borden) in the English-speaking provinces of the Dominion. We know that in the campaign of 1911 the Tory jingoes were paying —yes, I have it on the authority of Mr. Bourassa over his own signature—the Tory jingoes of Montreal and Toronto were paying for the sowing of the Nationalist seed in Canada. We know what happened; we were defeated, of course. The first session took place. My hon. friend the Prime Minister was feeling his ground. Would he repeal the Naval Bill? Would he introduce a new naval policy?—the Tory jingo policy of centralization as against the policy of my right hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition? The Prime Minister went to England, accompanied by his fervent home ruler, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), and by that fervent Nationalist—of that time—the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier). When they came back a banquet took place in Montreal at the Windsor hotel, and we are familiar with the declarations made by the Prime Minister. He told his hearers: I have my information from the proper sources, I have consulted the Admiralty; the House will convene in a few weeks; I shall submit my naval policy to the faithful Commons of Canada, and if Parliament prove unfaithful, I will appeal to the people of Canada. The emergency appeared on the 5th of December, 1913. We remember the heroic resistance of the Reform party against the tyranny and the stampede of the jingo party. We are aware of the effect, the damaging effect, of Mr. Churchill's letter. We had closure—a good French word misused for a very bad thing; closure was introduced under the master hand of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers). We know what was the answer of the Senate to the action of the majority in the House of Commons. While not referring at all to the little incident before our Easter duties of last year, now that the atmosphere of the House of Commons is serene and peaceful —is it not a fact, Sir, that events which took place since last session have vindicated the course of the Canadian Liberal party? I listened to the lecture at the Canadian Club in this city on Saturday by Mr. J. S. Ewart. We may differ as regards Mr. Ewart. He is an independent; he is above party politics. But as regards his perfect knowledge of the affairs of the British Empire, I think we can all take Mr. Ewart's word. Read that lecture of Mr. Ewart's, and read it again. He tells us that since last session the Australian navy is an accomplished fact, the Australian navy with the Australian flag at its mastheads. Since last session New Zealand has started a navy. Since last session—when my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) on his return from Europe declared that war was actually in existence between England and Germany—there has been a rapprochement between England and Germany. And if you look at the Annual Register for last year, you will find that the best customer that John Bull has is Germany. So far, then, our course has been vindicated since last session. More than that, the policy propounded by the Conservative party in this House—I should say the policy re-echoed by the Conservative party in this House, for that policy was imposed on the Prime Minister of Canada by Mr. Churchill, by the clerks of the Admiralty and by the party of centralization in England—the best authorities amongst the Imperialists in England, Imperialists of the sanest kind, men like Mr. Richard Jebb, Admiral Henderson and Admiral Fremantle, have declared that the policy propounded by the right hon. leader of the Opposition was the only good policy for Canada and for the empire. I shall not weary the House with quotations, but I repeat—Sir Richard Jebb, one of the best known apostles of the Imperial gospel, a disciple of Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Milner, Admiral Henderson and Admiral Fremantle have declared that the time has come to accept the policy of the leader of the Canadian Opposition. More than that, the London Times, the Thunderer—inspired at times—has approved of the Australian navy and the New Zealand navy. By that admission it has approved of the Canadian navy. But it had approved of the Canadian navy before. As I say, I do not care to weary the House with old extracts, but after the Conference of 1911, the Times shouted with joy at the announcement that at last there was to be a great Imperial policy based on the declaration made by the one who had been singled out in that Conference by Mr. Asquith as the Nestor of the Conference—namely Imperial unity based on local autonomy. Sir, the naval question has been shelved; the emergency has disappeared, and the time is now ripe for a permanent policy. As a Liberal, and as a loyal Canadian, I say to the Government, now that the emergency has disappeared, bring down a permanent policy; let it be along the lines of the Australian policy, and you will find the Canadian Liberal party with the Government, and supporting that policy. The emergency has disappeared but the Gio-

conda has also disappeared from Paris. I suspect that some fine Italian hand will some day sooner or later bring back the Mona Lisa of the Tory party, the emergency. When will it be restored and adorn the walls of this Parliament? Mr. Speaker, you need not guess it; we all know it. The emergency invented last year and shelved this year will be restored as soon as there are any rumours of a general election. It is needed for the flag-waving campaign. The 'no truck, no trade' cry is now too old a song; the cry of 'Canada as an adjunct of the United States' is dead and buried, and a new patented flag-waving campaign is needed to return the Tory party to office. But the 'wolf, wolf' cry will not succeed a second time. I know that certain jingo papers are trying to make themselves believe that there is an emergency. It must not die, it must not disappear. I read in the Montreal Star of Saturday the following lines:

> The airy manner in which Sir Wilfrid Laurier dismissed all question of a naval 'emergency' —past, present or future—the other day in Parliament, passed the comprehension of those who take an intelligent interest in foreign politics. The proofs of an 'emergency' are so plain, so plentiful, so painfully omnipresent, that it is incomprehensible to men who bother with anything outside their own bailliwick how a statesman of Sir Wilfrid's stature could possibly blind his eyes to what is written in massed bayonets across the continent of Europe.

I wonder if the gentleman who in his sound sober sense wrote the above lines is one of that organization of crooks described by Lord Welby, who uses the following language:

> We are in the hands of an organization of crooks. They are politicans, generals, manufacturers of armaments, and journalists, all of them anxious for unlimited expenditure and given to inventing scares which terrify the public and terrify ministers of the Crown.

I am quite positive, Mr. Speaker—and I am sincere in this—that the gentleman who said that the emergency was written in massed bayonets intended to terrify my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. Lord Welby continues that he could remember six war scares, each one made to order, and in each case of which the public had been gulled. Each time the scare had been exposed later on, but each new scare took, and resulted in enormous expenditure on armaments. These are the utterances of Lord Welby, a member of that august assembly, the House of Lords, which was reformed by Lloyd George, the much-talked of minister who has himself advocated a reduction in armament. I would not for one moment leave the House with the impression that Lord Welby is a crank, and that he did not know what he was talking about. I hold in my hand a little blue book—not the blue book which the Government intends to give as bread to the consumers of Canada, the report of the investigation of the high cost of living commission, but a little book bearing the suggestive tittle: 'The Six Panics and Other Essays,' by F. W. Hirst. Mr. Hirst, as we all know is the financial authority of the British Empire. He is the editor of the London Economist, a paper which is eagerly read every time it reaches his office by the Minister of Finance in Canada. Mr. Hirst is no crank; he is a good Britisher. Of course he has a little failing: he is a Radical. I commend the reading of his book to every member of the House of Commons. There were six panics in England during the last century. The first lasted from 1847 to 1848, and it originated by a letter of the Duke of Wellington. It was addressed to a British officer, and afforded painful evidence of enfeebled naval power. The iron duke, speaking about the painful evidence of enfeebled power of the naval forces of Great Britain, naturally excited public opinion, and the people were led to believe that the French were going to invade England. Mr. Hirst explained how the panic ended:

> This panic ended dramatically. Lord Russell was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Budget produced on February 18, 1848, raised the income tax from sevenpence to a shilling in the pound, in order to increase armaments and to reorganize the militia in accordance with the Duke of Wellington's advice. When this addition to taxation came into view, in association with preparations against the danger of invasion, the danger seemed to diminish and the panic abated.

And strange to say, a few weeks afterwards the invader entered England, but it was the aged French King Louis Philippe who went to England not as an invader but as a refugee. He had lost the crown of France. The second panic—again a French panic—lasted from 1851 to 1853. Lord John Russell, speaking in the House of Commons, said:

> Really, to hear or read some of the letters, some of the language used by some portion of the press, one would imagine that these two great nations, so wealthy, so similar in enlightenment, were going to butcher one another, merely to try what would be the effect of percussion caps and needle guns.

Mr. Joseph Hume, the veteran economist, describes the condition in England in one of the debates as follows:

Our present panics are not due as in times past to the old women, but to our having too many clubs about London, containing so many half pay officers, who have nothing to do but to look about for themselves and their friends. These are the people who write to the newspapers anxious to bring grist to the mill somehow or other.

And you know how the panic ended.

The alarm was constantly stimulated by startling paragraphs in the newspapers. One day the French army at Rome was reported to be chafing and dissatisfied, because it could not share in the invasion of England and the sack of London; the next there were whispered revelations of a secret plan, divulged by General Changarnier, for invading England and seizing the metropolis (which he publicly contradicted) then we were told of a plot for securing a naval station in the West Indies: next, the French Government had sent an order for steam frigates to Messrs. Napier of Glasgow.

Admirals on half pay were every morning surveying the channel and seeing on the horizon the French frigates coming with the invaders. How did the panic end? Mr. Hirst tells us that a little arrangement took place between the War Office in London and the War Office in Paris and the panic ended by the union of the French and English armies for aggression in the Crimea. The third panic lasted from 1859 to 1861. It was again a French invasion scare but Richard Cobden published at that time a little book entitled, The Three Panics, That ended the scare. There was another panic in 1884. Mr. Hirst tells us how it started.

According to an old official of the Admiralty this first success of 'the advanced school of naval thought' was one 'most unexpected' and owed its origin to the merest accident. Lord Salisbury the Conservative leader on a visit to Portsmouth in the summer of 1884 had heard discontent expressed about the state of the navy by some of the officials there and referred to the matter in a speech, which seemed to express a doubt as to whether the navy was strong enough to ensure the national safety.

A few days afterwards the question was taken up by Mr. Stead, the journalist. The Annual Register, alluding to him, remarked:

In nearly all quarters the Government's answer to the popular demand was pronounced inadequate. Nevertheless there arose a few anti-alarmists or skeptics who declared that the outcry in the newspapers was chiefly, if not wholly, the work of the professional advisers of the Admiralty, assisted in a great measure by the large ship builders, whose yards were empty and whose trade was temporarily at a standstill.

And the fifth panic was called the dreadnought scare. I need not worry the House with that. We all know that when Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman became Prime Minister he reduced the expenditure on the Navy Bill by many million pounds. Immediately the shipbuilders and armour platers raised a row and a campaign was started in the press to get England to build dreadnoughts. England had already one at the time, but as Germany was contemplating the building of many dreadnoughts, England was urged to start building them too. We all remember, too, the Blatchford scare and the articles written by that famous Socialist. We remember too that farce, humiliating for England, which was played all over England and even in the city of Ottawa—an Englishman's Home. You remember the lines, Mr. Speaker.

We want eight—
We won't wait—

dreadnoughts. Thanks to Mr. Hirst, we all know now the source of the dreadnought scare. It was started and paid for by the armour platers and we know how ultimately it failed. But we had another panic not so very long ago. We can have no more panics about dreadnoughts and superdreadnoughts, but not many weeks ago we were terrified by an air-ship panic. Officers on half pay I suppose, had seen lights in the firmament that were neither stars nor meteors; surely they must be the lights of the Zeppelins. And the press immediately started a campaign for supplying the home Government with airships. They succeeded. This is what Mr. Hirst says:

Previously, on February 20, this business side of the agitation came to the surface in a news column (headed 'Aeroplane Purchases—Machines for the British Army and Navy') which runs as follows:

And he then gives the number of machines bought by the English Government at the instigation of a few comedians writing in the press for the airship firms. Mr. Speaker, I have said enough on this subject. We in Canada have been for the last few years the laughing stock of the armour platers and of the insincere jingoes. I admit that many, in fact the majority of the jingoes, act in good faith but there is too much jingoism in Canada; too many people believe that they are born to save the empire. Mr. Asquith, the Prime Minister of England, can be depended upon in matters Imperial. In 1911 he served us with a notice in his answer to Sir Joseph Ward. He said that never so long as he was Prime Minister of England would the foreign policies of Great Britain be controlled by the overseas do-

minions. That was a notice very courteously and very firmly served on the empire savers. Mr. Asquith will not abdicate even for the prime ministers of Canada, Australia and New Zealand. He with Sir Edward Grey, is the inspirer responsible for the foreign policy of Great Britain and he does not intend to abdicate his functions. We have besides, it seems to me, our own problems, we have our own difficulties; we have the tariff to deal with, the labour question to deal with, we have the Hindu agitation in British Columbia to look after, and we have the yellow immigration to cope with. These are problems, these are difficulties, which can well occupy the time of the ministers of the Crown in Canada. Let us therefore turn our attention to Canadian affairs. We should not be ashamed to deal with Canadian affairs. We are building up our country. The mandate of the Prime Minister of Canada is the Dominion's mandate, not the empire's mandate. Serving Canada is serving the Empire.

Too much militarism in this country! Militarism is not a healthy condition. I believe in a moderate military expenditure. I believe that the common people of this country are ready to bear their share of military expenditure, but, Mr. Speaker—the rides—the joy rides—of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Mr. Hughes) in Europe with his gold-plated staff, his antics, his hiring of automobiles at $25 a day, is indeed a very poor advertisement abroad for our young country. The expenditure is out of all proportion. If I may be allowed I will again quote John Bright:

I do not care for military greatness or military renown. I care for the condition of the people among whom I live. Palaces, baronial castles, great halls, stately mansions, do not make a nation. The nation in every country dwells in a cottage and unless the light of your constitution can shine there, unless the beauty of your legislation and the excellence of your statesmanship are impressed there on the feeling and condition of the people, rely upon it you have yet to learn the duties of government.

The hon. Minister of Finance is shrugging his shoulders: Well, we won the by-elections anyway; we won six out of seven. I have here the circulars which were distributed in the county of Chateauguay, where, as my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has said, a double appeal was made. I know that the farmers were told to vote for the Government because the Government would give them road money and the French-Canadians in the county of Chateauguay were told what, by the Deputy Speaker? Mr. Speaker, I might inform you, en passant, that your deputy was in that election contrary to all precedent, and he was there holding public meetings. The great constitutional party respecting old usages and customs! Well, Sir, he was there distributing circulars telling what?

Mr. Borden is the friend of the province of Quebec. Never have we been so well treated as since he has been Prime Minister. Contrast that with the Laurier regime.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, you remember what the Mail said about Laurier being so lavish with the province of Quebec and so stingy with Ontario?

Contrast with the Laurier regime the attitude of Mr. Rogers. He is more generous with the province in the distribution of public works than was Mr. Pugsley, the Liberal minister. **thirteen million dollars of public money comes** in one year. There are public works for all over the province. Twenty-five million dollars will be expended by the Borden Government in the province of Quebec this year.

Then follows the words, 'eloquent figures.' We have here the figures for wharfs and rivers and the Quebec harbour. My hon. friend the Postmaster General thinks a little of Quebec. Here are the appropriations in the Main and Supplementary Estimates for harbours and river improvements. Here we find in high headlines: Quebec, principal items; Main Estimates, and Supplementary Estimates; page after page of them; divers public works and it says that this money will be expended in 1913-14. At the end there is a resumé as follows:

Public works, main estimates ..	$2,443,000 00
Public works, supplementary estimates..	974,000 00
Harbours and rivers, main estimates..	1,016,075 00
Harbours and rivers, supplementary estimates..	703,956 54
Public works, chargeable to capital..	1,514,000 00
Divers public works	4,700,095 00
Total..	$11,351,126 54

Then there is this appeal:

Electors of Chateauguay, will you return to the Brodeur-Lemieux regime, or do you prefer **the regime of Mr. Rogers and prosperity for** the province of Quebec?

Then we find also the following:

Mr. Borden is fair with the French-Canadians. We have rather a large portion of patronage.

I am afraid that is an appeal to the appetites of the people. What do you think, Mr. Speaker, of the action of your Deputy Speaker? Let us now read another leaflet:

Since Mr. Borden has been made Premier, the province of Quebec is much better treated than under the Liberal regime.

I hope the Mail will publish that.

Mr. Laurier used to neglect his countrymen because he used to say that on account of his nationality he could not do as much for them, but under the Conservatives we have two judges on the Supreme Court. Mr. Laurier has left us with one, Mr. Brodeur, who is the weaker of the two. Sir Elzear Taschereau has been succeeded by Mr. Fitzpatrick. When Mr. Gobeil, Deputy Minister of Public Works, took his pension, Mr. Laurier replaced him by Mr. J. B. Hunter, an Englishman. And when Mr. Gourdeau left his office as Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Laurier appointed Mr. Johnston, of Cape Breton, another Englishman. From 1896 to 1911 the Laurier Government did nothing for the harbour of Quebec, but it spent millions for the harbours of Ontario and the Northwest.

Much better to have an English-Canadian as a prime minister than a French-Canadian as Laurier was. Since Mr. Borden has been in office he has shown the greatest sympathy for the French-Canadian; he loves our race.

Then there is quoted a few phrases from a speech delivered in the House of Commons on the 22nd of March, 1905; it is too long to translate, but it is no doubt very eloquent and it does justice to Mr. Borden's broadmindedness. The article goes on to say:

The Borden Government has shown by acts that it respects our race. Is it not true—

Oh, Mr. Speaker, I come to you now; this is for your benefit:

Is it not true that 15 French-Canadian translators for the blue books have been appointed this year after having passed examinations? Even Liberals have been appointed. It is because Mr. Borden wants to be just to our language that he ordered these appointments.

In spite of you, Mr. Speaker.

Under Mr. Laurier it was impossible to have blue books in French until two years after their publication in the English version. Why should we not be just towards Mr. Borden when he is such a good fellow, especially when he gives us what Mr. Laurier has so often refused? Under the Liberals there was but one judge at the Exchequer Court, the Hon. Mr. Justice Cassels. Is it not true that Mr. Borden has appointed another one, the Hon. Mr. Audette, a French-Canadian? Why should we not recognize such acts of justice? Since Mr. Doherty has been Minister of Justice he has appointed in his department two French-Canadian lawyers, Messrs. Beauchesne and De-Salabery. All the lawyers in the province of Quebec who have done business with Mr. Doherty for the past two years know that there is very serious amelioration in that direction. Mr. Borden has appointed a Senator from Nova Scotia, Mr. Girroir, a French-Acadian from Antigonish who had been mentioned to Mr. Borden by the Acadian leaders themselves. Mr. Borden has appointed as Chairman of the Joint Waterways Commission the Hon. T. C. Casgrain, a French-Canadian, and that appointment is really quite creditable. Thus is it with all important posts in the civil service; we have our large share of patronage. We receive much more since the last two years than we have over received during the whole tenure of office of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

The Minister of Finance said: 'We won the election in Chateauguay.' Yes, Mr. Speaker, they won the election, but I give you the means by which they won that election in Chateauguay. The Minister of Finance, I know, is a bookworm, and he is fond of Napoleonic literature. Not very long ago I read new memoirs describing the campaign of Napoleon in Russia, and I saw related there that as the army of Napoleon, made up of soldiers and adventurers from all the countries of Europe—French, Spaniards, Prussians, Italians, Austrians—as that army entered the great solitudes of Russia some of Napoleon's staff of generals met an old Russian pope and conversation ensued between the humble Russian and the several invading generals arrayed in uniforms glittering in gold. They told the poor old man that they were sure of reaching Moscow, that they were confident to defeat the Russians, and that the army of Napoleon would triump after a brief campaign. And the old Russian said to one of the staff; general, you will cross with your magnificent army of adventurers the Beresina and you may cross the Niemen, and you will possibily reach Moscow, but count your troops and your eagles as you advance, and count them again as you come back.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is also on his way to Moscow with his gorgeously uniformed general, the Minister of Militia. In the ranks of the Tory party are to be found men of all stripes; we find some of the eighteen insurgent capitalists represented by the Minister of Finance; here are the loyal Orangemen and there, the pious Ultramontane—look at him just facing me now. I see in that army stalwart Tories, plenty of them, jingoes and Nationalist musketeers. They have passed two sessions and we are entering on a third. We may have a fourth session, but some day, the general elections will come. Napoleon with his generals and his adventurers went into the solitudes of Russia after Ulm, Friedland and Jena, and they crossed the Beresina and they crossed the Niemen, but his ragged remnants of a once grand army had to recross these rivers in their retreat, and they had to meet Wellington at Waterloo.

The Tory army may cross their Beresina and their Niemen, but the elections will come, sooner or later, and they will soon have to face their Wellington, and, at the same time, meet their Waterloo.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General): I suppose I will not disappoint the House if I say that I have no intention of speaking at such length as my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). The hon. gentleman has spoken for three and a half hours. I shall not judge the matter of his speech, because it might be thought by some who know that we have not been very intimate friends in the past, that my judgment is prejudiced. However, I venture to say that I do not think it will take me one-quarter of the time to travel over the same ground and to place the facts as they really are, not as he imagines them to be. It is not expected that the House should sit very late to-night, and consequently I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On the motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Tuesday, January 27, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. A. M. AIKINS (Brandon) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 28, to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: The present Dominion Lands Act approves of the principle and the policy of the complete alienation of water-powers, lands connected with water-powers, coal lands, coal, oil, quarry lands and gas lands from the people, and, I submit, to the detriment of the people. The purpose of this Bill is to prevent such alienation. I understand that it has been the general practice of the department in recent times not to alienate these lands, but to lease such lands under certain regulations made by the Governor in Council. But the regulations concerning the water-powers appear to me to be of such great importance that they ought to be first approved by Parliament before going into operation, and amended only at the will of Parliament. Moreover, the statute as it now stands authorizes the homesteading and pre-emption of such lands, so that when the homestead conditions have been complied with and the rights of pre-emption arise, the surface rights become severed from the sub-surface rights, to the detriment of the owners of the sub-surface rights, and will prevent the profitable working of these rights. The purpose of this Bill is to remedy these defects.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MONEY LENDERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. HENRY H. STEVENS (Vancouver) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 28, to amend the Money Lenders Act. He said: The present Money Lenders Act applies a limitation to the rate of interest to be charged on loans the principal of which is under $500. The intention of this Bill is to extend this limitation to all loans. Another proposal is to reduce the rate of interest from 12 per cent to 10 per cent. Another feature is an amendment to the interpretation clause describing what a money lender is and making the clause clear.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 30, respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. He said: This is to extend the time for the completion of the prairie section of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 31, respecting the National Transcontinental Railway. He said: The other Bill was for the extension of the time by Order in Council. This is to authorize the Governor in Council to extend it from time to time by Order in Council.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NAVAL SERVICE ACT REPEAL BILL.

Mr. DAVID O. LESPERANCE (Montmagny) moved for leave to introduce Bill

No. 32, to repeal the Act respecting the Naval Service of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. LESPERANCE: This is a Bill to repeal the Naval Service Act passed by the late Administration in 1910.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MARITIME MAIL SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON: I wish to ask the Postmaster General if some improvement can not be made in the method of transmission of mails to the eastern provinces. At present, if a letter directed to any point between Montreal and Moncton, or beyond Moncton, inclusive of Halifax and Sydney, is mailed in this city after three o'clock in the afternoon, it goes to Montreal by the afternoon or night train, remains there all the next day and then goes over the Intercolonial railway or the Canadian Pacific railway by the night train which leaves Montreal for points east. This mail matter should not be held twelve hours in Montreal. Letters mailed here in the evening should connect with the Maritime mail which leaves Montreal at 8.30 the next morning, thus reaching their destination in the eastern provinces fully twelve hours earlier than under the present arrangement. I have repeatedly brought this matter to the attention of my hon. friend and of his predecessor in office. This has been going on for a number of years, and it seems to me that it is time a remedy was applied. The mails are held in Montreal in order to be sent over the Canadian Pacific railway to the eastern provinces; they should go over the Intercolonial railway by the morning train, thus avoiding delay.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General): The hon. member for Westmorland called my attention to this matter the other day, and I thought he was right. I brought the matter to the attention of my deputy. At first sight he thought that the hon. gentleman was wrong in his statement of facts, but I told him that my hon. friend was sure of his facts. I asked him to look into the matter so that I might be able to give the hon. member for Westmorland a proper answer. Since then Dr. Coulter has been unwell, and that is the reason why my hon. friend has not yet received an answer.

[Mr. Lespérance.]

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. H. F. McLeod for an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, resumed from Monday, January 26.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General): In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Rouville (Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux) for the marked difference which I observe between his speech of yesterday and some of his former speeches during the last two sessions of Parliament. Every one will remember that my hon. friend was very angry at times during the last session and the session before; that gentlemen outside of this House of the highest respectability were traduced by him on the floor of this House without their having an opportunity to reply, and that ministers and members of the Government were very severely attacked. Evidently my hon. friend has adopted a new course of procedure. He discussed public questions yesterday from a public point of view, quoting at length from economists and Blue Books, and making an argument which was in no way a personal one. If he will not refuse them, I think that congratulations are in order. Perhaps my hon. friend has become wiser, but I have no doubt that the recent election in Chateauguay has had a quieting effect upon him. I shall endeavour to follow my hon. friend's course, and try to discuss public questions from a public point of view.

The hon. member for Rouville, in the beginning of his speech, expressed the hope that the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) having made such a witty speech, would be promoted to the Senate; he wished him God speed in that respect, and hoped that the day might soon arrive. In the next breath, however, my hon. friend, with remarkable lack of logic, told us that we should not appoint any more members of the House to the Senate, thus invalidating the wish to which he had just given expression in regard to the hon. member for Dundas.

I am going to pass very quickly over the preliminary remarks of the hon. member, because, as I said last night when I moved the adjournment of the debate, I do not intend to speak for three or three and a

half hours. The hon. gentleman next referred to the spoils system, meaning the dismissals made by the present Government. In that respect I desire to say that before the Government of my right hon. friend came into power in 1896, the dismissal of public officials had not amounted to very much. The Mackenzie Government and the Sir John A. Macdonald Government had not indulged in the dismissal of officials to any considerable extent. But in 1896 there was a debauchery of dismissals in all the branches of the public service and the example then set by the preceding Government was such that our own friends thought it was only fair that the people who had been thus unfairly and unjustly dismissed should be reinstated in their places and that the policy which had been followed in that respect by the preceding Government should be followed by our Government. Human nature is human nature, and when our friends all over this country witnessed the dismissals en bloc which had been made on the Intercolonial, in the post office, almost everywhere in the public service, it was only fair and natural that these people should ask us to follow that policy. After these dismissals had taken place and while they were still taking place at the hands of the late Government, the House of Commons passed a resolution, moved by Mr. Lake, who was then a member of this House, defining the conditions under which these dismissals should take place and saying when they should take place. This motion, after debate, was accepted by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, who was then Prime Minister, and it was agreed to unanimously in this House. I say that this having been accepted by both parties as the policy to be followed in that respect, the present Government were quite right in acting along the lines of that policy as outlined in this motion by Mr. Lake. That is what we have done and when our hon. friends say that we have made dismissals, I say that we have made them under those conditions and on those lines; and so long as the public service is improved in that respect, so long as new governments come in and are in the position in which we are ourselves, I think that, with the example set in 1896 and the following years, it is unfair for our friends on the other side of the House to tell us now that we should not have done what they themselves have done as being the right thing under the circumstances. Whilst in the one sentence we are told that we are making too many dismissals, we are in the next told that we do not make enough. I was told on the floor of the House by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) the other day that I should have dismissed one of the most important officials in my department. I was told last year that my Deputy Minister, even, had so exercised his duties that he ought properly to have been dismissed. On the one hand we are told that we have dismissed too many and on the other hand we are told that we should dismiss more. The middle course is the right one. I do not think we should dismiss people simply because they have been appointed by a preceding Government; but if these officials come within the four corners of the resolution moved by Mr. Lake and adopted by my hon. friends I do not think that the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) or any other member of the House has a right to tell us that we have adopted the spoils system.

The next argument made by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) was that the Finance Minister was wrong in stating that money had become easier, that the banks were lending money very freely. He said that if this was true in Ontario and the other provinces, money was not as easy in Quebec as elsewhere. En passant, I might say that if we are to believe certain reports which are published in a certain newspaper now, money is pretty easy in Quebec. But then, joking apart, I know as a fact that in the province of Quebec, as elsewhere, money is much easier than it was and we are certainly on the eve of the day when we shall see the business of this country restored to the place where it was several months ago.

We were told by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) yesterday that there were some very bad things which might be expected in the Redistribution Bill and he insinuated or rather said that the hon. member for St. Antoine division of Montreal (Mr. Ames) and myself had been conspiring about this and had been preparing some kind of a redistribution which would not be fair. Let me tell my hon. friend that he is mistaken in his facts. We were told that Sir John A. Macdonald brought in a Bill which my hon. friends called a Gerrymander Bill; that it was all wrong, that Ontario was carved in a certain way in order to gain political advantage; but

that, on the other hand, the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) adopted an entirely different method and came before Parliament with an absolutely fair proposition. That was to present the Bill, leaving the schedules in blank, refer the Bill to a committee of the House and then adopt what my hon. friend said was the unanimous opinion of the House about the redistribution which should take place. I want to inform my hon. friend that what he said about that was not exactly right. I looked up the debate and I find that the report of the committee was not a unanimous report; without going very far it will suffice to quote what the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, then Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), himself said and which I find in the debates of 1903, September 9, at page 10852. He said:

So far as I have read it, I will approve of the disposition of the representation as made by the report of the majority until I am shown by the discussion that I am wrong.

Now, those are the facts. My hon. friend from Rouville said that the principle of district boundaries was a sacred principle which should be kept in all cases, and he told us that under the Bill of 1903 that principle was respected in all cases. I have before me the Bill of 1903, and I find that in no less than twelve cases in the province of Quebec alone, parishes and townships were taken from one county and placed in an adjoining county. It is useless for my right hon. friend to say no, because I have the Statute right here in my hand.

The parish of Lavaltrie shall be transferred from the electoral district of L'Assomption to the electoral district of Berthier.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is not a transfer from one county to another.

Mr. PELLETIER: The parish of Lavaltrie was taken from one county and put in another one.

The Indian village and reserve of Caughnawaga is transferred from the electoral district of Chateauguay to the electoral district of La Prairie and Napierville.

The parish of Lacolle shall be transferred from the electoral district of Missisquoi to St. Johns and Iberville. The parishes of Notre Dame de Stanbridge and Notre Dame des Anges de Stanbridge shall be transferred from St. Johns and Iberville to Missisquoi.

That is another one. There is a case in point and my right hon. friend will remember that this was done in order to try and defeat the Conservative candidate in Bagot.

[Mr. Pelletier.]

The parish of St. Pie which gives a majority of 200, was taken from the county of Rouville, where the Liberal majority was supposed to be all right, and transferred to Bagot in order to make sure of electing one of the supporters of my right hon. friend. The parish of St. Marcel was transferred from Bagot to Richelieu. The parish of Ste. Hélène was transferred from Bagot to the district of Drummond and Arthabaska. Everybody knows why that was done. The parishes of St. Guillaume d'Upton and St. Bonaventure d'Upton were transferred from Drummond and Arthabaska to Yamaska. The parish of la Visitation de la Bienheureuse Vierge Marie was transferred from Drummond and Arthabaska to Yamaska. The parish of Ste. Flore was transferred from the district of Champlain to the district of Three Rivers and St. Maurice.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I affirm here that all these parishes, with possibly the exception of Ste. Flore and St. Guillaume were transferred back to their proper places according to their county limits. Lavaltrie, which had been from 1854 part of Berthier was, by the Act of 1892, made a part of l'Assomption. St. Pie, which had been a part of Bagot was in 1892 put into the county of Rouville. All the changes of 1892 were put back to the counties to which they belonged with the possibly exception of Ste. Flore and St. Guillaume. In 1873 St. Guillaume was placed for judicial and also for local electoral purposes in the county of Yamaska. So that in mentioning all these changes, my hon. friend only affirms the principle which we stand for and which is the principle of adhering to municipal and county boundaries.

Mr. PELLETIER: The municipal boundaries had been fixed by anterior legislation in so far as this Parliament is concerned. My right hon. friend found these parishes in certain counties and he took them from those counties in order to put them into other counties.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: They were put there by the Redistribution Act of 1892, and we objected to that.

Mr. PELLETIER: Yes, and we shall see with what result. I am not on my feet at this moment to tell my right hon. friend, or this House, that we intend to proceed in this or the other way; that is a matter which will be decided later on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am speaking of the past only.

Mr. PELLETIER: But I am going to speak of the future for a minute. Nobody has said that I know of that we shall not refer this Bill to a committee of the House. Nobody has said that it will not be done, and I only ask my hon. friends to wait until the Government has moved in this matter and not bring in their reproaches before that method which the Government may adopt has been adopted. We have been told that the method of presenting a Bill with blank schedules is the proper way. I do not say that it is or is not, but let us not condemn the Government in this respect before the Government has moved at all. The reproaches will fall flat if perchance the Government were to move on the same lines as my right hon. friend himself did when he was Prime Minister.

I would like to call the attention of the House to a very important fact in so far as my province is concerned. I have just stated that certain parishes were taken from the counties to which they belonged and put into other counties. I would like to put before the House a few facts in this respect as far as the province of Quebec is concerned. For the last ten years, before the election of 1911, every one knows that the representation in the House of Commons of the province of Quebec was, as far as the Conservative party was concerned, reduced to a very small number. In 1904 the Conservative party had in this House eleven members and the Liberal party had fifty-four; in 1908 it was practically the same thing. In 1911 it was twenty-eight to thirty-seven. Let us see how that works out. The total Liberal vote in Quebec in 1904 was 147,239. The total Conservative vote was 109,821. In 1908 the total Liberal vote was 153,393. The Conservative vote was 129,364. In 1911 the total Liberal vote was 164,274, and the total Conservative vote was 159,292. If the redistribution of the province had been arranged in order to give fair play to both political parties there, instead of having eleven members for the Conservative party in 1904 and in 1908, the Conservative party would have had twenty-seven members and the Liberal party would have had thirty-eight. In 1908 the Conservative party would have had twenty-nine members and the Liberal party thirty-six, and in 1911 the Conservative party would have had thirty-two members and the Liberal party thirty-three.

Mr. PROULX: What about the Nationalists in 1911?

An hon. MEMBER: Where is Bourassa?

Mr. PELLETIER: We will come to Bourassa by and by, but we will stick to this for a moment. I am not going to be taken away from my subject because somebody may speak of Bourassa. I am making a point and I think it is fair that I should be allowed to continue it.

Mr. PROULX: But you forget one party in 1911; there were three parties in 1911.

Mr. PELLETIER: I think I have forgotten more than the hon. gentleman ever knew. If you take the vote of 1904 and add up the Liberal vote with the Conservative vote it will give you 257,060. Then, if you divide that by the number of counties —sixty-five—you have a unit of 3,955, and as a result, if you take that unit and multiply it by the number of members which we should have had you have the test. To-day, in the province of Quebec, the counties are arranged in such a way that where we should legitimately have had twenty-seven members we had eleven, and where we should have had twenty-nine we had twelve.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has the hon. gentleman the figures for Ontario?

Mr. PELLETIER: I have not, but I have looked for my own province because we have felt the pinch in Quebec.

Mr. GRAHAM: We have felt the other pinch in Ontario.

Mr. PELLETIER: I do not know how well-founded may be the complaint of the hon. member, but at all events, if there is a bad case in Ontario that does not help to cure our bad case in Quebec. In view of these facts, I ask: Is it fair that one of the political parties in the province of Quebec should only have one-third of the representation it is legitimately entitled to? I may say, and I think I can speak for the whole Government, that we do not want to and do not intend to place such a Redistribution Bill before this House as will deserve to be called a gerrymander, but, on the other hand, our desire is to have a fair redistribution measure which will do justice to all parties. The facts I have given have been known for years in the province of Quebec and I am sure that both political parties will agree that the existing state of things should not continue. There may be complaints in regard to Ontario, as the

hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) says, but when you remember that out of 73 members from that province, 60 were elected to support the Government, there cannot be much necessity for a gerrymander in face of such clear proof of the political sentiment of the whole province.

I join issue with my hon. friend from Rouville in his remarks with reference to transportation. He stated that under the Liberal Administration the crops of the western farmers were removed promptly to market, but I can tell him that one of the very first things the Conservative Government had to do when it assumed power in 1911 was to attempt to remove the congestion in freight traffic for which the Liberal Government was responsible. There were millions of bushels of wheat on the prairies which could not be moved to the head of navigation, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) devoted much time and care and attention to remedy the evil conditions which we inherited from the preceding Government. Then in 1912, the hon. gentleman, with his well known ability to take care of such problems, succeeded in having the transportation of produce from the West handled with such promptness as to elicit the commendation of every member of the community. With reference to the question of unemployment in the country, I regret that hon. gentlemen opposite seem to desire to make as much political capital out of the existing situation as they can. It is unfortunate for the country that this should be made a political question, and that instead of all joining hands to provide a proper remedy, men of standing in the House of Commons, should on the public platform, seem to take delight in telling the people of the world that we have 100,000 unemployed in Canada. With all due respect, I say that such a statement has not a particle of truth to support it. When this assertion was first made, a newspaper in Montreal took the trouble to get into telegraphic communication with all the important centres in Canada, with the result that the total unemployed in the whole Dominion was found to be 17,000 or 18,000 instead of 100,000. We all know that the unemployment is not due to any question of tariff or of free food or anything like that; we know that 5,000 men were laid off by the Canadian Northern Railway Company when its line was completed between Sudbury and Port Arthur. We know that when the work on the Canadian Pacific railway between Toronto and Ottawa was completed a large number of men were laid off; and we know that when certain construction was finished on the Canadian Northern between Toronto and Ontario and on the Transcontinental as well, men were thrown out of employment. But that is an ordinary and natural condition, and it is not a thing out of which any party should seek to make political capital.

Mr. MURPHY: Has the hon. gentleman the number of unemployed from any government source?

Mr. PELLETIER: No, but we have in this Montreal newspaper the statement of the mayors of cities and of the presidents of boards of trade throughout Canada, and I should think they know much more about that matter than we do. I accept their word as representing the true facts. Then, the hon. member for Rouville has referred to the number of unemployed in the city of Quebec, and he has stated that if the Government works were not going on there, there would be a great many people without work. In the first place, I direct the attention of the House to the fact that if we have succeeded to a certain extent in affording employment on Government works in Quebec to so many people during this rigorous winter, that would not have happened under the late Government by whom Quebec was entirely ignored. I regretted to hear the hon. member speak of people being out of work in Quebec on account of what he called a lockout in the shoe trade. Surely the hon. gentleman must see that it is absolutely unfair to accuse the Government for what has occurred in that respect. There is an unfortunate condition in the shoe trade in Quebec, a condition which every citizen of Quebec and every Canadian regrets. There are about 3,000 men and 3,000 girls employed in the shoe factories out of employment, and that is a matter of deep regret to me as it is to every true Quebecker, and as it should be to every true Canadian.

But when we come to examine the reason for that, it seems unfair and unjust to bring before the House this fact as one showing a lack of good administration on the part of the Government. The unemployed shoemakers in Quebec are not idle, the factories are not closed, because of political conditions. Every one knows that a serious conflict has been going on for years in Quebec between the shoe manufacturers and their workmen. There has been strike after strike, and it has now come to a point where one of the contending parties has resolved that this matter

shall end, and forever. The men quit work because one of their number was dismissed, or because his job was taken away from him and given to somebody else. The men left the factories in a body. Later they desired to come back, but when they did so the manufacturers told them: We have had so much trouble in the past that we are determined to settle this question here and now. If you want to resume your positions in our factories, you must sign an agreement binding yourselves to obey the rules and the bylaws which are established for the proper working of the factories. One and all the men refused to sign that agreement and went home.

4 p.m.

I am not entering into any controversy as to who is right or who is wrong in this matter. In this case, as in many other cases, they might try to come to terms. It is out of my province, however, to discuss that phase of the question; but I say that these men are not out of work in Quebec because they are forced out of it by political or any other conditions, except that they are at war with their employers, and they want to win that fight for their union, whereas on the other hand the manufacturers want to win the fight for their union. These are the facts, and I hope and trust that the hon. member for Rouville will not have it spread broadcast throughout this country that this local trouble between manufacturers and workmen is one attributable to the way in which Canada is governed at the present moment.

Mr. BELAND: How many men are out of employment now?

Mr. PELLETIER: Between 2,500 and 3,000 in the shoe trade alone.

Mr. BELAND: How many factories are closed?

Mr. PELLETIER: Fifteen to seventeen.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Can the hon. minister explain why the manager of the Intercolonial railway at Rivière du Loup, some days ago, dismissed 23 employees in the winter time without even a day's notice?

Mr. PELLETIER: I am sure my hon. friend will admit that it is hardly fair to ask a Postmaster General what has been done in the Department of Railways a few days ago, without giving any notice of his question.

Mr. GAUVREAU: You are the minister of the district. You must know what is going on there.

Mr. PELLETIER: If my hon. friend will give the usual notice of his question, it will be answered.

The hon. member for Rouville referred to the dispute in connection with the United Shoe Company. He went so far as to say that the United Shoe Company was a combine; that it had been declared a combine by a board of arbitration, and that because these people had friends in the Government, had friends at court, nothing had been done in the matter. This is a most unfair statement of the case. I do not intend to enter into the particulars. At a later period my hon. friend and colleague, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) will do so. Suffice it for the moment to say that there is not one tittle of foundation or evidence for the statements made by the hon. member for Rouville in that respect. A board was appointed and found that the United Shoe Company was a combine, and that company was given six months in order to change the conditions of the leases which they had with the shoe manufacturers. The law says that, when a sentence has been passed by the board, if the manufacturers continue so to operate, they are liable to have an indictment brought against them before the court. The hon. member for Rouville said to us yesterday: How is it that these men are not paying a penalty of $1,000 a day? I desire to call the hon. member's attention to the fact that the United Shoe Company, after the board's decision, as a matter of fact changed the conditions of their leases; and that when the leases were changed they either obeyed the order of the board or disobeyed it. If they have disobeyed the order of the board, that is a matter for further adjustment and adjudication; but, as a matter of fact, the leases were changed within the time allowed by the board. Consequently, I think the hon. member for Rouville will have to withdraw his statement that the United Shoe Company were not condemned to pay $1,000 damage a day because they had friends in the Government and friends at court.

The hon. member for Rouville said: True enough, we had bad times and unemployment in 1907-8, but we then did a great thing; the Minister of Finance of that time, seeing the bad times, came before Parliament and made a big cut in the Estimates of the current year. My hon.

friend believes that to be the act of a big man. I do not. If, without impairing the credit of the country, in view of the good administration of the affairs of the country at a time when there is tight money, at a time when there is uneasiness in business, you can see your way, not to cut down public expenditure, but to leave it as it is, so as to give money to the people and to give employment to the people, I think you are a bigger man than if you cut down public expenditure.

We have been told by the hon. member for Rouville that he had heard the hon. Minister of Finance, one of the noble eighteen, say that he was not going to do the same thing as his predecessor had done in that respect. Whether the hon. Minister of Finance is one of the noble eighteen or not, I am prepared to say that we feel pretty safe under his direction and management of the finances of this country. I think the hon. Minister of Finance has been a safe pilot. He has been able, with his big mind and farsightedness, to tell us all that is happening now; and when he tells us that at the present moment we are practically out of our difficulties, I for one trust him and think he will be right for the next few months as he was when he foretold us what is happening to-day.

We have been told by the hon. member for Rouville that we are not taking care of the port of Montreal as we should do. If my hon. friend will look at the statutes of last session and the statutes of the year before, he will find there that we have given the Harbour Board of Montreal everything they asked for, and that the money has been spent under the direction and control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in a most proper and efficient manner. Now, I am from Quebec, but I make the humble claim that I am not a small Quebecer. Montreal is the metropolis of Canada. As such, her port and her facilities should be improved; and, moreover, they are being improved, with public money if you like, but money that is advanced by the Government and on which they pay interest, and pay that interest faithfully and well. We heard the right hon. leader of the Opposition say at a meeting—I think it was in Joliette—that the city of Montreal had not been properly treated so far as its connection with the Transcontinental railway was concerned. This argument has not been repeated in this House, and I have not heard from any representative of Montreal any complaint in that respect. Every one knows that the Transcontinental railway was begun in 1903 or 1904, and in the ten years since that time there has been no connection to link the commercial metropolis of Canada with the Transcontinental railway. Apparently the city of Montreal, at least a great part of the city of Montreal, thought that no reproaches should be made to the late Government on that subject, for if you will look at the election returns you will find that the majority of seats in the city of Montreal were carried by our friends of the Liberal party. Now, I wish to say here—because I have read something in the newspapers which calls for the remark from me—that if this Government and the commercial metropolis of Canada think that metropolis ought to have some connection with the Transcontinental, I for one will not stand in the way, but will cordially approve of anything that can be done in that respect, not as a Quebecer, but as a Canadian who desires to further the interests of Canada at large.

Now, Sir, about what my hon. friend said for the port of Quebec. Whilst I say let us do what is right for the port of Montreal, I say, at the same time, Providence has given us in Quebec one of the finest ports to be found in the world. But this port has not been equipped so far. Though the city of Quebec has been represented for years by members of the Liberal party in this House, there is not to-day—there was not before we came into power—accommodation of berths for more than three ships in the great port of Quebec. I have asked my colleagues, the members of this progressive Government, to have both ports equipped. There is no reason for rivalry or jealousy on the part of either Montreal or Quebec; for, if we are not disappointed in the clause which the late Government put in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway contract, and which may be interpreted to mean that the Grand Trunk Pacific may carry our trade to the United States—I say if that clause does not have that bad effect, there will be enough to make trade for the two great ports of the St. Lawrence during the summer navigation. And I hope that when these ports are equipped as they ought to be, we shall be able to attain the result we have in view and have it as the policy of all Canadians, Conservatives and Liberals alike, to have our trade carried to Canadian ports in Canadian bottoms and handled by Canadian labour.

Mr. BELAND: Will the Minister kindly state how many more ships will find accommodation after the works in Quebec are completed?

Mr. PELLETIER: At least seven or eight as against three for the last twenty years.

Mr. BELAND: Did any company complain of lack of accommodation under the late Government?

Mr. PELLETIER: When we came into power one of the first things I was asked was to try and have some accommodation in Quebec, because as was said by those who dealt with the matter, our company would like to send our ships there, but we cannot find any berths or accommodation.

Mr. BELAND: What company was that?

Mr. PELLETIER: I would not like to give names; but the hon. gentleman will learn these names when the accommodation is created. And as he is a good Quebecer, when he sees the ships there he will know their names.

I would like to say a few words in passing about the Georgian Bay canal. Our friends on the other side have begun all of a sudden to be very strong on the Georgian Bay canal, they are enthusiastic about the Georgian Bay canal.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Bullish.

Mr. PELLETIER: They were rather bearish when in power, but now they are not bears but have become bulls. The hon. member for Rouville told us that the Georgian Bay canal was not started at once because, forsooth, the southern part of Ontario was opposed to the wishes of the northern part of Ontario, and also to the wishes of part of the province of Quebec in this respect. Well, Sir, this should not stand in the way. If this work is a good work, one which is in the general interest of Canada, the fact that one section of the country would not like it would not stop this Government from completing it. The question whether this is a work in the general interest of Canada is the only one that would be considered. Sir, this is a work of great magnitude. We are told by men who know something about it that this enterprise, which has been looked into from an engineering point of view, ought to be looked into now from a commercial and a financial point of view before we embark upon any such large expenditure. Some people say that in a commercial and business way the canal cannot be made a success; others say it will be a success. Under the circumstances, the Government have come to the conclusion to adopt the only logical and practical course that it could adopt, and that is to have this question carefully looked into and a report made by thoroughly qualified men.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There are so many commissions already.

Mr. PELLETIER: But I can tell the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that the men whom we have in mind for appointment to that commission are men who will act for Canada and without salary in that respect. Their only object will be to help this Government in coming to a wise conclusion on this subject. I cannot give names now, but I think it is but a matter of days before we shall be able to tell the House the personnel of that commission.

It may be taken for granted that the people of the West—the people of Winnipeg, for instance, because Winnipeg is the great distributing centre of western Canada—should have some interest in this matter, and that this portion of the country, as well as Montreal and other important Canadian centres, will be represented on that commission. At all events, the Government, as the hon. Minister of Public Works has said, have been looking into the matter, and will try to find the best men, being guided by whatever will be in the best interests of Canada at large.

The hon. member for Rouville has said that certain things which took place in the county of Chateauguay were very bad. The right hon. leader of the Opposition, during the Debate on the Address, I think, said that the county of Chateauguay had been robbed from hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not think that we should accept with a great deal of anxiety the declaration made by my right hon. friend in this respect. Last year, during the debate on the Address, reference was made to another election robbery, and it was a matter of such public shame that the right hon. leader of the Opposition thought fit to move an amendment to the Address, which read as follows:

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

Now, some things have happened since then. When the trial took place, what became of the awful charges made in connec-

tion with the election in Macdonald? In that election, as in the Richelieu election of 1911, the sitting member admitted that certain errors had been made by some of his friends, the election was annulled, and that was all. Where was the terrorizing? Where was the proof of the operations of election thugs and of the other alleged irregularities in connection with the Macdonald election? No proofs came to light. The election was annulled without any scandal, and the same good man was re-elected by a majority of over nine hundred, his majority at the preceding election having been seven hundred and fifty. If the robbery which hon. gentlemen allege to have taken place in Chateauguay is of the same nature, I am sure my right hon. friend will be compelled to acknowledge that in his motion last year he went too far; that he made certain accusations against members of the Government without having the facts before him, and that he failed to substantiate them. I fully realize that the result of the Chateauguay election was not very agreeable to our friends on the other side of the House.

Mr. LANCTOT: What about South Bruce?

Mr. PELLETIER: I will come to South Bruce in a moment. When my right hon. friend told us that he had been robbed, I said to myself: Evidently some awful things have taken place in the constituency of Chateauguay. It may be that stuffed ballot boxes had been used, as they have been used in the past under a Government which was not a Conservative Government. When I heard this loud complaint, I could not help remembering Hastings, Brockville, West Huron and the Minnie M. But when the facts in connection with this matter are brought out in the courts, I am afraid that my right hon. friend will be somewhat disappointed, and that the persons against whom proof of irregularities is offered will not be those to whom my right hon. friend referred the other day.

We are told that a pamphlet was distributed in Chateauguay county, and that in that pamphlet the people of the constituency were told that another judge, Mr. Audette, a French-Canadian, had been appointed to the Exchequer Court. That was true; what harm do hon. gentlemen find in that? Does the hon. member for Rouville criticise that appointment? He does not, and will not. Since this Government came into power, Liberal speakers and the Liberal press day after day have said: 'What is the Borden Government going to do for the province of Quebec?' When we had the great leader of the Opposition as our Prime Minister, the province of Quebec was all right, but now with these awful men, Borden and Rogers, in power, what is going to become of our poor province? The newspapers throughout the province of Quebec have been saying: Just look at that; we had a Minister of Public Works from Quebec, but now the present minister is not a French-Canadian; our compatriots and their rights have been trampled upon. What do hon. gentlemen see in that circular which was read by the hon. member for Rouville yesterday? They see a copy of the Estimates voted by Parliament, showing that the province of Quebec received a fair appropriation of public money. Was it a crime to place this before the people of Chateauguay? If hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House had never committed any greater political crime than this, we should have little complaint to make. It has been said also that we told the people of Chateauguay that the Prime Minister of this country was a friend of all races and nationalities. Is that not true? Has not the Prime Minister of this country risen mightily in the estimation of the people of Canada? Has he not made good? Having been in power only two years, is his name not written in golden letters in the history of this country? Has he not endeared himself to every Canadian? Yes, Sir, he has, and we have the right to say so to the English-speaking as well as to the French-speaking people of this country. This is the crime we have committed in Chateauguay—that of telling the truth.

One of my friends on the other side asked me to speak of South Bruce; let me see what kind of literature was circulated in that constituency and what kind of appeals were made to the electors. Some were funny; some were anti-Canadian, and some, as usual, appealed to the prejudices of race and religion.

You will permit me to read the funny part in the first place. The hon. gentleman who now sits as member for South Bruce (Mr. Truax) made a speech during that election at Pinkerton, and a shorthand reporter was sent down to take notes of what he said. I shall not quote his speech at length, but shall content myself by placing a few sentences before the House. This is the way the campaign started:

I went down to a German wedding in Carrick and enjoyed myself. A few days after I was told I was drunk, I had a girl sitting on my knee. Well, you know, I am fond of females

all right at any time, but for the last ten years I have not enjoyed their company as I used to.

This was on the public platform. (Reading):

I played cards and such as that and had a dance, and as long as I like I will do so.

I think every one will admit that this was not quite enough to elect the hon. gentleman, and so something else had to be found. My hon. friend from South Bruce (Mr. Truax) was complaining that Conservatives were going in great numbers into the constituency and that he was fighting them alone, single-handed; but we read in another column of the paper reporting his speech that the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee), and many others of the stalwarts of the other side were advertised to speak at different meetings in the county, and then my hon. friend from South Bruce (Mr. Truax) took some courage and thought he would leave the question of the dance and the girls alone and would speak on other subjects. What do we see? Let me read to you here a circular which was distributed all over the county of Bruce and find what the hon. member himself did as a candidate in a Canadian constituency and a part of the British Empire:

Walkerton, Oct. 13, 1913.

Dear Sir,—Accompanying this letter you will find an exact copy, in part, of a speech delivered in Vancouver on August 17, 1912, by the Hon. Sam. Hughes, Minister of Militia and Defence in the Borden Government. Premier Borden has never repudiated that speech or any part of it, so we must conclude that the Hon. Mr. Hughes spoke that way on behalf of the whole Borden Government. Read the speech carefully.

The report is taken from the Globe, of course, and was annexed to that circular.

Read the speech carefully; note particularly the parts in larger type referring to Germany and also remember that shortly after this speech was made the Borden Government tried to force a vote of $35,000,000 through Parliament to send to England. The Hon. Mr. Hughes said the peril is very direct and Germany must be taught a lesson. Was this vote of $35,000,000 for the purpose of teaching Germany a lesson?

That is a question put by the hon. member.

Mr. Cargill is the candidate of the Borden Government, and therefore a supporter of this naval policy. If you think the Fatherland—

That is Germany—

—is a peril to Canada that must be taught a lesson, vote for Cargill; if, however, you would prefer to continue the present cordial relations existing between the Fatherland and Canada and to have a national and industrial peace and tranquility and the spending of Canadian money in Canada, give me your vote.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. PELLETIER: There is only one member who applauds; I am surprised that the whole bunch do not. It is a direct appeal to the German vote as against helping our own mother country. The hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Truax) had not invented that process and he had no right to have it patented; it was started long before he was elected in South Bruce. We all know that this kind of appeal was started in the election of 1911 by no less a person than the Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, a member of the late Administration, when he ran in Waterloo.

The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) went into that county of South Bruce and repeated this same appeal. I want to read to this House not only what a member of the late Government said on the platform—he was defeated, and properly defeated—but I want to let this House and this country know that another member of the late Government who has a seat in this House went to South Bruce and repeated the same appeal. The Mildmay Gazette gives a report of what took place at a meeting at Walkerton, and there we find that the Hon. Chas. Murphy was one of the speakers. And what did he say on this point?

His strongest contention on the naval issue was that the Borden policy was a direct insult to Germany and therefore a check to the peace conditions between that country and Great Britain which we are all so anxious to maintain.

Now, Sir, have we come to this in this country that because, forsooth, Canada is trying in a friendly way—a way which may be disapproved of by political opponents, but at all events it must be granted that this measure which was brought before Parliament last year was one which the majority in this House and I venture to say the majority of the people of this country approved of—to help the mother country, we have members of this House and would-be members of this House, candidates, who will go before the people of this country and tell them that this measure is one which will have the effect of destroying the rights, as the circular calls it, of the fatherland? We have had appeals in this country on sectional lines, and I thought they had gone to the bottom; but evidently they have not reached the bottom yet when we find that for political ends, to attain a political object, they will stir up the Ger-

man people of this country in a certain direction in order to win a by-election in this country of ours. Well, Sir, we have come to that. And we hear the hon. member complaining because we have told the truth to the electors of Chateauguay about certain facts, and there he is, with his friends, convicted to-day of taking on the public platform a stand which I do not hesitate to say any true Canadian ought not to approve, and, if it was Parliamentary, I would say any true Canadian ought to be ashamed of.

But that is not all. We have heard a good deal about this victory in South Bruce, but let me tell you that in that fight our friends thought fit to appeal to the German voters. In presenting that Bill to the House this Government had absolutely no intention of hurting the feelings of the German people who live in Canada. We thought we had a duty to perform towards the mother country, and I do hope that the German people of this country, though they were led astray by this appeal in the last by-election, will understand that whilst in Canada we form part of the great British Empire, at the same time we have for the German people the respect which that great nation is entitled to, and that our action was not in the direction of offering any insult to them but was simply a manifestation of our desire to do our duty to the great empire of which we form a part. Germans have been coming into this country, and they are coming all the time. I know a part of our western country right now where over 12,000 acres are being colonized and broken by people coming from Germany. I say, as one of the members of this Government: Welcome to these good people; let them come here, make homes for themselves and become citizens. If the French-Canadian people in my province and other parts of Canada have played a not inconsiderable part in bringing about the entente cordiale, the understanding between England and France, I hope that the German people in this country may be numerous enough at a given moment to exert such an influence as not only to prevent strife, but to do their utmost in order to bring about lasting peace between England and Germany.

But that is not all. Appeals to prejudices were made in South Bruce. We know that there are a great number of Irish Roman Catholics in South Bruce. The hon. the member for Russell (Hon. Charles Murphy) went to South Bruce and told the Irish Catholics that there was no reciprocity in the last election, but that the election was carried by the Conservative party on the Ne Temere question.

Mr. CARVELL: So say we all.

Mr. PELLETIER: Ah, these gentlemen will never acknowledge their defeat. Then we had this good Irish Roman Catholic, the hon. member for Russell, going to his co-religionists in South Bruce and telling them that the Conservative party had promised to bring in a Bill to render the marriage law uniform in this country. Who has made that promise? He says these things for what purpose and with what object? These are the facts. They sent broadcast a certain newspaper published in the city of Toronto, in which there happened to be printed an attack on the Roman Catholics, and they said: This is a Conservative paper, look at the awful headlines which are here directed against the Roman Catholics! That was sent not amongst the English Protestants, but it was sent amongst the Irish Catholics. I think this is striking below the belt. Both elections might well be compared, and if they are I think all the advantages of the comparison will be on one side.

Now, I would like to ask: What has become of free food? This was a fine baby which was born in Hamilton and came into this world amidst a big blare of trumpets. The gentlemen who offered that baby to the public made me think of the great Napoleon when a son was born to him; he showed it to all Europe and said: This is my son. This thing took place at Hamilton. The next time we heard of the baby was in Montreal at the Fielding banquet. Half of the poor, little tiny thing had become impaired to such an extent that it was practically out of sight, and the hopes for its full recovery were not strong. As a matter of fact, Sir, the baby died during the trip from Montreal to Ottawa. The right hon. leader of the Opposition forgot to throw a few well-deserved flowers, when he spoke on the debate, on the premature little corpse. He did not even refer to it. That was most unkind. It might have been made the subject-matter of an amendment to the Address, after the great flourish of trumpets with which this free food baby was introduced to our notice. If it was not a catch-word, if it was a serious policy, we had a right to expect that it would be embodied in an amendment to the Address. But none of that; it was buried somewhere in a snow-bank.

The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) who believes in miracles, tried

to galvanize the little corpse last night, but he said he was only speaking for himself and that he was not committing anybody else to his views. I am sure of that, but then he still believes in it. The hon. member for Rouville has an abundant faith. Even if the father of the newly-born policy has discarded it, the hon. member for Rouville, who was so enthusiastic when he saw the baby come into this world, still thought that there was something in it. But surely the hon. member for Rouville ought to have consulted his friends, because the people in the province of Quebec will now say: Look at the hon. member for Rouville; he believes in free food. I should think that it would be better for my hon. friend to put himself in accord with his leader in that respect, and if we do not hear of free food now from the right hon. leader of the Opposition perhaps the hon. member for Rouville may drop it also. At all events, that is only a suggestion, and I have no doubt it will be taken into my hon. friend's serious consideration.

Now, I just want to say this one word further: Free food means a reduction in the price of produce paid to the farmer. If you want to have free food you may go and tell them that in the cities, but I would invite you to say so before the producers, the farmers of this country. That is where the test comes; that is why the child did not live. My right hon. friend found that the baby had horns. a most unusual thing for a child. And then he dropped it like a hot potato. My hon. friend did well; he saw there was no use humbugging the people by telling the consumers in the cities that reciprocity would lessen the prices of the articles they consume, and at the same time telling the farmers in the country that they would get a higher price for their produce. That story lasted until the evening of the 21st of September at five o'clock and then it burst. I wonder why hon. gentlemen opposite attempt to revive it now. I represent a farming community and on behalf of the farmers in my county who till the soil, I say that they have just as good right to be protected in their industry as have the manufacturer and the artisan. If gentlemen opposite are going to reduce the cost of living to the consumers in the cities, will they please tell me how they can do that without redu ing the prices at which the farmer sells his products, leaving aside for the moment the question of the middleman. We were told last night by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), that our country was being drained by the people of the United States who came here to buy all our farm products; but if the people of the United States come to Canada to buy farm products and pay the freight on them to get them to their country, is not that proof that the price of these articles is higher in the United States than it is in Canada. Who can gainsay that principle? In the back townships of the province of Quebec for the last 15 years the farmers have been told when they had a fine crop of potatoes or anything else, that it was all done by Laurier, and the right hon. gentleman did not deny it very much; he simply suggested he was in partnership with Providence. The great trouble in this country is that our farmers' sons are leaving the farms for the cities, and, are they now going to be told that they must sell their farm products at a lower price than hitherto, thus encouraging them further to leave their occupation as tillers of the soil. For my part, I do not believe that to be sound doctrine. Of course, we all understand that this idea was thrown out as a 'ballon d essai,' to see how it would catch on with the people, but our friends opposite realize now that it would not float, and so they are looking for some other cry. Just imagine the incongruity of what we recently saw when we had our hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), a good protectionist to a certain extent, making a joint tour in his county with my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), who is the apostle of free trade. That joint tour was a good sample of the contrast there is between the diverse policies enunciated by members of the Opposition in this House.

On the question of the navy, I shall not speak at great length, nor do I think it necessary to do so at the present time. I was much impressed by the statement made by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition in this House a short time ago, to the effect that what was going on now with regard to the navy was inspired in the interest of the armour plate makers of the world, meaning, of course, that the Conservative party was acting in the interest of the armour trust. But I would like to point out with some emphasis, that the right hon. gentleman, when he spoke in Chateauguay and elsewhere, and complained so much of our naval policy, forgot to repeat the speech he made in this House last year, setting forth his naval policy. I went to Ormstown in the county of Chateauguay and before I spoke I was told by some respectable electors that the Conservatives had a very bad naval policy and they de-

sired me to explain it. I asked them if Sir Wilfrid Laurier had told them about his policy and the answer was, as the fact is, that he did not speak very much about it. Well, perhaps that is one of the things, so far as the Liberal party is concerned, as to which the past should bury its dead. But I would point out to the people of Canada that if there are any in this country who can be accused of a desire to help the armour plate trust, it is surely the men who want to build two fleet units, and not the men who want to build simply three ships. I want my right hon. friend to think over that situation, and to tell the people of Canada, as the fact really is, that the men who would give most work to the armour platers are the men who want to build the biggest navy. With these few considerations as to the navy I shall pass on.

The hon. gentleman from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has ceased to be a protectionist, and he seems to be very much concerned about the duty on agricultural implements, but it comes with very bad grace from him and his friends to talk about what reciprocity would have done for the farmer in the matter of agricultural implements, when we all know, as a matter of fact, that reciprocity did not purport to do very much in that respect. The hon. gentleman from Rouville has a way of his own in grappling with the tariff question, and in order to explain his attitude I shall quote these words from his speech of last night:

> But, Mr. Speaker, when protection is concerned, you can always make an argument when you wish to fasten and tighten around the neck of the farmer the collar of serfdom.

These are big words. Later he said:

> It is useless to mince matters. It is just as well to speak plainly and honestly to the privileged classes who since 1879 have been enjoying their privileges.

Now, what does that language mean? Here we have the hon. member for Rouville stating that since 1879 the collar of serfdom has been around the necks of the farmers, and that privileged classes have been protected during these many years. But the hon. gentleman was 15 years in power, and he is to-day the self-confessed perpetrator for 15 years of this crime, if crime there is. That is the sort of argument we have from hon. gentlemen opposite about protection. They pretend to say now that protection is a bad thing, but they know right well that they would not have attained power in 1896, and they would not have retained power for a year, if they had touched the principle of protection, which is a sacred principle in this country. And how did they get to power? As was pointed out by the right hon. Prime Minister the other day, the right hon. the leader of the Opposition was denouncing protection as bondage and slavery in Winnipeg, when at the same time he was writing a letter to Mr. Bertram, a manufacturer, in which he pronounced himself a protectionist. Is that the way to deal with a great question in a country such as Canada? I do not think it is. I do not think so. When the hon. members of the late Government adopted protection, they continued the system of protection, not because they liked it, but because, that great broad-minded man who inaugurated protection in this country in 1879 forced them, even from his grave, to follow that policy themselves.

After the elections of 1908, I heard a remark made which I thought was a very apt one. A good old Conservative was putting the question: 'Well, we have been defeated again; do you expect that we shall ever get back into power?' A man who heard him ask this question said: "Now, boy, you wait and you will see this Government fall to pieces when Canada is in danger.' That man was a prophet. When the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) departed from protectionist principles, which had been adopted in this country, and tried to fasten on this country the reciprocity pact, Canada was in danger, and then occurred the predicted fall.

If we are to judge by the hon. member for Rouville, our good friends have now evidently become free traders—free traders in opposition, protectionists in power! They dance the tango free trade when in opposition and the turkey-trot protection when in power. We do not believe in doing that. We have been protectionists in opposition and we are protectionists in power, because we want this country to have a stable fiscal and financial policy, so that the people may know where they are and where they stand with the Government of their own country.

5 p.m. We have been asked what we intend to do in order to solve the temporary difficulties which exist in this country. I have taken up too much of the time of the House already, but I will discuss the matter very briefly. We have appointed a commission which is looking into the matter. In this respect we are not very far from one of the propositions laid down by the right hon. gentleman him-

self when he said in Montreal that his free food policy, which was born in Hamilton, had to be taken care of in some other way, and that if he had been in power he would have appointed three of his ministers to traverse the country as a commission to look into the matter. Well, we have appointed a commission. So far it is not so bad; but while the commissioners are working on this, we believe that the great evil in this country is that, in the past, agriculture has not been taken care of as it ought to have been. The other day I heard one of the members of this House make a very apt remark. He said that before this Government was in power, the people of this country were not very sure whether they had a Minister of Agriculture or not. Our friend and colleague (Mr. Burrell), with the consent of the Government, has started a new policy of educational instruction for the farmers, and this will go far towards relieving present conditions.

There is another thing that this Government has done. Our policy as to highways would also have been of great service to the farmers of this country. Of course, we know what has happened. I shall not discuss that at any length. Another thing we have done, is to give a post office to every farmer at his door; that is, to make rural mail delivery which was only under contemplation when we took office, an accomplished fact.

There is one thing more which, if it is properly understood, will accomplish a great deal towards bringing the consumer and the farmer together; that is, parcel post. I am glad to say that parcel post will be an accomplished fact in Canada on the 10th of February next. We have been working at it in the department for months. We have the problem pretty well in hand now, and whilst we are working so hard in order to give to the public this boon which I think will bring together the consumer and the farmer. I hope in a couple of days, if not to-morrow, to lay before this House the regulations which have been adopted, and which will be distributed in order to inaugurate that policy. I think this is one of the things which should have been acknowledged on the other side of the House as one of the means which this Government is taking to meet present conditions. This Government has been thinking of the people, of doing something for the people. This is one of the things to which we have devoted a great deal of time and attention, and I think we owe it to our people as a mark of gratitude for the token of confidence which they gave to us on the 21st of September, 1911.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton N.): Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the House has listened with a great deal of attention to the address of the hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier). The conditions of the country to-day from the Atlantic to the Pacific are such that the people, not only in this House but outside of it, will listen with interest to any speeches made by any members of the Government. I am sorry to say that, so far as any remedy or any hope of a remedy for the distressing conditions which exist in the country to-day is concerned, we have listened in vain to the hon. member of the Government who has addressed this House this afternoon.

His manner of dealing with big questions reminds me of the story of a doctor who was called in to treat a man who had pneumonia. The extraordinary course was taken by the doctor of throwing this man into a tub of freezing water, and when friends of the patient asked him in alarm: 'What do you mean by throwing that man into a tub of cold water?' the doctor said: 'Well, I understand it is pneumonia that he has got; I do not know how to treat pneumonia, but after he is thrown into the tub he will take fits, and I am a devil on fits.' It seems that the only position in which the hon. Postmaster General excels is in dismissals, and he will get away as quickly as possible from discussing public questions in order to get back to his den and his dismissals. The hon. Minister touched lightly on the question of dismissals. No doubt he had a right to touch lightly on that subject, and to pass away from it as quickly as possible. I understand that a return was brought down yesterday, which has not yet reached the members, in which the department of the hon. Minister is given credit for having, within the last two years, aye, in less than two years, dismissed 650 postmasters and 450 other employees of his department. That, Sir, is the record of the department which is presided over by the hon. gentleman who just addressed you. And, while he has no money for the payment of postmasters, while he has no money to increase the salaries of postmasters, as he has been promising for the last two years, it appears from this return, or from one that is closely

connected with it, that between the 10th of October, 1911, and the 26th day of May, 1913, he found money enough to spend on his beheadings, $18,268.46. That, Sir, is the laudable course taken by this exponent of Government policy who addressed us this afternoon. And, so far as actualities are concerned, nothing else has been done in that department that tends in the slightest degree to the advancement of the general condition of the people of this country. We are told that the course taken by the late Government led to the course taken by the Government of which the hon. Postmaster General is a distinguished member. I submit that the resolution which he quoted this afternoon is no basis at all for that course, and, properly construed, never was intended to cover the dismissal of such officials as have been dismissed since this Government came into power. I submit that that resolution, the Lake resolution, so called, properly construed, could not justify one-tenth of the eleven hundred dismissals which have been made by the Postmaster General. That resolution, moved by Mr. Lake, who was then a member of the House, was explained in a speech made by the mover at the time. He complained of the fact that officers of the Government in the northwest who were paid high salaries and who ought to give all their time and attention to Government business, were giving their time and attention in fact to political matters, and this, he said, ought to be stopped. To that line of action the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier gave consent, they agreed that men of this class, men paid high salaries, should devote their whole time to the business for which they were paid and not to politics. But does the Postmaster General say that he has confined himself to the class of people referred to in that resolution? He has gone further with his axeman business and his beheadings than any other minister in this country has ever gone before. It has never been known before in this country that mail contractors, poor, honest men, who have put in tenders for carrying the mail and have honestly obtained their contracts, and, obtaining their contracts, have spent their money to provide vehicles and other equipment for the purpose of carrying those contracts into effect, have been beheaded, their contracts cancelled and given to others. That is a line of action for which the Postmaster General can find no precedent in this country, or any other country in the world. That is the charge I lay at his door a charge which he cannot and will not answer, so far as I can see, and which, certainly, he cannot deny.

He passed on from talking about dismissals and talked very glibly and very fluently indeed about these wonderful election scandals that he seeks to bring before this country. He passed very lightly over Chateauguay and came to the county of Bruce. He read some nice descriptions of certain convivial meetings which, he said, the hon. member who represents South Bruce (Mr. Truax) had attended in certain parts of that county. We are not aware whether the Postmaster General has any tendency or any regard for these convivialities with the fair sex—we have no evidence of it so far as the census of this country is concerned. But, Mr. Speaker, we, in this country, are now confronted with great questions, with questions involving the interests of the hundreds and thousands of men out of employment, as admitted by the hon. gentleman himself. I submit that that all-important matter was treated altogether too lightly by the hon. gentleman who has just addressed us, and from whom we had a right to expect a statement of some line of policy to be inaugurated by the Government of which he is a member. He spoke flippantly, as I said before, of the free food question. Will the hon. gentleman say that the farmers of this country are down to the point where 60 cents a dozen is the best they can do in eggs, 40 cents a lb. the best that they can do in butter, 25 cents or 30 cents a lb. the best that they can do in beef? Does the hon. gentleman say, or does this Government say, that we must not touch this holy structure which he calls Protection, and that no remedy whatever is to be afforded for the people? The theory of protection has always been that local competition would prevent high prices. I ask the Government if they stand now by that theory and determine to afford the people no remedy notwithstanding such prices as those I have just quoted. I submit that when it comes to prices of that kind the evidence is overwhelming that competition is not there; and I submit that if we can bring in supplies from outside it is the duty of this Government, it is the duty of whatever party is in power, to apply that remedy. I feel sure that those people in this country who are not able to furnish sufficient food for their children and for the proper maintenance of their families are looking for a remedy, and it is not encouraging for them to listen to the speech of the Postmaster General who, we have a right to believe,

represents the Government, and who tells us that this sacred structure of Protection must not be touched, that wherever the remedy may come from, it is not to come through any change of this structure. We listened a few days ago to a speech from the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen). He rather hinted that the revision of the tariff would come, that something would be done in the interests of the people who to-day are paying too high prices by reason of protection, and that he would be a party to doing something for the alleviation of the condition of the people. But if the speech of the Postmaster General is to be taken as an indication of what hon. gentlemen opposite propose to do, the Solicitor General has not very much to hope for, so far as any action on the part of the Government is concerned.

Passing on from the food question, the Postmaster General told us that he would not dwell at any length upon the matter of the navy. He was pleased to talk about dead bodies and dead babies, and probably thought that he was painting a very clever picture for the members of this House; but let me remind him that if he wants to engage in body-snatching or grave digging, he will find a very suitable corpse, so far as this Government is concerned, in the naval question. I would remind him of an incident of ancient or sacred history, wherein a certain great and noble personage suggested that he should go to a certain grave, whereupon he was told not to go, because 'by this time what is in the grave stinketh.' I wish to remind the Postmaster General not only that the naval question is dead, but that it is in its grave, and has been there so long that it stinketh. I am not at all surprised that he wishes to get away from it as quickly as possible.

The Postmaster General grew eloquent in telling the members of this House and the people of this country how much we should admire the actions of the Prime Minister of Canada. Let me ask him, or any member of the Government to show me any act of constructive legislation brought forward by the Prime Minister from the time that he took office down to the present, except the Naval Bill? Has he as Prime Minister produced anything else since he took office? I advise the Postmaster General, and every other member of the Government, to look upon the only fruit of his labour, this dead body to which I have alluded, and which will never again be resurrected to appear in the political life of the Dominion of Canada.

It is not necessary for me to deal at any greater length with the speech of the Postmaster General, who has simply reiterated an old, old story. He has simply gone over the same old ground; he has told us nothing new. Of course it is delightful to an old Scotchman like myself to observe the striking and radical changes which appear to have come over the hon. gentleman, and to witness his advocacy of true patriotism and of true loyalty to the King, the old flag, and the old land. I deem it no credit to myself to be loyal; I have no reason to be anything else. I am willing to concede to any man whose parents were born in another country the right to love his native land, but in his doing so there is no reason why he should be less patriotic to the flag under which he lives. There are conditions which make it ridiculous for a man to put forward his great pride and patriotism. It is only a few years since the Postmaster General took upon himself the duties of the position which he now occupies. This he did not because he was an out and out patriot; not because he was an advocate of a British navy, British protection and British advancement throughout the world, but because he had the negative qualifications; because he advocated 'not a man, not a dollar, nothing for the British flag; we are tired of it; it is not the symbol of liberty in this country—we had to put holes through it a few years ago to breathe the air of liberty.' That, Sir, is an indication of the company in which the hon. gentleman was found when the present Government came into office, and that is the company in which he may be found to-day. He came into this House under the leadership of a gentleman who made no bones of what his position was; a gentleman who occupied a leading position in the Cabinet.

That hon. gentleman, who represents the county of Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in the province of Quebec, was brought in here as one who was qualified for the position of Nationalist leader in this House. But when hon. gentlemen opposite did not get everything they expected, that leader left the Cabinet, and his going was an evidence of the fact that his policy was not a man, not a dollar, no navy—nothing whatever for the advancement of British institutions in this country. The hon. Postmaster General should have submissively and quietly walked out after the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, because if he had not walked ahead of him coming in, he would

never have occupied the position he holds to-day. We are told that the hon. Postmaster General is a great loyalist and patriot, and that we have but to inquire into his past history to find out how much justification there is for his holding his present position. The hon. gentleman spoke about how much he forgot; it is perhaps pleasing for him to realize that people will forget, for if his political record is not forgotten it is doubtful if he will ever again grace the benches of this House. At the last local election in the province of Quebec he pledged his political life to the people there, and asked them to support a candidate of his choice. But he was practically drowned out of existence; there was a ten to one vote—against his man—and then he was going to resign. But of course he did not do so. As long as there is any salary attached to his position, there is no danger of the Postmaster General resigning. The hon. gentleman was pleased to give us a dissertation upon good manners and parlimentary etiquette, but I think that his reply to the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) was not what I would regard as a proper answer for a big man, occupying such a responsible position, to make a respectable member of this House. The hon. member for Prescott simply said: 'You have forgotten a certain condition of affairs;' whereupon the bar-room answer was given; the police court cleverness was employed, and the Postmaster General said: 'I have forgotten more than the hon. gentleman ever knew.' That, Sir, is an example of the good manners of a Minister of the Government. I submit that it is anything but good manners, and it shows the peanut-political methods of the hon. Postmaster General. I had no intention of devoting so much attention to the speech delivered by the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), as I had a few observations of my own to make on these questions.

Speaking in this House a few years ago, since this Government came into power, I made the remark that I had hoped and believed that notwithstanding the fact that we had bad times and bad conditions when the Conservative Government was in power before, conditions had risen to such a high state during the fifteen years of the Laurier Government that the new Government could not, by any mismanagement on their part, bring the country back to the old conditions. I am sorry to say that I gave them more credit than they were entitled to in one way, or perhaps I did not give them credit enough. I did not give them sufficient credit for their ability to wreck the ship of state and bring it to the disastrous condition in which it is to-day, as compared with the happy conditions in which matters were found in 1911 when the Administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier handed over the reins of power. We handed over the reins of power after fifteen years of the most magnificent development that has ever taken place in any country. We found this country, Sir, when the right hon. gentleman who to-day leads the Opposition assumed office, in financial distress and storm. We found the same stagnation and standstill in financial and commercial matters extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific that we have to-day. We found that the Minister of Finance at that day was struggling to make one hand wash the other, struggling and in distress, getting every dollar he could from every source, legitimate and otherwise—I suppose legitimate—that could be gathered into the treasury; and with all that, and with the public service of the country depleted and starved, the only condition he could present, even in an election year, was a deficit approaching one million dollars. That was the condition that existed in 1896 when the Laurier Administration took charge. What has followed, Sir? The sun that set in adversity rose in prosperity. The moment the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier took charge of the affairs of this country and his Government assumed office—and that must be admitted to have been one of the ablest, if not the ablest, Administration that was ever constituted or formed in this country—everything budded forth and everything went forward with a bound to the prosperity which has continued for the fifteen years we were in power. We were told that although we had been saying we had surpluses, we had not had any; we were told that the moneys which appeared upon our books from year to year as a magnificent surplus were simply a paper surplus and that we did not have the money. We were told we were preventing proper investigation into the affairs of the country and that we were concealing something and that things were far from what they ought to be, that we had a dark lantern brigade and other institutions preventing inquiry. But the time came when, according to the rules of government we have in this country, a change took place. It is well, perhaps even if disaster should follow, that the people

should have a right to rule. I am not complaining about the change of government, but I am submitting that when the change did come, when the Government of the day had power to inquire into every condition which prevailed during the fifteen years we were in power, they had the opportunity of making good the statements which they had made that our surpluses were simply paper surpluses, they had a right to make good the statement that we were hiding behind dark lantern brigades the doings and actions of the Government. What did they do ? They had the right to inquire. They never did inquire, or if they did they found nothing. When it came to delivering over a statement of the surplus, we handed them over $39,000,000 of clean cash; everything was squared up and a clean Administration gave up its books in a most magnificent manner. The Finance Minister himself after making the most thorough search—and we may be sure he would have been glad to find any fault—had to come down and say that the conditions of the country were splendid and that the book-keeping, as handed over to him, was most magnificent and that he had nothing to say, that the money was there, he had counted it and found some $39,000,000 was there. That, Sir, is the condition in which we handed over the finances of this country to the incoming Government and that is the condition which, after two years, they have been able to bring to the state of financial crisis through which we are going to-day. I submit that when I made the statement that I thought they could not bring the country to this condition in such a short time, I am sorry that I miscalculated the capacity of the present Administration in bringing these matters to the very state and conditions in which they are to-day.

I wish to call the attention of the House for a moment to the speech of the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen). I have had the honour of sitting in this House with the Solicitor General for some years. I have always watched his career with considerable interest and have looked upon him as a clever young lawyer; I have certainly no fault to find with his promotion to the position which he occupies to-day. I have just one fault to find; I think that we in the great province of Nova Scotia should have got this position, we in that province have always been accustomed to be represented in the Cabinet by at least two ministers. I submit that to-day we are not, as a province, represented in the Cabinet at all. The Prime Minister is representing every province; not this Prime Minister but every Prime Minister is supposed to be the representative of each province in the Cabinet, regardless of the province from which he may come or for which he is elected. For that reason I submit that the great province of Nova Scotia is not, as such, represented in the Cabinet. We have about the same population as the province of Manitoba and I think we have reason to complain when they have practically three ministers from the province of Manitoba and we should at least have one from the great province of Nova Scotia. It is not because we did not use to have talented men from that province. We have given this country three premiers and two distinguished ministers of justice. We have given this country in the early days as a minister of justice, the late Hon. James Macdonald, a man of great fame as a lawyer and as a jurist in his own country. We have given you as minister of justice the late revered Hon. Sir John Thompson. As prime ministers we have given you Sir Charles Tupper, Sir John Thompson, and the present distinguished head of the Government (Mr. Borden). Therefore it cannot be said that we were used to be without talent in the province of Nova Scotia. But I am sorry that we have fallen on evil days and on evil times, that to-day while it is true that we have nine members representing the province of Nova Scotia supporting the Government, it is reported, whether it is true or not I do not know, that the Prime Minister stated to his friends that he would like to give the position of Solicitor General to somebody from that province of Nova Scotia, we were entitled to it, but he was sorry to say that, while we sent here considerable raw material, there was nothing really from which he could venture to make a solicitor general.

If we go over the list we find that we have from Cumberland a lawyer, from Hants a lawyer and from Annapolis a lawyer. We have this semi-ready from Kings. Out of this outfit it appears that the Prime Minister found it impossible to make a selection, and he decided not to give us a Nova Scotian for a solicitor general. Mr. Speaker, upon that ground I am sorry that I must give way and say that after all it was well that the boss of the Administration should have his way, and that the third man should come from Manitoba and no one at all from the great province of Nova Scotia, except the Prime Minister, who is participated in by the other nine

provinces just as well as by the province of Nova Scotia.

I pass on to say something on the speech of my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) in connection with the Roads Bill. There is such a thing as a man getting too big, there is such a thing as a man thinking beyond his powers. The legerdemain artist, the juggler is too big and too strong. I use the word 'juggler' without any disrespect for the capacity and power of the Solicitor General. There are men who go on the stage and make their living as jugglers. They throw their hat on the table and take rabbits, cats, rats and all sorts of things out of the hat. They are not in the hat, but it appears to the onlookers that they are. The Solicitor General has developed great strength along these lines of jugglery, but he went a little too far the other night. He went on to say that this is a Bill that anybody could deal with, having nothing to do with money at all. That was one of the rabbits he took out of his own hat. Then he gave it a twist, and it became the liveliest kind of a money Bill you ever saw, and nobody could dare touch it. It was too sacred, just like the policy of protection in the opinion of my hon. friend the Postmaster General. Nobody can put unconsecrated hands upon it because it is a money Bill. But I think that the Solicitor General has gone a little too far. He has tried to convince honest men and men of some experience of things which are really not true. He has attempted something which is really far beyond his powers. This Bill, which he wants the Senate to steer clear of, not to touch and to leave alone for the reason that it is a money Bill, is not a money Bill, and when the question was put to him he had to acknowledge that it was not. I can remember distinctly when the discussion was on that the right hon. Prime Minister stood up in his place and advised the members of this House, on the authority of the Prime Minister, that a resolution was not necessary. The Bill passed this House on the distinct understanding that it was not a money Bill. Therefore, if that was the case, and I believe it was, what right had the Solicitor General to say that when it got to the other branch of Parliament it was a money Bill or a Bill which required to receive the attention of this House only and could not be qualified or touched in any way by the hon. gentlemen in the other Chamber?

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Another strong reason given by the hon. Solicitor General why they should not touch this Bill was that legislation would have to be passed by this House following every step of the money from the time the expenditure was suggested until it got to its ultimate destination, and that the power of this House had to be exercised over it until that was done. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very sound principle, but I might remind the Government and the hon. Solicitor General that we have had, within the last two years, several large votes of money made by this House and not for public works as the term is understood. No legislation passed this House enabling the Government to follow these moneys to their final destination. I want to ask the Government and my hon. friend the Solicitor General what about the $15,000,000 that passed this House last year to be paid over as a bonus and a gratuity to a certain corporation in this country known as Mackenzie and Mann? They paid that $15,000,000 out of the moneys of this country. We voted against this, we wanted to have it done in a business way and as a business transaction, but we were outvoted by the majority on the other side of the House, that money passed out of sight, and we know not where it went, we know not what was done with it, and there is nobody under the sun that can be called to account to tell this House where the money has gone. Where is the high-sounding principle laid down by the hon. Solicitor General that we must follow this money to its destination? The Ontario Government came to us with a proposition which was the most absurd that I ever heard of, asking for a subsidy for a railway that had been built for years, that was making money, that was putting $500,000 or $600,000 a year into the treasury of the province of Ontario. They asked for $2,000,000 of money to be paid over to that Government. That $2,000,000 of money was paid to the Ontario Government and it went out of sight. We do not know where it went. Where is the principle of the Solicitor General that we must have legislation to follow these moneys to their destination and know what becomes of them? There is nothing of the kind. The same thing happened in the case of the province of Manitoba. Four million dollars was voted by this House and passed over to the treasury of the province of Manitoba in 1912, and there is not a line of legislation to enable us to follow that money and see what has become of it. What becomes of the idea that the Senate should

not touch this Bill, because, forsooth, this provision was not in it and it was necessary to follow this money that was to go on the roads of this country if it ever went. According to the Solicitor General, because this legislation was necessary, this Bill was not to be touched by the Senate except by the consent and goodwill of hon. members of this House. I submit that that is not the reason, that it cannot be the reason, for, if that were the reason the same principle would have been applied in the cases that I have mentioned in which $2,000,000 was paid to the Ontario Government, $15,000,000 to Mackenzie and Mann, and $4,000,000 to the province of Manitoba. That principle would have applied if the statement of the hon. Solicitor General represented the true reason. The reason was, of course, that the Government wanted to have a string on this money, wanted to control it, for the very good reason that has been made plain by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). My hon. friend from Guysborough, speaking in this House the other night, made reference to one of the reasons which has been controlling or moving the Government in placing this money within their own reach. The hon. member said on that occasion that he was not in South Renfrew at the time of the election, being the first by-election after this Government came into power, but he quoted from a Conservative newspaper, published in the riding and called the Renfrew Journal, the report of a speech made by the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid), on the occasion of that by-election. The report of that speech is as follows:

> Dr. Reid turned his attention to the good roads movement advocated by the Conservative Government at Ottawa, and the bald way in which he handled his topic disgusted all decent men who looked for something higher than this kind of talk from a Cabinet minister. The burden of this part of Dr. Reid's speech was that South Renfrew should vote for Dr. Maloney and the Borden Government would then spend money in this district for good roads.

I submit that when we come to the last analysis of the purpose of this Roads Bill, we have to take the view of it, given by this spokesman of the Government, a few days after the Bill was introduced. I remember well when the Minister of Railways brought in the Bill it was in the midst of the South Renfrew election. It would be unkind to say the measure was launched for the purpose of influencing that election, but there was at all events, as the Minister of Finance would say, a synchronism. However the moment the Bill was introduced the Minister of Customs declared to the people of South Renfrew what they would get if they did one thing and what they would not get if they did the other thing. The Government have dropped the great navy question; it is not only buried but it is malodorous and they fear to go near it, but this Roads Bill seems to be the darling of their hearts, and they take it to bed with them and they cuddle it and fondle it. They are making the people believe from Vancouver to Scutari that this money will be applied to roads running along the lines of the different settlements and concessions, and that it is a mortal sin that the Liberal party are standing in the way.

Mr. CARVELL: They are only trying to make the people believe that.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, the Government are trying to make the people of Canada believe that these roads will go all over the country. It reminds me of the story of an old farmer who bought a pig in Amherst and was driving him to Truro, and he was met by another farmer who said: You are taking the pig to Truro, but the owner of the pig replied: For goodness' sake don't let the pig hear you, because he thinks he is going back to Amherst, and if he hears he is going to Truro I'll have an awful time with him. And so, as the old farmer was trying to deceive the pig, the Government are trying to deceive the people of Canada by making them believe that this money will be spent on every foot of road in every county in Canada. But that is not the case, as I can prove from statements made by the spokesmen of the Government. That is a bold charge for me to make and I would not make it if I did not have the evidence. This Government is represented in the Senate by a Minister of the Crown, and what the Government leader in the Senate says is equally binding on the Government as if it were said in this House by the Prime Minister himself. If I can prove that the Hon. Mr. Lougheed, the leader of the Conservative party in the Senate, has declared that this money is not to be expended in the general way that road moneys are expended, then I suppose you will believe it. The constitutional argument was made by some gentleman in the Senate that this money, if voted at all, would be voted in contravention of the terms of the British North America Act, and in support of their contention they pointed to subsection 10 of section 92 of that Act. That section

enumerates the many things over which the provincial governments and legislatures have exclusive jurisdiction, and, amongst others, it mentions:

> Local works and undertakings other than such as are of the following class.

One of the gentlemen who took this constitutional objection was contending that this subject being exclusively within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures, it could not be dealt with by this Parliament. The Hon. Mr. Lougheed is a lawyer of many years experience and a gentleman of good standing in his profession, so that he was not to be taken by surprise on a question of this kind, and he made the answer of a constitutional lawyer to the objection which had been taken. He said: You are mistaken entirely; this does not come at all within the class of works you speak of; you say this should not be done because it is 'local works and undertakings in the province'; it is not that at all and your point is not well taken. Now, if these roads are to be built from A to B and from B to C all along the different concessions, as roads are usually built, then nothing could more fully come within that definition of local works appertaining to local matters. But the leader of the Senate got over that, and said that was not the intention at all.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: When the House rose at six o'clock, I was endeavouring to show, from the argument of the hon. leader of the Government in the Senate, that the Roads Bill, so-called, was not a matter calculated for the general improvement of the roads of the different provinces, but was a Bill that was intended for interprovincial roads. I was pointing out, following the argument of the hon. leader of the Government in the Senate, (Hon. Mr. Lougheed), when he was answering the contentions made by Senators made in the same Chamber, that this Bill was a trespass upon provincial rights. The hon. Senator, representing his own views and the views of the Government of the day, was setting forth that this was not in any sense a trespass upon the prerogatives and rights of provincial governments, but was absolutely and fully within the powers of this Parliament. He was arguing that the Bill, which he was then supporting as a Government Bill in the Senate, came not within subsection 10 of section 92 of the British North America Act, but within subsections 'A,' 'B' and 'C' of subsection 10. Subsection 10 itself gives to the provinces, absolutely and exclusively, local works and undertakings other than such as are of the following classes:

> (a) Lines of steam or other ships, railways, canals, telegraphs, and other works and undertakings connecting the province with any other or others of the provinces, or extending beyond the limits of the province:
>
> (b) Lines of steamships between the province and any British or foreign country:
>
> (c) Such works as, although wholly situate within the province, are before or after their execution declared by the Parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more of the provinces.

The hon. Senator was contending that this Roads Bill came within the scope and purview of subsection 'A,' 'B' and 'C' or some one of them, and was within the powers of this Parliament and not subject to the criticisms set forth by the hon. gentlemen who were contending that this was a trespass or an imposition upon the rights and prerogatives of provincial legislatures. In support of his contention the hon. Senator spoke as follows:

> If hon. gentlemen will look at the preamble of the Bill they should come to a different conclusion than that which they apparently have arrived at as the object of this Bill. If they will observe the language of the preamble of the Bill they will find that this is not a local undertaking. This has not for its object the improvement of the roads in a particular municipality, or group of municipalities. It is not intended for a moment that this assistance should be given to the ordinary highway in a local sense.
>
> Then I direct the attention of hon. gentlemen to the first clause of the Bill in which this is entitled the Canadian Highways Improvement Act. A proper distinction should be drawn between the Bill and the meaning which hon. gentlemen are disposed to attach to it. Hon. gentlemen seem to think that the Government of the day in its generosity has suddenly come to the conclusion that municipalities should be helped and that the provinces should be helped only so far as the development of local highways is concerned. But there is a larger object than that in view. The Government has the object in view set out in the preamble of the Bill. I maintain that while highways in their local sense are peculiarly provincial undertakings, that this is more than a provincial undertaking. This is an interprovincial and national undertaking and does not come within that class of cases referred to by my hon. friends, and particularly the hon. gentleman from DeLorimier, who cited to us last night section 92 of the British North America Act, in which he sought to bring this undertaking under subsection 10 of section 92, and within the language 'local works and undertakings.'

That is the clean-cut argument of the hon. the leader of the Government of the Senate.

If we are to understand the English language at all and to understand the application which the hon. gentleman makes of the provisions of subsection 10 of subsection 92 of the British North America Act, he makes it very clear and distinct, and shows it in a manner that cannot be controverted, that he puts himself within subsections 'A,' 'B' and 'C' of subsection 10 of section 92, which give this House power to deal with interprovincial matters, such as steamship lines, roads between provinces and railways and canals which extend beyond the limits of any one particular province. He says that this Bill has for its purpose a work of that character. I want to point this out to hon. gentlemen in this House, who are arguing that the Government in its generosity came down with a Bill in order to assist the different sections of roads in different counties in the whole Dominion of Canada, and that if any obstacle is thrown in the way of this Bill it is an obstacle thrown in the way of the different roads up and down the different constituencies in the Dominion. If I should on my own authority tell hon. gentlemen supporting the Government, that this was not the purpose of the Bill, they would sneer and laugh at my statement; but I am not obliged to rely upon my own statement. I have here in black and white, and in such a way that they cannot escape from it, the authoritative statement of the Government. That being the case, I submit to the House and to the country that, when any hon. gentleman tries to make out that this is a Bill that enables the Government to borrow money for the purpose of improving the highways generally, the people do not understand it so, and anybody who says that it is, is endeavouring, intentionally or otherwise, to deceive the people, for such is not the purpose and object of the Bill. I venture to think there is not a responsible member of the Government who, in view of the speech of the leader of the Senate, will undertake to say to the contrary. If so, they must revise these statements, revise their policy and acknowledge at once that what the leader of the Government in the Senate says is not to be relied upon as a true indication of what the real purpose of the Government is. This is another evidence of the fact that the trusts, combines and millionaires have such a hold upon this Government that they not only provide the ways and means by which they become millionaires, but they must also provide for their junketings, great white way from the Foothills to Halifax and possibly from Halifax to Sydney. No one road from the Foothills to Halifax could by any possibility be of any great use to the ordinary farmers along the thousands of miles of it on either side. That is said to be the purpose of this Bill, and, in that case, whether it went through or not it could not be of great importance to the farmers of this country. It is not only fair but it is most eminently desirable that the people of this country should understand what the purpose of this Bill is and should not be deceived by the Government in regard to it.

However, it is far from being the desire of any hon. member on this side of the House to throw obstacles in the way of money being provided in a legitimate and proper manner for the purpose of improving the highways of this country. But I am sure that you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, and so will other hon. gentlemen in this House who properly understand the conditions, that it is better for us to have even bad roads than to have in our country a legislation and a Government that will absolutely disregard the rules of the constitution under which we live. If it is necessary in order to improve the highways of this country, or to give more money to the local governments for any good purpose, I hope there is plenty of scope within the constitution for us to do so. It has been admitted by the Solicitor General that we could not pass this money over to the provinces without legislation being enacted for that purpose. He admitted that it was in contravention of the constitution to do otherwise—that roads were a subject particularly within the constitutional powers and rights of the provinces, and that we could not pass money over to the provinces without getting an Act of Parliament enabling us to do so. That being the case, I submit it cannot be done at all under the constitution. It means that you are endeavouring to pass a law in this Parliament which this Parliament has no authority to pass. The constitution provides that there are certain laws that can be passed by this Parliament and certain laws that can be passed by the legislatures of the different provinces. If legislation with regard to roads does not come within our constitutional powers whence do we get the powers to pass such a law? And if we are able to pass legislation with respect to roads, this being one of the things under the jurisdiction of the provinces, what subject can be said to be safe within the powers of the

provinces? Is there any subject allocated to the provinces exclusively by section 92 of the British North America Act that can be left undisturbed, if by an Act of this Parliament it can be taken away and all obstacles dealing with it removed? According to Senator Lougheed, the leader of the Government, this does not come within subsection 10, and he admits that if it did we could not deal with it. He says it comes within clauses (a) (b) and (c) of subsection 10 of section 92, and therefore we have power to deal with it. The Solicitor General did not agree that it came under clauses (a) (b) and (c) but says that we remove all doubts by passing this legislation which he thinks should be sanctioned by the Senate. Under section 92 of the British North America Act sixteen or seventeen different subjects, each one of importance to the people who live in the various provinces, come exclusively within the jurisdiction of the provinces. But the Solicitor General comes to this House with a constitutional heresy and tells us that all that is necessary in order to give us the power exclusively to deal with this subject of roads is to pass legislation in this Parliament. I submit that if that be the case, the British North America Act, so far as it giving protection to any particular province is concerned, is mere waste paper. And I submit to those who think that under section 93 of the British North America Act they have some protection in respect of questions of education in this country, who think that the provinces have exclusive rights to deal with education, that in order to keep these rights secure they will have to do away with the constitutional learning of the Solicitor General, for he says that in order to get over that difficulty all we have to do is to pass some legislation and then deal with any of these subjects just as we think proper. Without labouring with that point further, I submit that when the Government of the day comes down with a policy stating in a proper way that at the time of Confederation sufficient moneys were not allowed the provinces for the different public works, one of them being the roads and bridges of the provinces, and when they ask us on this side to vote moneys for the subjects which come exclusively within the powers of the province, we certainly will gladly give our assistance for that purpose and will vote the moneys to be properly allocated in that regard. The proper machinery provided by the constitution of this country will deal with these moneys, and there will be no trouble about it. This is nothing more or less than an increase of public moneys to be given to the provinces for this particular purpose. At different times and on several occasions large amounts of money additional to the amounts first provided have been granted to the provinces, and there has been no string attached to them, as the Government of the day wants to do in the case of this money; but each one of the provinces dealt with that money with its own machinery and in its own way. If it is necessary that more money should be given to improve the roads, and if we have the money to give, there is no reason why a properly thought-out plan should not be carried into effect. This is the money of the people. Do not let any one think for a moment that it is like the manna in the wilderness. This money is not provided by the Government exclusively. The people themselves provide it—there is no other source from which it can come.

If it is to be sent back to the people of the provinces, let it be sent to the proper authorities and handled through the proper channels. If this is done—and I have no doubt that some day it will be done—then there will be no opposition from this side of the House, because the people who spend the money will be answerable to the provinces, and the letter of the constitution will be properly adhered to. The action taken by the Government in the South Renfrew election is the chief objection we have to the appropriation of this money in the way proposed by the Government, and this objection we shall continue to have; we do not want to see the money of the people—the money of the people, I say, not of the Government—taken and used by the Government for purposes of political advantage. I am sure that the people of Canada are not so lacking of a sense of propriety or so devoid of a realization of what is meant by constitutional government as to condemn the Opposition for contending that this improvement to roads, if improvement it is to be, shall be carried out in a proper and constitutional way.

It was argued by the Solicitor General that we were stultifying ourselves in voting for the Agricultural Bill and refusing to vote for the 'Improvement to Highways Bill,' and that we were flying in the face of any constitutional argument we might make against voting for the latter. I sub-

mit that the two measures are absolutely separate and distinct, and that there is a great difference between voting for a measure for agricultural purposes and voting for a bill which provides for the improvement of roads. Section 95 of the British North America Act reads:

> In each province the legislature may make laws in relation to agriculture in the province and to immigration into the province; and it is hereby declared that the Parliament of Canada may from time to time make laws in relation to agriculture in all or any of the provinces, and to immigration into all or any of the provinces; and any law of the legislature of a province, relative to agriculture or to immigration, shall have effect in and for the province, as long and as far only as it is not repugnant to any Act of the Parliament of Canada.

There is a clear-cut authority, full and ample, giving this House the constitutional right to pass laws in reference to agriculture, and the voting for the Agricultural Bill does not in the slightest degree interfere with our opposition to unconstitutional legislation. The use of such an argument is vain, and scarcely worthy of the acute mind and careful reasoning of the Solicitor General.

One great point which is urged against us is that we are depriving the farmers of the country of the benefit of expenditure for the purpose of improving their roads, and that the roads used by the farmers who travel from their homes to adjacent towns or elsewhere were to be improved by the appropriation of this money. I think I have proved clearly and satisfactorily out of the mouth of the Government that such was not the intention of the Bill, and if the money were voted a thousand times, not one dollar of it would be expended in that way. That is the point I particularly wish to make; I desire to show the people of the country that they are being fooled or deceived by the Government and its supporters when such arguments are made.

Following the speech of my hon. friend the Solicitor General a little further, I wish to deal with that part of it in which he touched upon the tariff. Evidently the tariff is a subject which is not receiving harmonious treatment at the hands of the Government. I am quite aware that the Solicitor General has not the rank of a Cabinet Minister, but at the same time, if I have been capable of observing what has been going on during the last two years, he is in close touch with the present Administration, and knows well what is going on in the inner circles of Government. In his speech he gave us to understand that tariff revision is in prospect. For my part, I do not know whether or not there is any tariff revision in prospect. The present Government came into power under particular and peculiar circumstances. They came into power by preaching the doctrine, so far as the trade of this country was concerned, of 'leave well enough alone; do not touch the trade conditions of the country, for they could not be better.' But we never heard that the leader of the Government ever went back upon his old theory of adequate protection. Dear only knows what 'adequate protection' means. I understand that there is a new dictionary in process of compilation which will contain something like 450,000 words, and possibly in that new dictionary we may get a definition of 'adequate protection.' However, the Prime Minister promised the trusts and combines and mergers that if he and his party got into power, this policy of adequate protection would be carried out, and their interest protected. It is said, and I believe on very good authority, that the present Minister of Finance was admitted into the Cabinet because he was in a position to act as the trustee, representative, apostle and disciple of that doctrine as far as the trusts, mergers and combines were concerned. There is no other good reason why the capable Minister of Finance of former years should have been passed over and the position given to a gentleman who had not even won his spurs, and who knew nothing about politics. There must have been some underlying scheme by which he was to represent those who put up big money in order to bring the party back into power. Certainly I do not wish it to be hinted that I have had a desire to make any personal remarks about the Minister of Finance, but in carrying out this contract of putting up the tariff sky-high, and continuing the policy of ample or adequate protection, he has, to use a vulgar expression, taken cold feet. He is afraid to do it, and it is likely he will not do it—I am afraid he will fall down on the job. But he is holding on to the only cry that is left to him of leaving well enough alone. Nobody knows whether the Government will touch the tariff or not. Hon. gentlemen opposite used to complain that the Fielding tariff was not satisfactory. It was satisfactory to us, it has brought prosperity to the country from end to end, and for the present we have no evidence why it should be interfered with. It would seem to me that it will remain as it is until the affairs of the country are once more given into the

master hand of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who will make any changes that will be needed in it. I am sure that as things are going to-day there is no evidence that anything will be done by the present Administration. They are afraid to touch the tariff, they do not seem to understand it and therefore they will let it remain as it is. I must say, speaking for myself and the part of the country from which I come, that the Fielding tariff, the Fielding Administration has brought magnificent results in our part of the country. Magnificent steel, iron and coal industries grew up and were fostered under the administration of my right hon. friend and I would be loath indeed to tamper in any way with the trade policy in any way that would directly or indirectly interfere with these magnificent industries that have grown up and prospered under the administration of my right hon. friend. I am sure that such a departure would be far from any idea that he has of administration to-day, that he would do nothing that in any way would hamper or retard the advancement of these great industries.

I wish to call to the attention of the House the Mosaic vision of the Solicitor General in his speech the other night when he was dealing with the tariff. I do not know whether he understands this, but I believe he did. He said:

> When it is made—
>
> That is, the change in the tariff.
>
> —I, as associated with the Government, will do one of two things—I will accept full responsibility for the tariff as promulgated in that revision, or if I cannot do so I will sever my present association with the Government. When the tariff is revised, free wheat, agricultural implements and all other such matters will be fit and proper subjects for discussion. And I will be right in at the death; the hon. gentlemen's curiosity shall be satisfied to the limit.

I submit to you that if the people of this country are watching for light upon the probable or prospective course of the Government from this declaration of the Solicitor General they will find it rather vague. The coal interests, the steel interests, the wheat interests, the lumber interests, the fishermen and the farmers of this country are watching the trade policy of this Government. There is one consolation, that whenever the day comes that this present Government will deal with the question, when the clammy sweat of death has come over the question, when it is making its last kick, the Solicitor General will be there, he will be there at the death. I want the great interests of this country to try and figure out for themselves what consolation they can gather from this.

> When the tariff is revised free wheat, agricultural implements and all other such matters will be fit and proper subjects for discussion and I will be right there at the death.

I have heard a great many proclamations, I have watched politicians for the last thirty years and I never in my life saw any proposition so vague, so indefinite as this. The Solicitor General evidently knew what the attitude the Postmaster General was because the Postmaster General says that the tariff is a sacred temple, that it is a holy of holies into which even he could not enter at all and he takes care to say nothing about it except that it is a holy thing, that is all he will tell us about it, it is a sacred thing. His profession and calling and training does not enable him to go near it. He has heard of a certain mount in olden days which if a man put his hand to it fire issued forth and he was destroyed; he has heard of a certain ark which if a man touched he fell dead; and he regards sacred things as matters which he had better keep clear of. He tells us that the Solicitor General himself understood it in that way because if he touched it he would only be there at the death. So this idea seems to run through them all that it is a question of death the moment they touch this tariff. So, therefore, the people of this country may die without food, die without whatever is necessary for them, but this Cabinet, this Solicitor General at all events and the Postmaster General, have understood that this is a sacred structure, a sacred thing, and life is dear to them and they will not put unholy hands upon it. I suppose it would be dangerous for me to think of putting any interpretation on the speech of the Solicitor General because I have rather the reputation of being a Bible student and I find in the Bible that cursed is he that addeth to it or taketh from it. I will not add to it or take from it, but I will endeavour to make it clear to the people that there is going to be a sacrifice, blood is going to be shed and at that death the Solicitor General will be there and the Postmaster General will be looking on, at a safe distance.

Passing from that question I come to the passage that I read from the Address of His Royal Highness:

> It gives me great pleasure to be able to congratulate you upon the remarkable expansion of Canada's trade with other countries in the past fiscal year, during which our total trade far exceeded that of any preceding year.

No doubt that is the contribution of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) to the Speech from the Throne. He has no doubt done much to extend the trade of this country. The local Tory press in the part of the country I come from told us about the wonderful travelling of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. They told us that he travelled thirty-five thousand miles. That may be quite true, but I am sorry to relate that we have been given no result whatever from the travelling of these thirty-five thousand miles. If the hon. gentleman was only paid the ordinary constable fees of ten cents a mile it would cost this country considerable to meet his expenses. But, I am sorry to say that if we only paid him constable's fees there is no return whatever that would justify the venture of having sent him on those trips. It seems to me extraordinary that an old and trained veteran like the Minister of Trade and Commerce should go up and down this land, as he did in 1911, telling the people to have no truck or trade with the people across the line, that it was going to upset everything that was established in this country if any article whatever should pass over the border. Over the border, within sight of some of our towns and villages, is a population approaching closely to 100,000,000 people, a people of our own race, largely speaking our own tongue, observing our habits and customs, living much like ourselves and having that which could be traded satisfactorily and profitably with us. We are told that we should not have any trade with them, but the Minister of Trade and Commerce is sent by the present aggregation, which calls itself the Government of this country, on a fool's errand, 35,000 miles away to find trade. We have heard of men being sent upon a fool's errand. I will not say that the hon. gentleman would be on a fool's errand, but it is as much like it as one herring is like to another.

The hon. gentleman himself used to tell us in the discussion on reciprocity that the Hon. Mr. Fielding could never forget his barrel of fish and his coal hod. We have fish in abundance in the beautiful province of Nova Scotia, we have unlimited supplies of good coal, and if Mr. Fielding was always watchful as to the interests of the fishermen and watchful of the coal interests of the province of Nova Scotia, I am sure that no fault could be found with him. We have in the whole Dominion, exports in abundance of coal, fish, lumber, wheat and manufactured products. Let me ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce: Did you find any place where you could sell coal at the end of anywhere along the 35,000 miles? The answer must be no. Did you sell any lumber? No, not a foot. Did you sell any fish? No, they do not take fish at all; the Chinamen do not eat fish—cats, dogs, rats, and that sort of thing, and there would not be any great demand that I could promise to supply. Did you sell lumber? No. Potatoes? No. Any manufactured articles? No, because they do not wear any manufactured goods out there. That is the report that must be brought back to us here.

I shall wind up my reference to the condition of the hon. gentleman's report on his trade mission by the story of a coloured man who was a boss at a certain steel works. He had three furnaces to look after; he had furnace No. 1, furnace No. 2, and a locomotive to take care of. Each morning he had to report to his boss what had gone on during the night. One morning he came back and reported that furnace No. 2 was making white iron, which is worse than doing nothing. He said: We burned the bars out of No. 1 at four o'clock this morning, and at twelve o'clock at night we put the locomotive off the track; everything else is all right. That is the situation. This poor coloured gentleman had only three things to look after. In one furnace they burned the bars out, the other was making white iron, and the locomotive went off the track, but everything else, he said, was all right.

We have a certain number of things to export from this country—coal, lumber, fish, manufactured articles and wheat. We ask the hon. gentleman: Did you find any trade or any place where we can sell these things? The hon. gentleman must say: No, but everything else is all right. That, Sir, is the condition of trade in so far as its expansion has been brought about by any effort of this Government.

Now I come to another point. There is a paragraph in the Address which reads as follows:

> In connection with the highly important subject of transportation of our products, the provision of adequate terminal facilities at our great national ports has received and is receiving the attention of my advisers.

This is the question that comes close to home, and I want to touch briefly upon the situation in my own province and county in so far as the policy of the last Administration is concerned as compared with the policy of the present Administration. We are told that much is being

done for the development of terminal facilities at ocean ports. We have on the Atlantic coast in Canada some very excellent ports. We have the port of St. John, the port of Halifax, and the port of Sydney and North Sydney. We have three good harbours particularly. We have many others. I am not a Halifax man, and therefore I think that I can say that they have a good port at St. John, although perhaps a Halifax man might say differently. The port of St. John is good enough, at all events, for our good friends, Mackenzie and Mann, to take their steamers away from Halifax and send them to St. John, not because the port is better but because of a political end to be served. In the port of Halifax large expenditures of money are being made. We do not begrudge them at all. At the port of Sydney, at North Sydney, and the great port of the steel works, on the other side of the water, not a dollar has been expended. We had a promise from the outgoing Administration to build a magnificent terminus at North Sydney. We had the Intercolonial railway changed from its old route and brought around to the port of North Sydney for the purpose of making it a magnificent terminus for the Intercolonial, as we thought. But what do I find? I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) is not in his seat. We find that, although I myself and others had been able to induce the preceding Government to make this change and to bring this road from the wrong place to the right place in order to get the harbour at the proper angle and at the proper depth of water, the present Minister of Railways and Canals has ignored our protest, and that, after all the expenditure we have gone to to change this road, he is advising doing the trade of this port without touching this magnificent harbour at all except by means of the old, inadequate terminus constructed a number of years ago, and which is quite unequal to the present necessities. If the statement is true that the Government is making a large expenditure at the terminal port, why is it that the expenditure of a few hundred dollars is going to stand in the way of making one of the big outstanding ports on the whole Atlantic coast of Canada a fit and proper place for the handling of the business of this great country? I protest against it, I will protest against it always, and I say to this House and the Government that as I have fought the change before, when the day comes I will fight it again, and will never give this question a rest until the right thing is done. I will stand by the principle that nothing is settled until it is settled right, and the terminals of North Sydney will never be settled right until they are put into the proper place, and that magnificent port comes to its own in so far as Government improvement is concerned. Under the administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, we were given not only the promise but the actuality of a railway in the county of Victoria, extending to the capital of that county and through the heart of the county down to the placid waters of the harbour. When the Liberal Government went out of power we had the money voted for that project and we had the contract let. But then, this chilling blight came on; the Conservative Government came into power; the contract was cancelled, and, so long as this Government remains in power farewell and forever to any improvements in that county. The Laurier Government were to build railways through the counties of Halifax, Guysborough, Pictou, and Victoria, but with the exception of that part of the railway which traversed the county of Halifax, the Conservative Government discontinued the scheme and left us helpless. I submit that was not a fair deal; it was not what you would expect of a man of the proportions and ability of the Prime Minister in dealing with a big question of this kind; it was not fair for him to build the railway through his own constituency and leave the other constituencies, equally important, without railway communication. I appeal to the Government now, and it is not yet too late, to place in the proper location the railway they are now building. This is not a local question; it is a national question. It is not contended that the public works undertaken at Halifax are of local importance, nor should works undertaken in the great port of Sydney and North Sydney be considered as anything but national works. The trade with Newfoundland, which is all landed at Sydney, is one of the largest assets of the Intercolonial railway, and why should not the Government of Canada provide proper facilities for handling that trade? I venture the prediction that whoever is living twenty-five or thirty years hence, if that road is left where they propose to leave it to-day, will regard it as an act of madness that it was not continued to the

9 p.m.

great port of Sydney. These questions are not receiving the attention they deserve from this Government. I trust the day is not far distant when the men now in office will be hurled from power, and when we shall again see an intelligent Government with a policy which will develop the counties of eastern Nova Scotia and every other section of Canada which is not receiving fair treatment to-day, and which will take measures to bring in touch with the pulsation of the commercial centres of the Dominion and the outside world, the fertile and productive regions in my province now neglected and held back. I fail to see any of the great things which gentlemen opposite tell us this Government is doing. If the people of this country had servants who were stupid they might put up with them, but when incapacity is added to stupidity I do not think the people will long stand for it. We have evidence of the incapacity, the stupid blundering, in many cases the insincerity and possibly dishonesty of this Government, whether that be known to the heads of the departments or not. I have no doubt the day is not far distant when the Government, Solicitor General and Postmaster General, and everybody else who has anything to do with it, will, to use a poetic but perhaps not elegant expression: turn their toes up to the roots of the daisies; and then, the people of Canada will have done with them. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity of presenting my views on these questions to the House and to the country.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (Simcoe East): I can congratulate the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), in this, that he has dispelled some of the gloom caused amongst his friends when they read the Montreal Daily Mail this morning. His merry quips and his ancient stories have been somewhat refreshing, and even the fine old crust on them does not much detract from their interest and their amusement. If the hon. gentleman had delivered his somewhat lengthy speech in his own riding, I have no doubt little importance would be attached to it, because of the fact that there is to-day in that part of the country as elsewhere, a certain amount of depression which all of us would like to see disappear. I am not going to say that Canada is as prosperous to-day as it has been for the past two or three years, for no man can expect enormous expansion to continue, year in and year out, without a check. In recent years railway building in Canada has proceeded with unexampled rapidity, and an enormous number of men have been employed in construction work on the Canadian Northern railway, the Canadian Pacific railway, and the Transcontinental railway. Many of these enormous undertakings of the railway companies have now been brought to a conclusion, and hence it is that a number of workingmen have been thrown out of employment, with the result that every industry in the country has been more or less affected. An hon. gentleman opposite the other day, speaking of the high cost of living, said that canned goods were higher in price than ever before, but if that hon. gentleman had only known what the real facts are, he would have had to admit that canned goods are cheaper to-day in Canada than they have been at any period during the last five years. That fact cannot be gainsaid, because there are hon gentlemen on this side of the House who are engaged in that industry and can vouch for it. Follow the line of construction of any railway in this country, and you will find the route marked with empty tin cans, which contained the food supplied to the men in the construction camps, and due to the completion of these railways, the men are out of employment and there is not the demand for canned goods there once was. But these hon. gentlemen, instead of coming to Parliament as representatives of the people and endeavouring to ameliorate conditions, are doing what? Endeavouring to black-eye Canada in every part of the world, and the greatest sinner of them all is the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. That right hon. gentleman should have made sure of his facts before he started out to black-eye Canada, as he did the other night. He wishes to have it heralded from one end of Europe to the other that poverty and destitution are stalking throughout Canada, and never has the right hon. gentleman turned over on his tongue a more delicious morsel than when he said the other night: 'Well, hard times are here.' The right hon. gentleman has been in power in this country, and at that time what had his policy to do with the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway between the city of Toronto and Ottawa, or the Canadian Northern railway except in this, that his Government with the most lavish hand was handing out bonuses at all times and at all seasons? Yet these gentlemen are complaining to-day when this Government is doing what any government should do in a time of stress,

when it can well afford to discount the future and endeavour to meet the requirements of the people by placing before them for construction public works that are absolutely necessary with the future prospects of the country.

My hon. friend who has just resumed his seat, in a very small portion of his speech, appealed to the Government not to interfere with the duty on iron. There is no portion of the hon. gentleman's speech which will be appreciated where he lives more than the small reference which he made to the duty on iron in this country. I regret that the hon. gentleman did not devote all his time to discussing the iron question in Canada to-day, one of the greatest questions before the people of Canada, not only for the present but for the future. The other day Senator Colonel Mason moved the adoption of the Address. Colonel Mason is a well known figure in the commercial life of Canada. He is president of one of the leading banks, and it was a worthy comment made by him that despite the fact that our imports are about $700,000,000, nearly one-fifth of all our imports are made up of iron and iron products. What has this country been doing for the last ten years? Endeavouring to develop the iron industry. Go in what direction you will and you will find that attempts have been made in towns, in cities, to build up what should be the greatest industry in any country, the iron industry, because it enters into so many manufactured goods.

What has Germany done in that respect? I read in a handbook to-day that whereas in 1888 only 2,750,000 tons of pig-iron were produced in Germany, by a beneficent, by a proper and by a wholesome policy of protection, in 1912 the production had increased to the enormous extent of 17,852,000 tons. Where is Canada to-day? What has she been doing on this iron question? When our friends were in power, they assured the town of Port Arthur that they would be in a position to develop the iron industry in this country. They paid out of the public coffers of Canada a bonus to the extent of $200,000 for a railway to lead up to the iron mines. $2,000,000 was then invested in an iron plant. The city of Port Arthur, depending on their assurance that a fair protection would be accorded to the iron industry, bonused the concern to the extent of $200,000. The town of Midland a few years ago gave a bonus of $50,000 to an industry in that town. Why? Because they believed that the policy of the country would be one of protection to the iron industry. The same thing has gone on in other parts of Canada as well as in Ontario. I go down to Gloucester, N.B., The Government bonused in that county to the extent of $200,000, a railway to lead up to what is probably one of the richest iron mines in the Dominion of Canada. Surely when they have invested their money in a mine, when they built their railway, and when the Government granted the bonus that was granted, they expected that in due time there would be such a policy of protection to the iron industry that not only would the mine be developed, but that a large industry would be placed there for the production of pig iron. What has happened? There is this mine in New Brunswick with its enormous wealth of pig iron lying idle, and five or six hundred men who would be engaged in mining it are out of employment and no smelters have been built.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is that the Canadian Iron Company's property?

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: That is one of theirs. I can go into the province of Nova Scotia, rich in ore and coal. How is the iron industry in that country to-day? I read the following in The Weekly Sun:

> In Nova Scotia too, blast furnaces are likely to close down for some weeks and collieries in that province will almost certainly follow suit. The United States iron trade is suffering as well. Across the line it is reported that a million iron workers are idle.

What is the result of the stagnation of the iron trade in the United States? The result is that the American people engaged in this line of industry are to-day dumping into Canada what available pig iron they may have, trying to find a market for it here, because they have heard that most of our local smelters are shut down.

What is the condition of the iron industry in Canada? Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House the other day made it plain that this Government should, before there was any change or any abatement in the trade of the country, take time by the forelock and make provision for it. If that is a charge at the door of this Government, how much more so was it a charge at the door of the late Government, because under their policy there was a scheme or plan by which the bounties to iron were given, on a sliding scale it is true; but it is well known that under legislative enactment the time would come when they would be ended

and that measure of protection or bounty would be taken off iron, and it was the duty of the Government to increase their tariff duty on iron so as to protect it for the the future.

The duty on iron is $2.50 per ton, that is under the general tariff. Under the British preferential tariff it is $1.50 per ton. Last year we imported from the United States $3,000,000 worth of pig iron at the uniform price of only $13 per ton. Let me call the attention of the House to this fact, that the lower the price in the States of pig iron imported into this country, the higher the duty. For instance, suppose the price were $20 per ton. The duty being $2.50 per ton would be nearly 12½ per cent; by reason of the fact that the price ruled so low, namely, $13 per ton, the duty would be nearly 19 per cent. I am free to admit that here in Canada we have conditions which make it more difficult for us to cope with the people of the United States in the production of iron. In the first place, the climate is against us. The rigours of our winters are against the employer who hopes to get out of his employees as much as they could give under different conditions. Ore cannot be handled, coke cannot be handled, nor can any of the articles that go into the composition of iron, with the inclement weather we have in this country as compared with the United States. In the next place, we have not the field of labour to draw upon that they have. With the huge coloured population the United States have, how cheap labour is in that country. And, worse than that, so far as Ontario is concerned, every pound of coke that we use, we must draw from the United States, thereby incurring a large cost for railway carriage. For these reasons, and with the knowledge of these facts, it is easy to understand the odds we must face. And neither this Government nor the last Government can deny that these facts have been from time to time brought to their attention and they have been urged to take action before the crisis was reached that has been reached in our iron industry.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the hon. gentleman tell us why this Government has done nothing for this industry for the last two sessions?

Mr. BENNETT: The question is a fair one. All I can say to the hon. gentleman is that I believe that had there been unanimity in this House and no effort to make political capital out of the question, something might have been done for the iron industry, to the benefit of Canada as a whole.

Mr. NESBITT: The hon. gentleman speaks of it as being one of our disadvantages in iron manufacture that we have not the coloured labour. Would he say where the United States Steel Corporation, the Pittsburgh people, use coloured labour?

Mr. BENNETT: I suppose the hon. gentleman does not imagine that the Pittsburgh labour is coloured labour. But I did think that he knew that in Birmingham, Alabama, and other points hundreds of thousands of tons of pig iron are made by coloured labour and that iron comes into competition with the Pittsburgh iron.

Mr. NESBITT: I would like to tell the hon gentleman that the United States Steel Corporation are the largest makers of pig-iron in the United States, and they do not use coloured labour.

Mr. BENNETT: They are not the only manufacturers of iron.

Mr. NESBITT: No, but they are the largest.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not contradict that. But the Pittsburg people have the advantage of having coal close at hand, and that, no doubt, to some extent, offsets the advantage of the coloured labour in the South. Now, the pig-iron output of this country in 1912 was 917,925 tons, of a value of $12,307,000. At that time we had employed in the blast furnaces 1,778 men. I do not know how many there are to-day. But I must say I think these figures that I have taken are in error, because if I am correctly informed, the blast furnaces at Sydney employ probably 3,000 men, and even more. I am not here to complain only of what the prior Government did, I am here to complain of what the present Government is doing and what hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House are doing, or rather not doing, when they fail to come to the rescue of this, the biggest industry in Canada, an industry which might be made greater than it has ever been simply by correcting the mistakes made by the past Government, which mistakes are being continued by the Government of to-day. On this subject I speak feelingly, on this subject I speak in earnestness. For I know what the iron industry means to a town. I live in the town of Midland. I saw it first a struggling lumber village. I saw two iron furnaces come to

that place and employ from 400 to 600 men. I saw splendid streets opened and houses filled with the families of men who drew their $2 and $3 and $4 a day. And at one fell swoop I saw these industries closed and the men scattered to the four winds of heaven. And I come here to find a Parliament that occupies its time with resurrecting bygone issues that have been controversial for twenty years instead of coming to the rescue of one of the greatest industries of the country, when that rescue could be effected by the two parties being united in the work.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why has not the Government moved in the matter? They have the responsibility.

Mr. BENNETT: If I can move them, I certainly will do so. I am sorry if I have not shown the hon. gentleman that that is what I am trying to do. And I hope he will speak from his place on this question and that he will implore the Government, as I am imploring it, to take action.

Now, I come to another matter in which Canada stands at a disadvantage with respect to the iron question. Not only on the question of pig iron are we handicapped, but on the question of what is known as scrap iron as well. Scrap iron is used in conjunction with the ore in all the smelters; I have seen it used in Midland, and it is used elsewhere. Last year we imported from the United States no less than 54,000 tons of scrap iron. The duty is only $1 per ton, and as the price is about $14 a ton, the duty is about 7 per cent. I am sorry the Minister of Finance is not in his place tonight, because I should wish to address myself to him particularly in regard to one matter in relation to which the iron duties are of the greatest importance. A few years ago, before the change of Government, in answer to the request and demand of the agricultural implement manufacturers, and at an evil moment for the iron industry in this country, Hon. Mr. Fielding made the concession of reducing the duty on agricultural implements. The duty was reduced on mowers, reapers, harvesters, binders and attachments from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent. At the same time, the raw material was admitted free of duty. That was a greater concession to the manufacturer than he had enjoyed before in having 20 per cent duty on the manufactured goods. For, while his duty was only decreased 2½ per cent, he was given permission to import his materials duty free. This concession, it was claimed by the iron people, was manifestly to their disadvantage. I am not here to say to what rate these duties should be increased, but I am here to call the attention of the House to the certain important facts. We are bringing into this country the enormous amount of $140,000,000 worth of iron and iron products, as I have stated, and as was shown by Senator Mason. We have iron in our mines; we have coal in our country; we have subsidized railways to all these different mines; and towns and cities have expended thousands upon thousands of dollars in bonuses. It is high time the Government should awaken to the emergency, and high time that both sides joined in backing up the Government in making such changes in the tariff that the smoke may again issue from these smelters, that other smelters may be built in the country, and that all the other advantages may be gained that follow in the wake of this great industry. In Ontario we talk much about the advantages of cheap power. It has been demonstrated in Germany, where they have the coal, and have used that coal to make coke, that the by-products of the coke amount to enormous sums. Why could not we have this industry with its by-products and all the wealth which would thereby be created? And from gas issuing from the coke ovens power would be produced at cheaper prices than those at which electrical energy can be sold.

I know it will be argued by some persons that if you increase the duties on iron a monopoly will be created. In answer to that, I have only this to say: We have here in Canada laws against combines. If a combine is made in restraint of trade or to unduly enhance prices, let that law be enforced, and that will have the effect of bringing prices down. After all has been said and done, the amount of iron that enters into the manufacture of one of these implements is but a mere bagatelle; I am assured that in the ordinary reaper or mower only about $3.50 worth of iron is used, so that no very great excess of price would be engendered. Take the case of malleable iron. We imported from the United States last year upwards of $2,000,000 worth of malleable iron, paying duty at the rate of 27½ per cent. We have malleable iron industries in this country, and they too might manufacture what is necessary for the requirements of

Canada. I do hope the Government will take this matter into their serious consideration, and that such changes may be made in the tariff as will result in the opening up of the iron industry, thus developing the mines, creating traffic for the railways and giving employment to thousands of men who cannot be employed in this country and who must be driven out of Canada altogether unless aid is given to this industry at once.

During the debate more or less has been said in regard to the matter of transportation. My hon. friend the member for West Huron (Mr. Lewis) addressed himself to the House the other afternoon on the question of the losses on the Great Lakes during the past few months. Every hon. gentleman within the sound of my voice knows what happened on the occasions referred to. Two hundred and fifty valuable lives were lost. Insurance companies can compensate the owners of the vessels which were lost, but no power can compensate the families which have been blighted with sorrow and which have had their breadwinners taken from them. I want to say here that a great deal can be done in Canada by the Government of the day in the way of preventing the occurrence in future of such catastrophies. The Government has to-day announced the policy of expending a large sum of money on what is known as the French River section of the Georgian Bay canal. A glance at the map will point out to any hon. gentleman that the mouth of the French river is at the north end of Georgian bay, near Manitoulin island. A large amount of money—I shall not charge my memory with recalling how many millions—has been expended on enlarging channels north of Manitoulin island, and it would need the expenditure of but a few additional millions to provide a channel from Port Arthur and Fort William through the Sault canal and north of Manitoulin to all Georgian bay ports. When I tell the House that last year, out of 80,000,000 bushels of grain—I am referring to wheat alone—which were shipped from Fort William, over one-half that quantity was delivered at points on the Georgian bay, it is fair to argue that by a better system of routing, not only 40,000,000, but 80,000,000 bushels might be taken that way. The Georgian bay ports serve a number of routes. While 80,000,000 bushels of grain may come from our Canadian Northwest and be delivered from Fort William at different points, the bulk of that amount does not by any means go by way of export either through New York or Montreal. A large proportion, I should say fully 50 per cent of it, is consumed in Canada, and therefore, through the different ports on the Georgian bay which are reached by the Canadian Pacific railway and by the Grand Trunk railway, this grain could be distributed throughout the different provinces of Canada. In addition to that a large portion of the grain from the north western states goes to the eastern and northeastern states via this route. This grain can be delivered from Montreal to eastern and northeastern states as cheaply as it can be delivered from the port of Buffalo, therefore it should be the object of the Government, by all possible means, to endeavour to divert that trade into the channels to which I have referred, and prevent its going to Buffalo. We are building up in Canada a large marine trade. Hon. gentlemen who do not live near the Grand Lakes have no conception of the immensity of the trade that is done to-day on these lakes; less have they any idea of the size of the vessels engaged in that trade. When I tell hon. gentlemen that in these Georgian Bay ports during the season of navigation they can see vessels carrying half a million bushels of grain of the value of half a million dollars, involving a total investment, including cargo, of $1,000,000, it will be at once apparent to them that a large and increasing trade is being done. If we are to carry that trade through Canadian channels, then the result will be the building up of a Canadian fleet, the giving of employment to Canadians on the vessels, and the grain in turn will be carried over Canadian railways. What avail is it to Canada if forty million bushels of grain are placed in American bottoms at Fort William, carried to Buffalo on American railways, and transported to the city of New York? That is no benefit to Canada at all; it does not leave one cent in the country. But if by the means I have indicated you can transfer that forty million bushels of grain to ports on the Georgian bay, hand it over then to the Canadian Pacific railway and to the Grand Trunk railway, and to their many branch lines and direct connections to New York and other United States ports, you would give to the Canadian railway companies a large amount of trade. We are handicapped in Canada in respect of this carrying trade. There is no doubt about it that when the port of Montreal is closed we are under the disadvantage of a severe handicap. I believe, as I was informed very credibly a short time ago, that the Canadian Pacific railway

recently made this arrangement: they carried to the Suspension bridge ten million bushels of grain, which was then handed over to the New York Central railway to be carried down to New York for export to England and other European countries. What did that mean? It meant that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were better satisfied to have the profit that would enure to them by the carrying of the grain from Fort William to the Suspension bridge than to carry it to Halifax or St. John, N.B. What is to be done to better these conditions? In the first place, the great handicap exists at Montreal, because the grain trade is not in full force and in full volume until the port of Montreal is on the point of closing up for the winter. The port of Montreal is invariably closed on November 26 or 27, and it is just about that time of the year that the grain is being pushed forward in the greatest volume. The result is that these large United States freighters, capable of carrying half a million bushels, come to Fort William, load up there—because it is no contravention of the coasting laws to ply between a Canadian port and a United States port—go down to Buffalo, tax the elevator accommodation there to its uttermost and those that cannot be accommodated become floating storehouses, until the grain can be unloaded later. Canada thereby lost last year the carrying by Canadian vessels and Canadian railways of the immense amount of 40,000,000 bushels of grain. This Government has now embarked on what to my mind is going to be a damaging project: the deepening of the Welland canal, but that is a matter of Government policy. No word of mine can stay it now, and I only hope and trust that it will not be a mistake. But if the vessels of the United States were able last year to come to our Canadian ports at Fort William and Port Arthur and take 40,000,000 bushels of grain from there to Buffalo, when the Welland canal is deepened to 25 or 30 feet, and will accommodate these large lake freighters, will they not be able then to take another 40,000,000 bushels of grain to Oswego, which is a shorter rail haul than to New York from Buffalo? Are we going to build up a merchant marine fleet in Canada? We are trying to do it. My hon. friend the hon. member for West Toronto (Sir Edmund Osler) is one of the owners of a large line of freighters on the lakes. To-day they are building—and I am glad they are doing so, because it gives that much more employment to Canada, and increases Canadian tonnage to that extent—an immense barge capable of carrying 10,000 tons. In the shipyards at Port Arthur the company commonly known as the Richelieu Amalgamated Company is building a huge barge capable of carrying some 10,000 tons.

And to-day in the town of Sarnia there is a vessel receiving her finishing touches, one of the finest vessels on the lakes, I suppose she will be the Empress of the Great Lakes, outstripping in stability and grandeur anything on the American side as a passenger steamer. While capital in this country is being invested along these lines to build up the trade of the country, why should not Canada, through its Parliament and its Government, take steps to prevent the trade from slipping from Canadian channels and being diverted into American? I believe it can be done but it can only be done by closing the doors before the horse is stolen. I am not addressing myself to this matter from a local point of view at all. I live in a section of the country which has risen to what was prophesied years ago that an enormous quantity of grain would be carried through that point. Twenty years ago when the late Mr. Hays paid his first visit to Midland, when I went with the mayor to call on him as an act of courtesy, he said that when the Grand Trunk had their line completed through to Montreal with better grades they hoped to be able to carry not only Canadian grain to Montreal but also to carry a large portion of the American grain. And what has the foresight of the Canadian Pacific railway done? Grades were against them, distances were against them from Owen Sound to Montreal. At a cost of $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 they, without any government subvention, built a line from their own town of Port McNichol across to a point near Peterborough, eliminating grades, making a perfect roadbed, and to-day you can see a train moving out loaded with 60,000 bushels of grain. In consultation with a leading official of the Canadian Pacific railway I was told that they hoped not only to carry through the Canadian channel, by Canadian vessels and by Canadian railways, the grain of the Canadian northwest to an immense extent, but to go right into Duluth and take the grain away from the American vessels and railroads, grain intended for distribution to the eastern States and also all through Canada. What is the handicap at Montreal? I do not live in Montreal so I do not know the facts, but if I am correctly informed, and I think I am well within

the mark, ocean vessels were lying in Montreal for twenty days at a time and Great Lake barges lay there from ten to twenty days at a time. Why? Because there was not sufficient elevator accommodation. I do not believe it is the business of the Government or of the country or that it will ever be the business of private capital to build such elevators simply for the purpose of storing grain but if they could keep a perpetual stream of grain passing through they could make money but they cannot keep them there perpetually or for a great length of time simply for the storage of grain. What to my mind must be done is to secure better ocean rates from Canada to the Old Country. That matter has been placed before the Government. It has had a sympathetic hearing and that is all. Why cannot this Government engage in the institution and forming of an insurance business for lake freight and ocean freight in this country? If our vessel interests on the Great Lakes and on the ocean are unjustly discriminated against by the American and British companies let this Government form itself into a business proposition and give to the vessel interests of this country such rates of insurance that they will be able to compete with the out-going freight on vessels from New York. This matter should commend itself to the Government at the very earliest day. We have great advantages in this country to develop that trade to go by the north shore of Manitoulin island and by these two great railway systems and ports on the Georgian bay. When I speak of these two great railways let hon. gentlemen consider that the Grand Trunk have not only one line of railway from the Georgian bay but two because they own the railway from Depot Harbour, so the Grand Trunk have two lines by which they can carry the grain to the northeastern States as well as to our own Canadian ports or even to New York itself. If there is danger of accident and catastrophe on the Great Lakes, if they occur on the four lakes, Ontario, Erie, Superior and Huron, surely they will be minimized if the trade only has to run the length of one lake and if the danger is minimized surely the insurance can be kept down. If you discuss this matter with a vessel man he will say there is a uniform rate of insurance whether to Buffalo or Georgian bay ports. In the first place Canada has a great advantage or should have over the United States in the matter of insurance in this that, while I have never seen a compilation of figures, I think I am well within the mark in saying that insurance companies, prior to last year when the catastrophies occurred on lake Huron, paid more insurance losses for collisions between Sarnia and Detroit than on all the lakes put together. Why is that? Because there are narrow places and you see the huge vessels going up and down—and I think I am within the mark when I say every five minutes a vessel passes up or down—in the fall of the year when there may be snowstorms or heavy fog there are a great many collisions and as a result a great deal of money has been lost by the insurance companies. More than that every vessel that goes to a point on the Georgian bay will make three trips there as against one trip to Buffalo. Surely that is a manifest advantage when you consider the size of a boat carrying 500,000 bushels of grain where the rate may be as high as 3 cents a bushel. There is a saving of two trips. Then there is another question of importance and that is that by our route there is no detention. Reading the vessel reports you will often see a whole fleet delayed at lake St. Clair or some other narrow point by reason of a heavy fog when there is no possibility of moving forward and they all come to a halt for fear of accident. I believe that this country and this Parliament could well address themselves to the task of discussing a matter of this kind. It is not a purely local matter, it is not even a provincial matter, it is a matter of great importance to the whole country. Surely it is a matter of importance to the farmer of the West if he can lessen his freight rates and to the manufacturer in the East if he can carry back his manufactured goods at a lower rate. I wish that hon. gentlemen in this Chamber would visit some of these ports on the Great Lakes and see the possibilities there are there for the development of the carrying trade of the country. The Canadian Pacific railway alone employ over 75,000 men and, taking four per family, that means the up-keeping by that company of a population of 300,000. The Grand Trunk railway must have almost a similar number and therefore it is to our manifest advantage that the railway interests of this country should be advanced so that the Canadian Pacific railway will employ not 75,000 men, but double 75,000 and every other company may be increased proportionately. I am addressing myself to these two matters because they affect the part of the community to which I belong and from which I

come, and the people of my constituency are deeply interested in this whole question. They are vitally interested in the two questions. I think I can fairly say that the iron industry, affecting as it does every province of this Dominion, has made the province of Nova Scotia, and I ask hon. gentlemen where would the province of Nova Scotia have been to-day had it not been for the development of the iron industry? Where would the thousands of young men in this province have been? Certainly not in that province where they have passed into the ranks of mechanics and artisans of a high grade. This industry has affected the development of the whole country. Why, therefore, not develop in New Brunswick, where they have those splendid areas of iron ore, a large iron and steel business? Why not develop these industries in the province of Ontario, where we have large iron deposits? Go into the county of Hastings, and you will find that they have them there, go to Port Arthur and Fort William, and you will find that they have them adjoining those cities. Let us spend our energies and bring our arguments to bear upon the Government in order that this iron industry may be developed. The coming into the Chamber of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) reminds me of the fact that within the past year a smelter has been established at Port Colborne. This should be backed up. The duty on pig iron should be raised to such an extent, in my opinion, whether it should be $5 a ton or $6 a ton, that the Canadian market would be guaranteed to the Canadian producer of pig iron, with the result that this great industry would give employment to thousands of men in this country. Open up and develop the mines and keep within our own borders the wealth that is now going to the neighbouring republic.

I am not going into many of the other questions that have been discussed. They will be discussed, no doubt, on the Budget. I am a believer in this, that we here in Canada have been galloping at too fast a gait. We have had too much gambling in the Northwest in lands. Go to any town in the province of Ontario, and what is the statement that will be made to you? Men here are hard up by reason of the fact that they have been making payments on land in the Northwest. With all my friends who have come down from the Northwest, it is all one and the same story—they have been indiscreet, they have got property rich, they have been buying lands very freely, and as a consequence they have not been able to pay their agricultural implement and store bills. But these things are all going to level themselves up. This country is only on the edge of its development. I saw it stated the other day by Mr. Michener, the leader of the Opposition in the Alberta Legislature, that in Alberta only two per cent of the arable land is under cultivation. I have heard the statement made, and I believe it is within the mark, that the province of Saskatchewan has less than ten per cent of its arable land cultivated, and the old province of Manitoba still has large areas of land that have not been taken up. What does it mean to Canada, to us here in Eastern Canada, who have felt the throb of development in the building up of our industries and factories as a result of the settlement in the West of thousands, and hundreds of thousands of farmers? When there comes a production from that western country, not of 200,000,000 bushels, but of ten times 200,000,000 bushels of grain, and when Canada has three great Transcontinental railways in full operation, it will mean everything not only for Eastern Canada but for Western Canada. Let hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House look before them and see what is going on in this country. Look at the railway construction that is being commenced to-day, the branch lines in the Northwest. True, in old Ontario we are not having new lines of railway constructed such as we had in years past. We are having dry docks built at Vancouver and at Sault Ste. Marie, and there is an expectation of others being built at different points. We are having grain elevators constructed; a new one is being built for the Canadian Pacific railway at Port McNichol. In the West we see indications that flour mills are to be erected in anticipation of the flour traffic westward by way of the Panama canal. We have the ship-building industry that I have referred to before. On all sides we see the prospect of the coming to Canada of thousands of people. Not only from Great Britain and from Europe, but from the United States the tide of immigration has set in for Canada. We are the only country in the world to-day that has unbounded areas of land to give free to the man who wishes to come in and become a citizen of this great country. Let the beacon lights of Canada for years to come be hope in Canadians and faith in Canada.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, I must compliment the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. W. H. Bennett) on the excellent speech he has made. I have heard him speak in this House quite a number of times when he was formerly a member, and since he became a member recently, and I must say, after listening to the speech he made to-night, at the same time not wishing to cast any reflection upon the speeches of hon. gentlemen who preceded him, that we should have more of these speeches in this debate and in the House.

With the example before me I am going to try and deal with one or two questions that should be of practical interest to the country, and I propose to do it in a very short time. I was attracted and much pleased with the announcement made by the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) this afternoon that we are at last to have parcel post in this country. There is a saying in the Bible that bread cast upon the waters will return after many days. Some of us have cast bread on the waters of this Parliament in favour of parcel post, and we see a realization of our hopes in the coming back of the bread on these waters now. While it may be said that progress is slow in this country, still we are always making some progress, and I congratulate the hon. Postmaster General on the announcement this afternoon that at last we are to have parcel post. I hope he will make his experiment on the largest possible lines, that he will take heart from the splendid success of parcel post in the United States, and that when he introduces the system next month the terms will be liberal, the service will be wide, and that the benefits will be appreciated in every portion of the country.

It is our privilege in the debate on the Address to bring up general topics, or topics of interest to various sections of the country, and I hope that privilege will long continue. I propose to-night to refer to two or three things, but before doing so I would just like to lay down two underlying principles that I think are now recognized more or less by all Canadians. The two things that strike one most in a review of the history of Canada are, first, the long struggle to obtain self-government in this country as against the mother land. That took years and years. It required over a century of effort to obtain anything like self-government in this country, but we have it to-day, and we look upon it as the most valuable thing we have under our system of government—namely, the right to manage our own affairs absolutely independent of the mother country. That, to my mind, comes up perhaps in connection with the question of naval defence, and I may be permitted to refer to that a little later on. There is another great underlying principle in connection with our country which is perhaps not recognized by all of us, but which must be recognized virtually by most of us, and that is that if we have achieved our political independence in this country as against the mother country, and if we have self-government, we have also achieved another great principle, and that is complete independence for Canada to control her fiscal policy independently of the United States. That took a long while to achieve, and the right hon. gentleman in a way was perhaps not opposed to it, but he did try to develop in this country the idea of commercial union, and later on reciprocity, and his experience must now demonstrate to him that while, as I think, he has the interest of this country at heart, the thing he thought to achieve in the way he thought to achieve it was against the wishes of the majority of the people in Canada who are determined above all, not only to have political independence and to uphold self-government as against the mother country, but determined to uphold the principles of being absolutely independent of the United States in the matter of their fiscal tariff. I do not cast any reflection on the right hon. gentleman for maintaining that position because we know that, Ephraim came down to history because he was wedded to his idols, and the right hon. gentleman may go down to history for his fidelity to his views.

My conception of Canadian history is that it teaches the two great principles of the right of self-government and the right to form our commercial and fiscal policy independent of the United States, and that Canadians are going to assert those principles under every circumstance. In connection with the debate on the Naval Aid Bill, it was a matter of regret to me that suggestions were made in this House which looked to the abandonment of the idea of absolute self-government and of Canada being mistress of her own destinies.

I come now to matters of direct and present concern. We have had a great deal of what we call national policy in this country; we have had national policy in the interest of the manufacturers

and for the encouragement of home industries of all kinds; we have had national policy in the matter of railroad building and we have spent immense sums of money and incurred enormous liabilities in that respect;

10 p.m. and last session we had what perhaps might be called national policy with regard to banking, because we passed a law which was thought to be in the interests of the banking institutions of the country, and with which they are satisfied. But, Sir, the day has come when we must have a national policy for the farmers of Canada, and I now demand a national policy for the farmers of the Canadian Northwest in the direction of the abolition of the duty on wheat, so that these farmers may get what they want in their own interest. The farmers of the Canadian West want free wheat for two reasons: first, because they say they can get a better price for their wheat in the United States, and, secondly, because they contend they get better freight rates for the wheat they export to Europe if they send it by the American railroads. I believe it has been established that the price of wheat is better on the average in the American market, and that the railroad rates in the United States to-day are more favourable to the producer than are the Canadian railroad rates. These two things having been established, it is our duty in the interest of the farmer of the great west to withdraw the duty on wheat and thereby secure the entrance of Canadian wheat into the United States. It may be charged that in this I am abandoning my views with regard to protection. I do not know that I am, but if my views or if anybody's views on the subject of protection happen to be wrong or happen not to suit the requirements of to-day, then it is well that these views should be modified. But I think I will be able to show that I will have to abandon very little of my protectionist views to secure a great benefit for the farmers of the West. It has been said that free wheat would be detrimental to the Canadian railways and detrimental to the Canadian millers. I purpose answering that later, but in the meantime I say that I do not wish it to be thought that the Canadian millers are dependent on the legislation of the United States to keep their milling industry in this country. If it is necessary to keep the milling industry in Canada, I say now that we will have to find some method of our own to do so. If the Canadian farmer in the West—and he is now up against it, and we all admit he is up against it, and he has had a hard time with stringent money and discouragement of one kind and another—if the Canadian farmer in the West is suffering, then it is our duty to come to his relief and to give him the benefit of this American market where the prices are better, and to give him also the benefit of cheaper transportation over the American railways.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell us how much was the price of wheat in the United States higher than the price in Canada during each month of the past year? The hon. gentleman might also tell us to what extent freight rates are lower in the United States than they are in Canada?

Mr. MACLEAN: If the hon. gentleman wants to have that question answered, let him go to the farmers of the Canadian West.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: That is not an answer.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is quite a sufficient answer. I have watched the progress of the agitation; I have seen it discussed in the newspapers; and I think the farmers of the West know what is good for them. Am I to understand from the hon. gentleman that the price of wheat is less in the United States than it is in Canada?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: During a large portion of this year it was.

Mr. MACLEAN: How is it then that shipments of wheat are going from Canada to the United States now and paying the duty? It may be that at times the price was higher in Canada, but what I say is that on the average the price is higher in the United States. We have the resolutions passed by the farmers themselves, and my hon. friend will not dispute that the farmers who have the experience know what they are talking about. Anybody who has read the long and careful investigation made by the Winnipeg Free Press in regard to freight rates in the West, must admit that a case has been made out that rates are lower on American railways, and that the price of wheat on the average is better in the Canadian market. It is our duty to do something for the farmer. Other hon. members have made speeches to that effect.

Mr. EDWARDS: Do you mean farmers or wheat growers?

Mr. MACLEAN: I will say wheat growers. The man who grows wheat is a citizen of this country and requires our protection. Of course, I would like to see him a mixed farmer, and the way to make him a mixed farmer is to show him that he is getting the best price for his wheat. Mixed farming is coming in the West, and a better system of farming is coming in Ontario. But to-day the farmers of the West are more or less discouraged. If I can believe the letters which I get, and all that I read and hear, and the resolutions that are passed, I know that the people who are asking for relief are the farmers of the West, and they are asking for relief in regard to railway freight rates and the price of wheat.

I come now to the question as to whether the railways will be injured or not and whether the millers of western wheat will be injured or not. A great cry has gone forth that they will be. It is also put forward that the eastern wheat grower will be more or less injured if we have free wheat. After analysing most of these statements, and I have got some capacity for getting at the truth of a statement, I find that this cry of free wheat is almost altogether from the railways of this country and partly from the milling interests of this country. Canadian railways can carry that wheat for less, and the moment they have the competition of the American railways they will come down to American rates, and they can keep their freight if they wish to.

The same is the case with the millers. Do you mean to tell me that Canadian millers, with their mills almost at the seat of production of the wheat, cannot compete with the American millers? I say that they can; I say that they are ready for the business. Of course they would like to keep the monopoly they have to-day in regard to wheat milling in this country, and they have got a great monopoly. They are well linked up together and are in a position, by reason of their monopoly and the association of the railways, to keep down the price of wheat. Thus in two ways the Canadian farmer will benefit. They will benefit by the competition of American railways and they will benefit by the fact that the millers will have to come up to the mark and give them more for their Canadian wheat if they want to grind it in their mills. If I thought for one moment that the Canadian mills would be in danger, I as a life-long protectionist might be inclined to listen to their views, but I have made a full investigation of the matter and, to the best of my mind, the Canadian railways can stand a reduction in the freight rates, and the Canadian mills can stand the competition and can give more for the Canadian wheat and can still keep the business.

In connection with that, there is also the question of the offal from grinding grain, for the purpose of feeding stock. The farmers of the West ought to go more into mixed farming. They ought to abandon that business of being merely wheat growers and become out-and-out farmers. They ought to feed the offal of that wheat, ground in Canadian mills, to Canadian cattle. In that new national policy for the benefit of the farmers, which I think we ought to have in this country, we cannot too soon come to the idea that we must stop slaughtering our young cattle, and that we ought to use all the offal of the wheat ground in Canadian mills for feeding live stock on Canadian farms. There is a good national policy for the farmers, and I am for it, and it is because I am for it that I am making this statement to-night.

My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) says: Oh, we may lose this cattle-feeding business in this country; our cattle will all go over to the States, and our bran and shorts will go over there, and the Americans will feed it to our cattle. Then so much the worse for Canada. If it has that tendency, then under that principle, which I asserted here previously this evening, that we have the right to make our own fiscal policy and be independent of the United States, it is for us to do it here. If it is found that the millers of this country cannot grind our wheat under the competition of the American railways for the freight, then it is up to this Parliament and to the Conservative party now in power and to the party which opposed reciprocity two years ago, to make a national policy in this country such that it will keep this business here. We should not depend for the retaining of that business upon fiscal legislation passed by the United States. That is my idea of a national policy and that is my idea of what Canada ought to stand for.

Mr. EDWARDS: How?

Mr. MACLEAN: I can keep the milling industry here by a bounty on milling. I can frame up a policy that will encourage the growing of live stock in this country.

Mr. EDWARDS: Would you have a bounty for that too?

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not know whether I would or not. I am not against giving bounties; I was born that way. I hope the hon. gentleman is not taking the posi-

tion that the national policy for the encouragement of home industry in this country ought to be based upon the legislation of the United States. That is what it comes down to. If it goes abroad that this Canadian Parliament is looking to the United States duty on wheat to keep their industries at home and to encourage their home industries, President Wilson will be down to-morrow with a Bill taking off the duty on wheat, whether we care to do anything or not. That is what we are up against. Most likely he will do it, but in the meantime, do not let the Canadian farmer of the West suffer from present conditions. Take the Canadian farmer out of bondage, and he is in bondage to-day to the railways and to the mills. When I say that the railways can stand a reduction in their freight rates, let me give you the instance of the enormous wealth of the great Canadian Pacific railway in this country. Can any Conservative member stand up in this House and say that he justifies our present railway policy, which is a discrimination in Canadian freight rates as against the Canadian West. The whole country paid for these railways or for the most of them. We passed the legislation and we are here to pass legislation, the result of which will be fair treatment throughout Canada. And, though we have been passing legislation dealing with railways for twenty-two years since I first came here, and long before that, I have never yet heard the voice of the man I would like to hear declaring on behalf of the West: We refuse to let any legislation go through this House until the principle of equality of freight rates in this country is inscribed in the Statute Book and not left to the Railway Commission. Who is there, who claims to be a Canadian and says he believes in fair railway rates and equality of treatment, who could justify the discrimination that has been put upon the West, that stigma that has been put upon them that although they pay their share of the customs duties and of everything else in this country, for some reason they, for all time, are to pay railway rates that discriminate against them. I contend that the Canadian Pacific railway has in its charter to-day a condition under which it ought to give lower rates to the people of the West. If you tell me that the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Canadian Northern railway, who are coming into the field, could not stand the reduction in rates that the Canadian Pacific railway would stand; I would reply that some kind of national policy should be devised that would help them out for the time, and that the people of the West should not be allowed to continue under this unjust and unfair condition of railway rates. Nobody has ever justified it yet. The Railway Commission may be trying to justify it, or may be trying to wipe it out. My contention is—and I will stand by it every day in the week—that the time has come for equality of railway rates as between the East and the West. I contend that the farmer of the West is entitled to the best market for his wheat and to the lowest possible freight rate. I know just what the people of the West want, I have no doubt about it; and I am here to-night to urge the Government when considering their tariff, and in any changes they may have to announce in connection with the Budget speech — especially in view of their statement in this debate that the interests of the farmers of this country is to be their first concern — to give consideration to the prayer of the farmers of of the West that they may be given free wheat in order that they may get better prices, and also given equal freight rates with the East. I may have to discuss this question at a greater length on a subsequent occasion during the present session. But I think I am doing a very practical service to the country by bringing the subject forward and giving what I think are sufficient reasons for the position I have taken.

Now, I wish to deal briefly with another question that I have raised pretty often in this House, and that is the capitalization of railways. That question has been brought to our attention again by the action of the Canadian Pacific railway in its last issue of capital. I have heard very prominent men in this House, especially lawyers, and more especially ministers of justice, say that the question of capitalization is of no interest to the people, that it does not matter to the people what capital the railways issue. Will anybody look at the United States to-day and see what has taken place there in regard to the over-capitalization of railways, see how the New York and New Haven and Boston and Maine roads have been wrecked and reduced to absolutely non-paying propositions by reason of over capitalization, and repeat here again the statements I have heard made in this House by men in high positions supposed to be authorities on this question? Over capitalization is a curse; it is against the public, against the State, against the railway itself. But the air is clearing in the United States. A statement was made there the other day by the Presi-

dent of the United States which, I think, settles the question for good. I heard the other day that our Minister of Finance was considering the question and would perhaps issue a commission to ascertain the facts in regard to the capitalization of railways. I do not know whether I am correct in saying that, I merely heard it incidentally. But we do not want any commission after the lucid deliverance that was made by Mr. Wilson when he addressed Congress the other day. I will read his words:

> In the second place, business men as well as those who direct public affairs now recognize, and recognize with painful clearness, the great harm and injustice which has been done to many if not all of the great railroad systems of the country by the way in which they have been financed and their own distinctive interests subordinated to the interests of the men who financed them and of other business enterprises which those men wished to promote.
>
> The country is ready, therefore, to accept, and accept with relief as well as approval, a law which will confer upon the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to superintend and regulate the financial operations by which the railroads are henceforth to be supplied with the money they need for their proper development to meet the rapidly-growing requirements of the country for increased and improved facilities for transportation.
>
> We cannot postpone action in this matter without leaving the railroads exposed to many serious handicaps and hazards; and the prosperity of the railroads and the prosperity of the country are inseparably connected.

The time has come when we must regulate the capitalization of the railroads and other corporations of this country. Overcapitalization has been a curse. I say, it has wrecked railroad after railroad in the United States. Attempts have been made under State laws to regulate the capitalization there. Wherever this has been done the benefits have been substantial and the results have been greatly appreciated by the public. But the time has come in regard to railroad corporations when the federal authority must control the issue of capital. And the wise thing for us in this country as I have often contended in this House—and both parties are to blame that it was so, and the worst thing ever done in that thing in this country, I have often contended in this House and both parties are to blame for it—was the way we allowed the Canadian Pacific railway to issue stock on which a high dividend had to be paid, against an issue of bonds which would have been sufficient for all their purposes. I hope and trust that in the new Railway Bill which is to come down, I do not know whether it is mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, but I have seen it stated in the newspapers that such a Bill was to be introduced—there will be a section vesting the control of capitalization of railways in the Railway Commission. I hope the Minister of Railways will also put on the statute book a principle of equality of freight rates in this country. It is a principle that Parliament must settle. It is absurd to say that such a principle must be left to the Railway Commission. If the assertion of the principle means that freight rates may have to go up a little, if we put the principle on the staute books, it will be the duty of the Railway Commission to adjust the rates all over the country so that there may be equality. I want to see the man rise in this House who will say that, notwithstanding that railways cost no more to build and to run in the West than in the East, there should be higher prices in the West than in the East. If the feeling in this House is, as I believe it to be, in favour of equality of freight rates, then that should be put on the Statute book and not left to the unsafe action of a Railway Commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am largely disposed to agree with what my hon. friend says about over-capitalization, but he said that it was over-capitalization that had brought the Boston and Maine railroad to its present condition. Can he explain that?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes. A man died recently in the United States, having first made a confession of faith and of his belief in the Christian religion. If any hon. gentleman will refer to recent issues of the New York World he will see it plainly set out that the late Mr. Morgan and Mr. J. D. Rockfeller were at the bottom of a scheme for buying up all kinds of trolley, steamship, or subsidiary lines at the rate of say $8,000,000 each, and the next minute selling them to the New York, New Haven and Hartford railway or the Boston and Maine railroad for $25,000,000. The shareholders of the big road, many of whom are poor people of New England, can ill afford to be looted by schemers unloading such worthless propositions and getting four times what they pay for them in paid-up stock of the great company. That is the way it is done, and it can be done here. The President of the United States now says, in the presence of Congress, which will carry out his wishes, that within a very few weeks no railway shall issue any securities without first receiving the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. And we want that

here. It is provided by Act of Parliament in some way that the Canadian Pacific railway shall consult the Governor in Council in regard to some of their issues, but they have not done so, and they have gone round the corner and put out this note issue. I do not believe they wanted the money, but they wanted to do some melon cutting for the benefit of their shareholders. I do not think it has been a very successful issue; something has happened since these melons were cut by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and it is this: The net shrinkage in Canadian Pacific securities since this melon cutting began,—having regard to all the issues that have been made since—is $150,000,000. It has been ascertained by the investors in these securities that this cutting of melons and unnecessary enlargement of stock is not a good business transaction for that railway. I want to see legislation in this country providing that all our railroads, large and small, must subject the issue of their securities to the control of some responsible body. It is in the public interest that they should be so controlled, because the increasing of the issues is done with a view to imposing greater burdens on the people. That has been established and admitted on all sides, and you will see legislation in the United States this year in that direction.

We have entered upon a policy of great expenditure in the way of ports and terminals in this country. We are to make Montreal a great terminal port, and the same may be said of Quebec, St. John, Halifax, and I think I heard an hon. gentleman say this afternoon that he hoped Sydney would be included also.

Mr. ROGERS: What about Vancouver?

Mr. MACLEAN: I hope my hon. friend will make Vancouver a terminal port also. It is the duty of the Government to implement that policy by taking control of the terminals in the great inland cities of Canada, and my proposition here to-night is that the Government ought to take over the terminals in the city of Ottawa and Toronto. I have been coming to Ottawa for over twenty years, always landing a mile from the station, in spite of the fact that there is a splendid terminal in the centre, and all the railways ought to come in at that one terminal. Public ownership of railways is coming gradually in this country, and we are perhaps beginning right by taking over the terminals at the seaports, but we should take over the terminals in the inland cities also. The Minister of Railways ought to call together representatives of all the railways that come into this city and say to them: you must get together, join all your sidings and put them under an independent company, or in the hands of the Government—I would prefer the latter. Then if we were to bring the Intercolonial into this city to-morrow, we could bring it into a terminal owned by the people. In Toronto, where we are spending millions at the present time on harbour improvements, I would like to see the Government take over the terminals there, and build a great terminal station, perhaps in the upper portion of the city, bringing all the railways together, and taking over all the sidings, of which there are an immense number, making the terminal and the sidings national, and providing that their use shall be open to everybody. Let there be no preference in it; and some day, when we want to bring the Intercolonial to Toronto, we will have a proper terminal for it to come to. We ought to place these terminals at Halifax, St. John, Montreal and Quebec absolutely in the hands of the state, and I hope that is the intention. We ought to do it in Ottawa, in Toronto, in Winnipeg, and in some of the other western cities, thus getting ready for public ownership of railways in Canada. I believe the opportunity is rapidly coming of nationalizing one or more of the railroads of this country in the public interest. I believe a good step in this country towards the improvement of transportation would be to connect the Intercolonial railway with one or two transcontinental railways and to own the terminals in all the cities. We would then be in a stronger position, and be better able to regulate the railway rates. Transportation is an ever-present issue with every progressive country today. With Bismarck railways was the great issue; Lord Salisbury when Prime Minister of England said that railway transportation was the greatest political question in the world. It is coming to be the greatest question in the United States. Public ownership, to my mind, is coming fast in the United States. The railways have been exploited by adventurers to such an extent that they are almost stranded, and if they are not allowed to raise the rates according to the request they are now making, they will say to the Government: well then, you take over the railways and run them as best you can. That feeling is in the air in the United States; it is more than in the air here, and the way to prepare for

it, according to my judgment, is, if we are to provide for terminals at the ports, that we should own and control the terminals in all the great cities. This will be a step nearer to public ownership of our railways.

I wish to make one or two remarks with regard to the Banking Bill that was passed last session, and the effect of it. We have a money stringency in this country to-day; everybody admits that. They have had panics in the United States, and for a long while they have been trying to correct them. Only a few weeks ago a new currency and banking bill was passed in the United States Congress. I devoted some attention to this question when the Banking Act was before the House last session, and when the Bill was first introduced I said that I was more interested in questions of currency, savings banks and the national note issue, than in the mere organization of a bank. A bank is only an organization like a wholesale grocery so far as that is concerned, but we sat weeks and weeks considering and all the Banking Acts we have had in this country have dealt with the question of the organization of the banks. The greatest issue in the matter of banking is not the organization of a bank but the organization of the currency of the country and the creation of a great credit for the business interests of the country. I tried to have some attention given to the question of currency and how to increase the available money in this country for the benefit of the business of the country, but I could not make any headway. Hon. gentlemen will probably recall a speech I made in the House on that very question. I was put down up in the committee as a kind of a numbskull who did not know what I was talking about when I talked of currency, but the things I said there, in a very surprising way have come true in the United States. The question there was absolutely one of currency and the money available for the credit of the business of the country, and what have they done? They have first of all declared that the concentration of all the available money of the country in New York was against the public interest and they have substituted for that a system of regional banks which may be twelve in number scattered over the country where there will be great reserve stations. They have also adopted another principle for the first time in America and we want it here in Canada badly. It is a prinicple that has been admitted in Europe for one hundred years and that is the principle of re-discounting. They adopted this principle of re-discounting, which simply is that any bank in the United States that is a member of a regional bank and has good securities to offer can take its securities to this bank and get national notes therefor and the national notes are as good as gold. They get these national notes and relieve the money stringency. The condition of affairs in Canada is that if any bank in this country finds that it has lent out too much money to its customers and that its depositors are asking for their money back, if it should go out in the street and offer to re-discount any of its paper its standing would be immediately questioned and it would be said that the bank was hard up. The Bank of England any day it finds that it wants more money actually sends its men out into the street and calls in brokers and other banks and says: we want £1,000,000; here is the paper we have discounted, A 1 commercial paper. We discounted it at 4½ per cent. We want the money, we will let you have it at 4§ per cent, we will lose money but we are glad to lose it, we need the money and they thus get it for their business. That great principle of re-discounting in connection with banks has been made the law in the United States, and it absolutely provides flexibility of currency. It is backed up by what? Not by the issue of bank notes, but by the issue of national notes secured by a proper gold reserve in Washington.

What is the difference between the Canadian banks and the United States banks under that system? The Canadian banks are engaged every morning in two things. The first thing the smaller banks have got to take care of is their own circulation, and if they have paid out a lot of notes they know they have to take care of them in the clearing house that day. But that is not the only thing they have to take care of. They do not know what depositors of theirs the day before may have more or less lost confidence in them and perhaps written out cheques for the whole of their deposits in the bank. Such cheques would be put in the clearing house by another bank and would come to them at 11 o'clock in the morning and they would have to provide for them. To-day the Canadian banks are themselves afraid of the country, afraid of one another, and they have immense reserves ready. Some of them say they have 62 per cent of all their money in liquid assets, and yet they will not let it out because they are afraid of these two things; they cannot rediscount, and they have to

take care of their own issue and he ready to pay depositors who call for their money

The day has come when bank notes must be withdrawn in this country and national notes must take their place, and we can give these banks a better currency and give it to them on deposit at 2 per cent, and they will make more money out of that than from their own issues. If they can re-discount there will not be a bank that will be afraid to extend its credit to its customers; it will know that we have the system of one great national bank in this country doing the business of the country in the way of re-discounts and issuing of national notes. They can get relief immediately there. The other thing is that the Government of the United States to-day is a partner in the banking business of that country, and the profits over a certain point are to be shared with the country; and the banks in the United States, and the President of the United States and the Government of the United States will hereafter have a say, as the Government of France has a say, and the Government of Germany and the Government of every country in Europe, with the exception of Great Britain, has a say in the rate of discount that prevails in the country. It would be a good thing for the farmers of the West if somebody here in actual authority had something to say about the rate of interest which the banks have been charging out there. There is another discrimination put on the people of the West; 10 per cent interest is the rule out there because we have permitted higher freight rates to be charged the farmer in the West than are charged in the East, and the farmer of the West, I am afraid, will have to put up with it until he rises and says it has got to stop. We must have in this country the improved system of banking which they have in the United States and in all Europe, and we cannot have it too soon. If there is a money stringency here now there will be another stringency subsequently and this will often occur. The way to head off a money stringency is to have a means of credit, a flexibility in the currency of the country by the system of rediscounts controlled by the state and the use of national notes, sufficiently secured by gold and other reserves of the nation; and when you have that there cannot be a money stringency such as we have had in this country, and such as they have had in the United States. The proof of it is this: A short time ago when the banks of the United States were prepared to take advantage of the American people by reason of the stringency, the present Secretary of the Treasury, a very progressive man, Mr. McAdoo, said: 'I have $500,000,000 of the nation's money, and I will lend it to any bank.' The rate of interest that was threatened was never put into force, money got plentiful and money will be enormously plentiful in the United States by reason of that improved banking system. When we dealt with the organization of banks last session we did not deal with the question of currency. We absolutely neglected it and if we want to bring the country back to prosperity we have to revise our currency laws. The nation must have a lot to say in regard to banking and must make provision for rediscount, for a plentiful supply of national notes properly secured by gold reserves. If we do that we will do something to help and benefit this country. The banks to-day, under the present system, cannot find the currency necessary for this country and that was the reason for the subterfuge that was adopted last year of creating a gold reserve in Montreal. Any one who wishes to see that it was only a subterfuge and has not increased the currency should read an editorial in the Montreal Telegraph of a few months ago written, I imagine, by the late Minister of Finance. I read that article with great interest. It confirms my views and I wish to say that the currency question is another question that has been absolutely neglected in this country for years and years. We have been working under an old system, so have the people in the United States; but they have instituted reforms in this respect, they have shown the way as they are showing the way to us now in a great many things. If you wish to see progressive legislation here you have to look for it in the United States and in England. The greatest progressive legislation is going on in the United States. The people there were awakened some years ago. They had been brought up to believe that they had the greatest government and the greatest constitution in all the world.

The fathers of their constitution were treated as fathers of the church are now treated by good churchmen. When you come to an actual investigation, their constitution amounts to very little and great monopolies and very unfair things were permitted under it. There was child labour in that new country and there were slums all over the United States. Nearly everything was found to be bad, the Government was bad, the constitution was archaic.

But the people started to read books on political economy, and the magazines started to discuss these questions in a way that the public press had neglected. The attitude of the public press towards a great many of these questions has been surprising. I have been identified with the press for quite a while and I still say this, that a newspaper has no right to assert that it is possessed of the gospel unless it is the true gospel that it preaches. Newspapers think they have a divine right and, but if you investigate the history of the United States for the past thirty years you will find that the newspapers have been gradually going against the people and that the magazines have come to the relief of the people. The people began to read these books on political economy and as a result to-day there is a wave of political reform in the United States. They are making a degree of progress in that direction that may well attract our attention. They are older than we are and they have had more experience than we have. They have reformed their laws in regard to banking and they are reforming their laws in regard to the capitalization of railways. The Railway Commission has come to the relief of shippers and farmers from one end of the United States to the other. I see the right hon. leader of the Opposition laughing; perhaps he thinks this is a new doctrine.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, I quite agree.

Mr. MACLEAN: Perhaps he thinks that I am a disciple of his. I hope he will be a disciple of mine and follow me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We will exchange views.

Mr. MACLEAN: Having dealt with the banking law, I come now to the question of the cost of living. This is a great question in this country. It is true that the cost of living has greatly increased and it is true that, in a large measure, that cost of living is due to the methods by which we distribute the necessities of life. I know districts in many cities where there are rows and rows of stores that seem to be distributing the necessities of life. It seems to me that some system of co-operation could be devised whereby that distribution, instead of costing, as it often does, forty and fifty per cent of what the producer gets for his goods, and in some cases double that amount, could be more satisfactorily and economically taken care of. It is true that the middleman, the cold storageman, the combine and one organization and another, are taking an unfair advantage of the people. We have got to remove these things and deal with this question in this House and in the local legislatures in such a way as to reduce the cost of living.

It is also true that our farmers are not producing enough on the land. I have watched the Canadian farmer in various places for quite a number of years, and the opinion I have come to is that he is more or less attracted by the lure of the cities and he wishes to go to the city. It is also peculiar to farming on this continent, or at least on portions of this continent, and especially so in Canada, that farmers are trying to get through by raising as little as possible. It seems to be the idea of a great many farmers to raise as little as possible. If we are to have a National Policy for the farmers of this country, we must try and encourage them to raise much more than they raise now, and in some way to offer them a better price by making an immediate connection between them and the consumer and at the same time giving the consumer a lower rate. If my right hon. friend, in his anxiety to give us free food, will devise a scheme on that line, he has a good cry and he will get lots of men to join the army. But he has to put it on the basis of some system of co-operation and control, in order to get our people to raise more produce on the land, and he has to devise some means by which to get this produce into the hands of the consumer at a price less than that which he pays now but at a better price for the farmer, cutting out this middleman business and benefiting both parties to the bargain in that respect.

What is the policy which we require in connection with farming in Canada to-day? We have to have a great big farming policy because we must deal, not only in the Dominion, but in the various provinces, and in the West especially, with this farming problem. It takes a big National Policy to cope with the weed pest in the Northwest, and it takes a great big policy to deal with the draining proposition in my own province of Ontario. With a system of drainage and a system of good roads in the province of Ontario you can take three weeks off the winter in the fall and you can take two weeks off the winter in the spring in so far as the farmer is concerned. I have seen farm after farm in the province of Ontario where work stopped largely because of bad roads and lack of drainage. There has

never been such an open fall as there was last year in Ontario, with the result that a great deal of fall ploughing was done there, and I am glad to hear that the situation in the West is to a large extent similar. What the farmer is up against more than anything else in this country is the struggle against nature. The struggle against nature is so severe in the way of weather, or in the way of water on the land, not drained off, especially in the spring, that the farmer cannot get upon the fields to begin operations. That is the discouraging thing in farming taken in connection with the lack of good roads. I may be a poor observer, and I may not have been bred a farmer, but I have lived among farmers, I am trying to farm myself, I know all the farmers in my constituency intimately, and I know the troubles that they are up against. If you ask me what the Ontario farmer is up against I will tell you: he is up against the lack of drainage, he is up against the trouble that bad roads give him by his not being in constant touch with the base of supplies, and I am sorry to say that in Ontario the struggle is so severe that of the race of farmers who settled there three generations ago some have been lured to the West, some have gone into other businesses and some have degenerated so that they are not equal to farming under these conditions. If that is the case, we have to approach this problem. We must see that there is better farming, we must have better education in regard to farming, but in order to do this we must give the farmer the facilities that he requires in order to carry on his business profitably. The province of Ontario has embarked upon the hydro-electric policy which will provide cheap transportation and power on the farm and light for the houses and stables, and in this way help to make living on the farm more comfortable. Things of that kind that can be done by Government must be done if we want to keep our Canadian people on the farm. Farmers would not be lured away to cities and to other occupations and they would not go to the West if the struggle were not such a severe one, the consequence of which is that they are now trying to do as little as they can. The whole idea of the man on the land in Europe is intensive farming and big production. In our country the idea is little production, only enough to get along with. The State must do something in order to encourage farming. Look at the record of Denmark in regard to the national encouragement of farming. It is surprising what things the Danish farmers do in the British market. They have the finest national policy for the encouragement of the farmer that is to be found in the world. Italy is coming to it; France is magnificently cultivated; Frederick the Great showed the Germans how to drain their lands, and he first drained the townships he owned himself. Improved farming under government encouragement is characteristic of Europe and it will have to be characteristic of Canada. Smaller farms and holdings will have to be cultivated; changes in the present system will have to be brought about, and the Dominion Government and the provincial governments of Canada will have to frame their policies with that end in view. In the beautiful fruit district of Niagara and along the whole of the north shore of lake Erie, is taking place great improvement in the system of farming. But that improvement is to some extent brought about by large interests, and for my part I do not want to see the organization of large farms and the systematic cultivation of large districts under corporate control. Rather, I am in favour of the small farmer owning his own land and doing a great deal of the work himself. I am in favour of the intelligent direction of that farmer by the government and the co-operation of the Dominion and provincial governments with the farmer in teaching him the essentials necessary for production. What we want in Canada is large production and good farming on comparatively small areas of land. The more I study the question, and the more I move around among the farmers of my own province the more I am convinced that there is not too big a man in all Ontario or in all the world to put at the head of the supervision of farming in the province of Ontario. There is immense opportunity there, and my advice to all the provinces is to take up the encouragement of farming; to take advantage of everything they can get from the federal authority, and to formulate and to carry out vigorously well matured plans. In this Parliament there were introduced two good measures, one the Highways Bill and the other the aid to agricultural education, and although constitutional objections may be raised to such measures, that is not the point at the present time. In connection with the solution of the problem of the increased cost of living in this country, what we want is increased production on the farm, and the providing of means to bring in direct touch the farmer who farms and the consumer

11 p.m.

who consumes. That I believe will result in higher prices to the farmer and lower prices for the consumer. It is not impossible to attain that end, but it wants prevision, and organization, and the co-operation of the farmers and the consumers. The most we can get from this commission that is now to travel around the country is that they will tell us the difference between what the farmer gets and what the consumer pays, and there is something in that. I was pleased to hear my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) speak in regard to the encouragement of farming, and I believe that both parties in this House, and all the parties in all the provincial legislatures, should co-operate and throw aside this wretched thing of partyism for the time being in their efforts to make this the great producing agricultural country, nature destined her to be. Let it be the object of this Parliament and this Government, and of the legislatures and governments of all the provinces, to put their shoulders to the wheel and to improve farming in Canada on the lines I have indicated to-day.

Mr. EDWARDS: Would the hon. gentleman consider the eight-hour day a factor militating against the farmer?

Mr. MACLEAN: It may militate against him a good deal, but he will have to deal with it. One of the troubles of our farmers is that they have to be educated to understand that it pays to employ a competent labourer, and to pay him good wages, and to give him a house on the farm to live in. I know farm after farm in this country where there is no accommodation for the so-called hired man.

Mr. EDWARDS: Would you consider the eight-hour day a disability on the farmer?

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not know whether it is or not. I believe it will be some time before it becomes a real factor, and then it will have to take care of itself.

Mr. CARVELL: When that does come about the consumer will have to pay more for the product.

Mr. MACLEAN: No doubt it means, that in the end it will come on the public in some way. And, if the people believe in an eight-hour day for the mechanic, the people will have to believe in an eight-hour day for the farmer, unless of course the farmer cultivates his own land, and that is one reason why I want to see the farmer and his family till the soil themselves and engage in somewhat intensive farming of a small area rather than waste energy in cultivating large farms.

I will only say one or two words on the navy and then I am finished. I am sorry that Canada occupies the position she does to-day on this question. It has been a sore question for our people. We do not stand as well as we ought to stand in the eyes of the world because we failed to deal with that question. I am not going to cast any reflection on any one, but I will come back to my hero worship and I will read what Woodrow Wilson said a few days ago in regard to public questions:

> Legislation has its atmosphere, like everything else, and the atmosphere of accommodation and mutual understanding which we now breathe with so much refreshment is matter of sincere congratulation. It ought to make our task very much less difficult and embarrassing than it would have been had we been obliged to continue to act amidst the atmosphere of suspicion and antagonism which has so long made it impossible to approach such questions with dispassionate fairness. Constructive legislation, when successful, is always the embodiment of convincing experience and of the mature public opinion which finally springs out of that experience.

An air of suspicion and distrust was created in this country with regard to Canada's action in the matter of naval aid to the mother country. I am not going to say who was responsible for that, but I do regret it. Every Canadian outside this House regrets that that question was approached in an atmosphere where distrust and suspicion prevailed. Why did it get into that state; why did that miserable atmosphere surround that question? I know it was not due to anything that occurred in our province, because if there is anything that we in Ontario think well of it is of our duty to the empire, and if there is any place where public opinion prevails in this country, it is in the neighbourhood of what used to be called the head of lake Ontario. We who live up there—and who sometimes have so little to say in regard to the government of this country—we try to think well of the great public questions and we have in the past in some measure furnished some of the best political thought for Canada; we have not brought in that atmosphere of suspicion and distrust about this question. We have not got there that atmosphere of suspicion about this question. I do not for one moment say that that atmosphere originated in another quarter in this country. If I was to say that some of it came from Montreal, the last thing that I would

say would be that it in any way came from my compatriots the French people of the province of Quebec. I am not saying that, because if I can trace that unfair atmosphere and that atmosphere of suspicion, I would trace it to certain influences that speak the English language, that speak through the newspapers and that have had a double-faced policy in regard to this question. Now we have had that atmosphere of suspicion, that atmosphere of distrust, surrounding this question. Is it not possible for this Parliament and for this country to get together, and with a clear, pure atmosphere of patriotism and a recognition of our duty to the mother country to do something in the direction of a money grant that will show where our heart is with the old land?

I am not going to pass any reflections upon the past. If we can get the atmosphere cleared up, insignificant as I am, I will be prepared to-morrow to undertake the responsibility of securing a standing vote in the House of Commons and in the Senate of Canada for a large and substantial grant from the Parliament of Canada to our mother country, as a recognition of our duty to stand by her in the matter of imperial defence.

Mr. A. VERVILLE (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to occupy the time of the House very long, but I think I am in duty bound to say a few words in regard to omissions from the Speech from the Throne. Last year I had occasion to say before the House that for the second session the labour cause had been omitted from the Speech from the Throne. I thought, from the remarks made last year, that this session some announcement would be made that would carry to the labouring people of this country some hope of legislation of some nature to better their conditions. There is, however, not a word in the Speech this year in regard to this matter. As I stated last year, I am convinced that the present Government is absolutely hostile to the labouring classes. Last year I said that I thought the Government was hostile, but from this year's Speech from the Throne, I have finally come to that conclusion, and many others with whom I have come in contact have come to the same conclusion.

The high cost of living has been a subject of debate during the last few days. I intend to deal with that question for a few minutes. When the Government saw that throughout the country a condition of unrest was existing, they made up their minds to appoint a commission to investigate the real causes of the increased cost of living. I would not blame the Government for having appointed a commission, if they had taken immediate action to alleviate that condition. I do not believe that when a man's home is on fire he sends for the fire brigade by mail. He generally rings in the alarm, as he needs immediate action. The fire of hunger is in a good many workingmen's homes in the country, and it seems to me that immediate action should be taken.

I may be asked as to what are the reasons for the increased cost of living. There are many reasons, and of course we may differ as to the causes. In my judgment there are three main reasons: the tariff, the over-capitalization of trusts and mergers, of which my hon. friend spoke, but of course he kept in mind mostly over-capitalization of railroads. Over-capitalization of all industries, trusts and mergers is a cause. The third cause is the operation of the cold storage plants in the country. These are the three main reasons, although there are many others which it seems to me the Legislature of this country should study immediately, and should have studied long ago.

Last session I gave figures as to the operation of the cold storage plants, and last session and the session before I gave figures in regard to trusts and mergers. During the present debate I heard the Prime Minister ask the hon. leader of the Opposition what he had done during the fourteen or fifteen years he was in power to prevent the operations of these trusts and mergers. Any one who has studied economic conditions, especially the financial aspect of them, knows that 56 of these trusts and mergers have been formed in the last five years. It is only about four years ago that these trusts and mergers started in serious operation. In 1910, the reciprocity pact which was before the House—by the way, if they believe it to be dead, I believe it is still alive—was intended to intervene in the operations of trusts and mergers which were becoming strong. In 1912 I believe 19 of them were formed; and, as I say, in five years 56 of them.

I have figured out the amount which each workingman will have to pay in regard to paying interest on the watered stock of the trusts and mergers, and I will give figures to the House later on. First of all I want to deal with the question of the tariff. How much has the workingman to pay on the tariff? In the first place he has to pay for clothing a little over forty dollars

a year on tariff alone. I have taken the preferential tariff on clothing because we have that benefit from the mother land. Then he has to pay on food stuffs alone a little over sixty dollars a year on the tariff, and the farmers derive no benefit from this whatever. And, when you take into consideration this $100 in round figures and also about $183 that he has to pay on the watered stock of the trusts and mergers, and figure against all this the amount he is likely to earn in the year, you may well ask how it is possible for him to keep up his family in a proper way. Since the American tariff has been changed the cost of living—I speak of the city of Montreal, because I am more familiar with conditions there than elsewhere—has increased nineteen per cent. Let me give the facts on which that statement is based. I will give figures of market quotations, the latest of them taken on the 24th instant and the others in September last:

	Increase per cent.
Roast beef	30
Steaks	30
Kidneys	46
Roast veal	11
Veal chops	11
Corned beef	32
Lamb	42
Roast pork	18
Pork chops	10
Sausages	27
Beef, second quality	26
Bacon	02
Salt pork	05
Second quality sausages	20

This makes an average of nineteen per cent since the Wilson tariff came into force. I stated last session that the Government would probably be forced by economic conditions to give us reciprocity. I am now convinced that this must result from the increased cost of living and the change in the United States tariff. It has been the custom to talk of the tariff as a weapon against an enemy or at least a dangerous neighbour. I do not know that there is any such danger. It is not my intention to go into details about the farmers and how they would be affected, for there will be opportunity to do so on the Budget. But I desire to say a word upon the subject of cold storage. I have read that it was a man named Charles Tellier who discovered the process of cold storage. He died recently in Paris. I have read some of his works, and it is evident that it was from the humanitarian standpoint he wrote, and he was pleased that he had made a discovery which he thought to be for the benefit of the common people. Until recently, we thought that ourselves. But now that system is being operated against the masses of the consumers and against the mass of the farmers as well. I am glad to see on the Order Paper the name of a Bill relating to this question of cold storage. I do not know what the Bill is to contain, but I suppose it will have the effect of regulating the operations of these establishments.

Now, I desire to say a word or two on the subject of the unemployed problem, which makes the high cost of living so hard at the present time. It was stated in this House by the leader of the Opposition that 100,000 people were out of employment in Canada. Well, I am in contact with enough labour societies in this Dominion to know that that is not an exaggeration. Last night the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) intimated that a large number were unemployed in Vancouver. Of course his statements were challenged. And, according to 'Hansard' the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) stated that there were only 2,500 men idle in Vancouver. I make the statement here that there are in the city of Vancouver today 4,500 men idle in the building trades alone. In the last four months 10,000 people have left British Columbia for American ports because of the lack of work. Furthermore, if you take the city of greater Vancouver, a very conservative estimate is 10,000 out of work at the present time. I may be asked what authority I have for making this statement. When I heard last night that there were 2,500 only out of work in Vancouver, I was so astonished that I took the trouble to telegraph to that city, and I will read to the House the telegram I received this afternoon. The hon. member for Vancouver is just entering the Chamber, and I do not think he will question the authority of the man whose name is appended to this telegram:

> According to United States immigration officers ten thousand people left British Columbia during the past four months for United States points. Forty-five hundred still out of work in building trades alone according to statement furnished the mayor by Labour Council. Conservative estimate unemployed in greater Vancouver would reach over ten thousand. Civic and other charitable bodies overtaxed in caring for jobless. Situation acute unless public works are opened up soon.
>
> R. P. Pettipiece.

I was astonished when I heard the statement of the hon. member for Vancouver, but of course, it was not for me to intervene at that time. However, in view of some of

the statements I had seen in the press, I took it upon myself to get an official report.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that a forged telegram?

Mr. VERVILLE: It belongs to the House. What has happened in Vancouver seems to have happened in other cities. Every one now is crying for work—they are not crying for bread but for work. This situation seems to prevail in every part of Canada. It has been the privilege of our Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) to travel through this country during the summer. Of course he was in British Columbia, and probably later on we may hear his report of the immense amount of good he did during his trip to the coast. Also we may have his report as to the real conditions existing in the Maritime provinces. I see by the papers that he was in Sydney, and is quoted to have said that conditions there are all right, everything harmonious. I do not quite agree with the hon. gentleman. I have been there myself. But I happened to be with the other crowd—with the crowd that were in need. Probably that is why I have not the same information.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many are unemployed in Montreal?

Mr. VERVILLE: Is is very hard to state the exact number, and I will tell you why. At one time of the week the number is very large and another it is less, because they are working short time in places. Only last week one large engine works in Longue Pointe, because of lack of orders laid off, I do not know for how long, about 1,700 men. The laying off of 1,700 men means that the purchasing ability of these people diminishes at once by seventy-five per cent. When it is said that there is over-production of manufactured goods, we must bear in mind the fact that there must of course be overproduction when there is no demand. It is said that conditions are very good in the country at the present time, and that the farmers are prosperous. They are, but the reckoning will come, and perhaps in a couple of months. We must not expect that when the demand in the cities suddenly ceases the farmer will be immediately affected; in a few months he will be unable to sell because the people have not the money with which to buy his goods. The farmers will feel it the more keenly because they have to purchase a great many things which they do not produce themselves. The hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) said the other day: Why don't you leave things in the old way? Yes, why should we not use candles instead of electric lights? We must not be against progress. It is impossible to expect the farmer to build his own carts and wagons, make his own harness and shoes; he has to buy all these things, and they amount to a great deal. The farmer is heavily taxed on the goods which he is obliged to purchase. I observe from the memorial of the grain growers of the West that the farmers are learning that it is imposssible that this condition should continue very long. I know that the present Government are bound to a policy of high protection. I do not blame them, because the people, when they put them where they are, said: you are to increase the tariff, if possible, instead of lowering it. It was said during the last election campaign that if reciprocity passed the doors of the manufacturers of the country would be closed to the workingman. Reciprocity did not pass, and the doors are closed, and this shows, that, if reciprocity had passed, the doors of the manufacturers would be open at the present time.

Some hon. gentlemen have said that the mode of living has a great deal to do with the increase in the cost of living. Sometimes workingmen live in luxury; they buy too many things which they could get along without, and they forget the amount of money they have to pay for these things. Let us see, however, whether the use of these luxuries is against the interests of trade. The hon. member for Dundas spoke the other day about automobiles. I hope and trust that none of the members of this House believe that the workingmen buy automobiles. I would not begrudge a businessman the possession of an automobile, because the raw material that enters into its construction amounts to very little; it is all labour; and if it is all labour, it is not what you would call a luxury. But if I happened to see a diamond in the same house, I would say that that is a luxury, because there is no labour attached to it. It had been said also that the working people do not need to dress so well. Probably it would be better for them if they did not, because they would be enabled to save more money. Why is it that I have to pay $10 more for a suit of clothes in Canada than in England? I have no objection to the proprietor of a woollen industry getting rich, but I do not want him to get rich at my expense. It is a fact

that on the other side of the water you can buy for $15 a suit of clothes for which you would have to pay in Canada $25 or more. But, it is said, labour is cheaper over there. The labour on a suit of clothes amounts to $1, and that is the difference as far as a suit of clothes is concerned, between the cost of labour in Canada and the cost of labour in England. I claim that this is wrong, and that some kind of a readjustment should be made. I claim also that, as regards the necessities of life, the Government should take steps to furnish cheaper food to the masses of the people of Canada. The people are not asking for bread, they are asking for work, but if they do not get work, of course they must have bread. Last year I made a prophecy with regard to conditions this year which has been fully realized, and no one who studies these great questions from an economic standpoint can fail to know what is going to happen. I do not claim to have any professional knowledge of the matter, or to speak from the standpoint of a student of political economy; I speak merely from a practical point of view. There are many people in the country to-day who do not know how much they can buy for a dollar, and that is one of the great questions in the country at the present time. That condition should be alleviated, and I submit that as legislators we shall be responsible for whatever may happen in the cities, towns or villages wherever there is a working population.

It has been said by some hon. gentlemen that the cities were attracting the rural population, and of course this is due to the fact that there are too few hands on the farm to do the work. The people in the country urge that there are too many attractions in the cities for the men, but have you ever seen a municipality that had anything in the line of water-power that was not willing to pay a large amount to a big industry to induce it to locate in their district, and thus take the people off the land? The people of the country are anxious in many cases to pay a bonus, whether there is water-power or not, for the purpose of having near them an industry which may employ perhaps one hundred hands, male or female. In this way the sons and daughters of the farmers are induced to leave the farm and work right there in little town or village, as the case may be. It may be that the municipality is willing to pay $25,000 or $30,000 to an industry that is not worth $10,000. I claim that the people of the country are just as responsible for the influx of population to the city as the people of the city are. Those who are responsible are the large manufacturers who are so anxious to have a large number of men whenever they have a call for employment. They sometimes want to have, if possible, three or four men for each job. The people who come from the country to the city and get out of employment are at the mercy of the civic authorities, as has been shown by a telegram produced to-night with regard to Vancouver. The same may be said with regard to Toronto, Montreal and other cities. That is the real situation, and my last word is to ask the Government to do something effective immediately, not to wait for the report of the commission, for we really know now what the report of that commission will be, as we know what the economic conditions throughout the country are. But that report will not relieve the sorrows now existing in large cities and towns, and I ask the Government to do something immediately, either in the form of large public works in different cities or in the immediate reformation of the tariff, so that the working men throughout the country may receive some benefit and be able to support the cold weather of the present winter.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Béland,	MacNutt,
Bickerdike,	McCoig,
Boivin,	McCarney,
Bourassa,	McCrea,
Boyer	McKenzie,
Brouillard,	McLean (Sunbury),
Buchanan,	McMillan,
Cardin,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Carvell,	Marcile (Bagot),
Charlton,	Martin (Montreal,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Ste. Mary's),
Clark (Red Deer),	Martin (Regina),
Delisle,	Michaud,
Demers,	Molloy,
Douglas,	Murphy,
Ethier,	Nesbitt,
Fortier,	Neely,
Gauthier (St.	Oliver,
Hyacinthe),	Pacaud,
Gauvreau,	Papineau,
German,	Proulx,
Graham,	Reid (Restigouche),
Hughes (Kings,	Robb,
P.E.I.),	Ross,
Kyte,	Seguin,
Lachance,	Sinclair,
Lafortune,	Thomson,
Lanctot,	(Qu'Appelle),
Lapointe	Tobin,
(Kamouraska),	Truax,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turgeon,

Law,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Macdonald.
Maclean (Halifax),
Verville,
Warnock,
White
(Victoria, Alta.),—64.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Achim,
Alguire,
Ames,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York, O.),
Arthurs,
Ball,
Barker,
Barnard,
Barrette,
Beattie,
Bellemare,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Best,
Blain,
Blondin,
Boulay,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Boys,
Brabazon,
Bradbury,
Broder,
Burnham,
Burrell,
Clark (Bruce),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Cromwell,
Crothers,
Doherty,
Edwards,
Elliot,
Fisher,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Foster (Toronto, N),
Fowler,
Fripp,
Garland,
Girard,
Glass,
Green,
Guilbault,
Hanna,
Hartt,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hughes (Victoria, O.),
Kemp,
Lamarche,
Lavallée,
Lesperance,
Lewis,
Macdonell,
Maclean (York, O.),
McCurdy,
McKay,
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Marshall,
Meighen,
Merner,
Middlebro,
Mondou,
Morphy,
Morris,
Morrison,
Nantel,
Nicholson,
Nickle,
Paquet,
Paul,
Pelletier,
Perley,
Rainville,
Reid (Grenville),
Rhodes,
Robidoux,
Roche,
Rogers,
Schaffner,
Sevigny,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Shepherd,
Smith,
Smyth,
Stanfield,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Sutherland,
Thoburn,
Thompson (Yukon),
Thornton,
Tremain,
Walker,
Wallace,
Webster,
Weichel,
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox,
Wilson (Wentworth),
and
Wright.—108.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Borden,	Pardee,
Clare,	Cash,
Coderre,	Wilson (Laval),
Cochrane,	Devlin,
Carrick,	Lapointe (Montreal),
Hepburn,	Lovell,
Lalor,	Richards,
Munson,	Cruise,
Jameson,	Bureau,
Taylor,	Martin (Regina),
Baker,	Kay,
Foster (Kings),	Carroll,
White (Leeds),	Emmerson,
Davidson,	Chisholm (Antigonish),
Monk,	Gordon,
McLeod,	Knowles,
Porter,	Champagne,
Lancaster,	Guthrie,
Osler,	Pugsley,
Aikins,	Turriff,
Northrup,	Power,
Currie,	Clarke (Essex),

Amendment negatived.

Mr. PARDEE: I was paired with the right hon. the Prime Minister; otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I was paired with the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster); otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. CARROLL: I was paired with the hon. member for Kings, N.S. (Mr. Foster); otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I was paired with the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm); otherwise I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. CARRICK: I was paired with the hon. member for St. James division, Montreal (Mr. Lapointe); otherwise I would have voted against the amendment.

On the question: shall the main motion be adopted.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, as the hour is somewhat late and I did wish to make some remarks on the Address, concluding with an amendment which may provoke more or less discussion, I would beg the consent of the leader of the House to my moving the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER: I had understood that there was some arrangement between the whips, agreed to by both sides of the House, that the Address would be disposed of to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. FOSTER: That certainly was the impression we had on this side of the House and I had heard nothing to the contrary until the hon. gentleman rose to his feet. Of course, it means that if it is to proceed now the arrangement which was made falls to the ground. That is a bad thing for this one arrangement but it is a much worse thing for the possibility of arrangements in the future. I should like to invite my right

hon. friend's attention to what was the understanding on this side and see what can be done about it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am surprised to hear that there was an arrangement of that nature. I never heard of it. I do not think that any such arrangement has been made. I do not know but that an arrangement had been made to finish the debate on the present amendment, but I know of nothing beyond that.

Mr. STANFIELD: To clear up this matter I would say that possibly there has been a little mistake. My understanding was that the vote was to be taken to-night. Perhaps I took too much out of that in accepting it to mean that the Address was to be settled.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Neely moves, seconded by Mr. MacNutt, that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER: While I have been disappointed, and I am sure gentlemen on this side have been disappointed, at the statement which has been made, I presume that the motion which was made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Neely) means that there will be a more or less extended debate on the amendment which he proposes to move. Under these circumstances I do not think it is best for us to beat our heads against a stone wall and remain for the small hours of the morning, but I would like my right hon. friend to give some intimation as to what time he thinks this discussion upon the Address may come to an end.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We have no desire on this side of the House to prolong the discussion, but some of our friends want to speak on the question. I do not think the debate will be very much prolonged but I will not bind myself to any time. I would observe that there should be no misunderstanding between the two sides of the House especially in regard to anything that is agreed to by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield). I would take his word under any circumstances and I would be very glad myself to give him every opportunity in the same way. If my hon. friend from Colchester tells us that he understood that the debate was to be closed to-day I would agree at once, but surely there must be a misunderstanding.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Hon. George E. Foster, the House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. Wednesday.

Wednesday, January 28, 1914.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs) presented the following report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of the House during the present session:

No. 1

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Aikins,
Barker,
Barnard,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Blondin,
Borden,
Boys,
Bristol,
Bureau,
Carvell,
Charlton,
Chisholm (Antigonish).
Coderre,
Crothers,
Demers,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Fowler,
Fripp,
German,
Kay,
Lafortune,
Lamarche,
Lancaster,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Lemieux,
Maclean (Halifax),
Marcile (Bagot),
Munson,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Porter,
Rainville,
Robidoux,
Ross,
Sevigny,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tremain, and
Wilson (Laval).—40.

No. 2.

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs

Achim,
Aikins,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Arthurs,
Baker,
Barker,
Barnard,
Barrette,
Béland,
Bellemare,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Boivin,
Boyce,
Boyer,
Boys,
Brabazon,
Bradbury,
Bristol,
Bureau,
Buchanan,
Carroll,
Cash,
Chabot,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Lapointe (Montreal, St. James),
Law,
Lemieux,
Lesperance,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
Maclean (York, O.),
MacNutt,
McCraney,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McKay,
McKenzie,
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
McLean (Sunbury),
McLeod,
Marshall,
Martin (Regina),
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Monk,

Charlton,
Clare,
Clark (Red Deer),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Cruise,
Currie,
Delisle,
Devlin,
Douglas,
Edwards,
Elliot,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fisher,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Fripp,
Gauthier (Gaspé),
Gauvreau,
German,
Girard,
Gordon,
Graham,
Green,
Guilbault,
Guthrie,
Hartt,
Henderson,
Hepburn,
Jameson,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lalor,
Lamarche,
Lancaster,
Morphy,
Murphy,
Neely,
Nesbitt,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Oliver,
Paquet,
Pardee,
Porter,
Pugsley,
Rhodes,
Schaffner,
Sevigny,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Smith,
Smyth,
Stanfield,
Stevens,
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Thornton,
Tobin,
Tremain,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Wallace,
Weichel,
White (Renfrew),
White (Victoria, Alta),
Wilson (Laval),
Wilson (Wentworth), and
Wright.—121.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-five members.

No. 3.

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs

Ames,
Armstrong (York, O.),
Ball,
Boulay,
Bourassa,
Boyce,
Boyer,
Boys,
Broder,
Bureau,
Burnham,
Carrick,
Carvell,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clare,
Clarke (Wellington),
Davidson,
Devlin,
Ethier,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Fripp,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Glass,
Gordon,
Guthrie,
Hepburn,
Hughes (Victoria),
Lachance,
Lamarche,
Lavallée,
Macdonell,
McLean (Sunbury),
McLeod,
McMillan,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Mondou,
Morris,
Morrison,
Murphy,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Paul,
Perley,
Porter,
Proulx,
Reid (Grenville),
Robb,
Ross,
Sharpe (Ontario),
Shepherd,
Steele,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Thoburn,
Tobin,
Turriff,
Jameson,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Walker, and
White (Renfrew).—63.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 4.

ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs

Achim,
Alguire,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Barrette,
Best,
Boulay,
Burrell,
Chabot,
Clare,
Cromwell,
Doherty,
Fortier,
Hazen,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Maclean (York, O.),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCraney,
Marcile (Bagot),
Michaud,
Morris,
Paquet,
Paul,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rhodes,
Roche,
Seguin,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Stanfield,
Turgeon,
Verville, and
White (Leeds).—33.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of seven members.

No. 5.

ON PRINTING.

Messieurs

Beattie,
Bickerdike,
Bowman,
Brabazon,
Brouillard,
Cardin,
Chabot,
Clark (Bruce),
Clarke (Wellington),
Currie,
Douglas,
Elliot,
Graham,
Lavallée,
Lesperance,
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Middlebro,
Murphy,
Nantel,
Nicholson,
Roche,
Stevens,
Verville,
White (Victoria, Alta.), and
Wilson (Wentworth).—25.

No. 6.

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs

Aikins,
Baker,
Bennett (Simcoe),
Blain,
Boys,
Carvell,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clarke (Essex),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements,
Crothers,
Davidson,
Edwards,
Fisher,
Foster (Kings, N.S.),
Fowler,
Fripp,
Martin (Regina),
Meighen,
Merner,
Michaud,
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Mondou,
Morphy,
Morrison,
Murphy,
Neely,
Nicholson,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Pardee,
Pelletier,
Proulx,
Pugsley,

Garland,
German,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Kyte,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Maclean (Halifax),
McCoig,
McCraney,
McCrea,
McKenzie,
McLeod,
Marshall,
Martin
(Montreal, St. Marys),
Reid (Restigouche),
Rhodes,
Robidoux,
Rogers,
Sevigny,
Sinclair,
Smyth,
Stanfield,
Tobin,
Tremain,
Truax,
White (Leeds), and
Wilcox.—63.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-one members.

No. 7.

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs

Aikins,
Ames,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York, O.),
Baker,
Ball,
Barker,
Barnard,
Beattie,
Bellemare,
Bennett (Calgary),
Best,
Bickerdike,
Blondin,
Boivin,
Boyce,
Bristol,
Broder,
Buchanan,
Burnham,
Cardin,
Carrick,
Carvell,
Charlton,
Clark (Bruce),
Clark (Red Deer),
Cockshutt,
Currie,
Demers,
Edwards,
Emmerson,
Fisher,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Fortier,
Foster (Kings, N.S.),
Foster (Toronto, N.),
Fowler,
Gauthier
(St. Hyacinthe),
Glass,
Graham,
Guthrie,
Hanna,
Henderson,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Hughes (Victoria),
Jameson,
Kay,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Law,
Lemieux,
Lesperance,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
Maclean (Halifax),
Maclean (York, O.),
McCraney,
McCurdy,
McLean (Sunbury),
McLeod,
McMillan,
Marshall,
Martin (Regina),
Meighen,
Middlebro,
Nesbitt,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Osler (Sir Edmund),
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Perley,
Porter,
Power,
Pugsley,
Rainville,
Rhodes,
Robb,
Roche,
Ross,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Sinclair,
Steele,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Sutherland,
Thomson (Qu'Apelle),
Thompson (Yukon),
Thornton,
Tobin,
Turriff,
Verville,
Warnock,
Webster,
Weichel, and
White (Leeds).—100.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-one members.

No. 8.

ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs

Achim,
Alguire,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York, O.),
Arthurs,
Ball,
Best,
Boivin,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Broder,
Brouillard,
Buchanan,
Burrell,
Cash,
Champagne,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clare,
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Wellington),
Cromwell,
Cruise,
Currie,
Delisle,
Douglas,
Edwards,
Elliot,
Fortier,
Foster (Kings, N.S.),
Garland,
Gauthier (Gaspé),
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Glass,
Gordon,
Graham,
Guilbault,
Hanna,
Hartt,
Henderson,
Hughes (Victoria),
Kay,
Lanctôt,
Lewis,
Lovell,
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCrea,
McKay,
McLean
(Queens, P.E.I.),
McMillan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marshall,
Meighen,
Merner,
Molloy,
Morphy,
Morris,
Morrison,
Munson,
Neely,
Oliver,
Pacaud,
Paquet,
Paul,
Proulx,
Richards,
Robb,
Roche,
Ross,
Schaffner,
Seguin,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Sinclair,
Smith,
Steele,
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thoburn,
Thomson (Qu'Apelle),
Thompson (Yukon),
Thornton,
Truax,
Turriff,
Walker,
Wallace,
Warnock,
Webster,
Weichel,
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox,
Wilson (Laval),
Wilson
(Wentworth), and
Wright.—98.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twelve members.

No. 9.

ON MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Messieurs

Alguire,
Barnard,
Boulay,
Bradbury,
Cardin,
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clarke (Essex),
Clements,
Emmerson,
Fowler,
Gauthier (Gaspé),
Hazen,
Hughes
(Kings, P.E.I.),
McCurdy,
McKenzie,
McLean
(Queens, P.E.I.),
Morrison,
Nicholson,
Pardee,
Pelletier,
Power,
Robidoux,
Shepherd,
Sinclair,
Stevens,
Stewart (Lunenburg),

Jameson,
Kyte,
Lafortune,
Lapointe (Montreal, St. John),
Loggie,
Taylor,
Turgeon,
Truax,
Wallace, and
Wilcox.—36.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 10.

ON MINES AND MINERALS.

Messieurs

Arthurs,
Carrick,
Carroll,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Devlin,
Douglas,
Foster (Kings, N.S.),
Garland,
Green,
Guilbault,
Hartt,
Hepburn,
Lalor,
Law,
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
McMillan,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Merner,
Mondou,
Nesbitt,
Osler (Sir Edmund),
Richards,
Sexsmith,
Shepherd,
Smith,
Smyth,
Thompson (Yukon),
Turiff, and
Walker.—35.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 11.

ON FORESTS, WATERWAYS AND WATER-POWERS.

Messieurs

Ames,
Barrette,
Béland,
Bellemare,
Blain,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Brabazon,
Champagne,
Charlton,
Cochrane,
Coderre,
Cromwell,
Cruise,
Davidson,
Ethier,
Green,
Henderson,
McKay,
Michaud,
Munson,
Osler (Sir Edmund),
Perley,
Richards,
Rogers,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Thoburn,
Warnock,
Webster,
White (Victoria, Alta.),
Wilson (Laval), and
Wright.—32.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 12.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Messieurs

Beattie,
Burnham,
Devlin,
Foster (Toronto, N.),
Hanna,
Lapoint
Lavallée,
Lemieux,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Monk,
Perley,
Rainville,
Reid (Restigouche),
Schaffner, and
Taylor.—15.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of five members.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

No. 13.

ON THE LIBRARY.

Messieurs

Béland,
Blondin,
Borden,
Boyer,
Broder,
Clark (Bruce),
Crothers,
Doherty,
Emmerson,
Foster (Toronto, N.),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Meighen,
Pardee,
Pelletier, and
Pugsley.—17.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid, the report was concurred in.

Hon. J. D. REID moved:

That the Select Standing Committees of this House shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records, with the exception of the Committee on Debates and that on the Library of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

THE PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Hon. J. D. REID moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on printing, viz.: Messrs. Beattie, Bickerdike, Bowman, Brabazon, Brouillard, Cardin, Chabot, Clark (Bruce), Clarke (Wellington), Currie, Douglas, Elliot, Graham, Lavallée, Lespérance, Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's), Middlebro, Murphy, Nantel, Nicholson, Roche, Stevens, Verville, White (Victoria, Alta.), and Wilson, (Wentworth), will act as members, on the part of this House, on the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Hon. J. D. REID moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to inform Their Honours that this House has appointed Messrs. Béland, Blondin, Borden, Boyer, Broder, Clark (Bruce), Crothers, Doherty, Emmerson, Foster (North Toronto), Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Lemieux, Lewis, Meighen, Pardee, Pelletier and Pugsley, a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned, and to act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of a Joint Committee on the Library.

Motion agreed to.

THE PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT.

Hon. J. D. REID moved:

That Messrs. Fripp, Pardee, Ross, and Stanfield be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the

direction of the restaurant, as far as the interests of the Commons are concerned, and to act as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the restaurant, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Return showing Lands sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company during the year ended October 1, 1913.—Hon. W. J. Roche.

Seventh Joint Report of the Commissioners for the demarcation of the meridian of the 141st degree of west longitude.—Hon. W. J. Roche.

Return of the by-elections for the House of Commons of Canada held during the year 1913.—Mr. Speaker.

Report of the Auditor General for the year ended March 31, 1913, vols. 1 and 2.—Hon. Geo. E. Foster.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 33, respecting The Acadia Loan Corporation, and to change its name to The Mortgage Corporation of Nova Scotia.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

Bill No. 34, respecting The Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Jameson.

Bill No. 35, to incorporate The Bank of Edmonton.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 36, respecting The Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—Mr. Guilbault.

Bill No. 37, respecting The Ottawa and Ungava Railway Company.—Mr. Chabot.

Bill No. 38, respecting The Sterling Trusts Corporation.—Mr. G. V. White.

Bill No. 39, respecting The Thessalon and Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Smyth.

Bill No. 40, respecting La Compagnie des Pouvoirs d'eau de Valleyfield, limitée.—Mr. Sevigny.

PARCEL POST REGULATIONS.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER laid on the Table of the House the regulations for the parcel post, to come into effect on the 10th of February, printed in both French and English.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In the course of his speech yesterday afternoon and during the short time that I happened to be absent from the Chamber, my hon. friend the Postmaster General made reference to a recent by-election in the constituency of South Bruce, and in that connection made certain observations with respect to myself which are both misleading and untrue.* For the sake of brevity and accuracy let me refer to 'Hansard.' The hon. gentleman is reported as having said:

> The Mildmay Gazette gives a report of what took place at a meeting at Walkerton, and there we find that the Hon. Chas. Murphy was one of the speakers. And what did he say on this point?
>
> His strongest contention on the naval issue was that the Borden policy was a direct insult to Germany and therefore a check to the peace conditions between that country and Great Britain which we are all so anxious to maintain.

In the first place, I did not happen to have the pleasure of speaking at Walkerton in that election; but if this extract from the Mildmay Gazette purports to give what I said at other places, then I characterize it as misleading and untrue. My reference to the insult offered to Germany was directed, not to the policy of this Government, but to the report of a speech mentioned in this House last session, delivered by the Minister of Militia (Mr. Hughes) on the Pacific coast, in which it was stated that the hon. gentleman said that Germany would have to be taught a lesson. My further reference to the naval policy was that when the naval holiday of a year was proposed last fall by the hon. Mr. Churchill, the despatches which came from Germany, and which were published in the Canadian press of October 21, 1913, showed that the three ships which had been under discussion in this House were the ships that stood in the way of Mr. Churchill's offer being accepted by Germany, and in proof of my statement I read this despatch from the Ottawa Citizen, dated Berlin, October 20, 1913:

> The naval authorities here consider the proposal that Germany should not build any warships while England is constructing or acquiring at least three cannot be discussed.

So much for that. Further on in his speech the hon. gentleman is reported to have said:

> Appeals to prejudices were made in South Bruce. We know that there are a great number of Irish Roman Catholics in South Bruce. The hon. member for Russell (Hon. Charles Murphy) went to South Bruce and told the Irish Catholics that there was no reciprocity in the last election, but that the election was carried by the Conservative party on the Ne Temere question.
>
> Mr. CARVELL: So say we all.

Mr. PELLETIER: Ah, these gentlemen will never acknowledge their defeat. Then we had this good Irish Roman Catholic, the hon. member for Russell, going to his co-religionists in South Bruce and telling them the Conservative party had promised to bring in a Bill to render the marriage law uniform in this country. Who has made that promise?

With respect to these observations, I have only to say that I did not make any appeal to the prejudices of any class of the community in the county of South Bruce. I made the same statements at each of the meetings I attended. I spoke as a Canadian to Canadians, and I merely said what I have said over and over again in this House. As to the hon. gentleman's question who made the promise, my answer to it at this time and place will be the answer that was suggested to be given to him who would inquire as to the monument of Sir Christopher Wren, 'Circumspice.' I have only to add that I know nothing about the leaflets or pamphlets that may have been distributed in that election.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER: Could the hon. gentleman give us a running interpretation of that foreign phrase?

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. the Postmaster General will do that.

Mr. PELLETIER: Speaking to the question of privilege raised by the hon. member, I hold here the newspaper from which I took that report, the Mildmay Gazette, which, as I am told, is an independent newspaper. As a matter of fact I made a very slight mistake, which has no bearing on the point. The heading reads:

R. E. Truax holds meetings in his interest all through county—R. E. Truax at Walkerton.

I took it for granted that the speech was made in Walkerton, but on reading it over I find it was made at Mildmay.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM: It was a mild speech.

Mr. PELLETIER: What my hon. friend has just quoted is an exact reproduction of what the papers have said. Whether it was well reported or not well reported of course is another question, but I want to let the House know that I have reported the fact as I have found it in the paper.

Mr. MURPHY: That may be, but I have pointed out that the statement in the paper is both misleading and untrue.

[Mr. Murphy.]

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY TRAIN CHANGES.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON: Perhaps the Minister of Railways and Canals is in a position to answer my question with respect to the discontinuance of the Ocean Limited and of other trains, if any, on the Intercolonial.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals): In reference to the Ocean Limited, we have come to the conclusion to discontinue it through February and March. Last year we ran it for the first time in history throughout the winter and met with a considerable loss, a very great loss, by doing so. The traffic is much less this year than last, and therefore we have come to the conclusion that it is not in the interest of the road to run the train. Another thing is that we are short of rolling stock on the Intercolonial, and if we continue the Ocean Limited we would not have an opportunity to clean and paint the cars and put them in good condition for next year's traffic. In reference to the other lines, I may say that we propose taking off the Southern Express between Windsor Junction and Halifax—a distance of thirteen miles—leaving ten trains running; the Express between Halifax and Bedford—eight miles—leaving ten trains running, the train between St. John and Hampton—twenty-two miles—leaving eight remaining; one train between Point Deschenes and Painsec—twelve miles—leaving four trains; one train between Campbellton and St. Flavie, leaving two trains; one train between Fredericton and Marysville—three miles—leaving three trains each way per day; one train between Windsor Junction and Dartmouth—twelve miles—one train remaining each way per day.

Mr. EMMERSON: Perhaps the hon. minister would tell us whether there will be any change in the running of the Maritime Express. If it continues to run as now, leaving Montreal at 8.30 in the morning, it will be impossible for Ottawa passengers to catch that train without remaining in Montreal all night. I may say that, formerly, when the Ocean Limited was not running, the Maritime Express left Montreal at 12 noon, making it possible for Ottawa passengers to catch the Express by leaving here on the 8.30 morning train.

Mr. COCHRANE: In reference to that, I can only say that I have no doubt that

the Maritime Express will be run in the best interests of the public.

Mr. EMMERSON: My hon. friend cannot give me the information?

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. H. F. McLeod for an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Tuesday, January 27.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt): It is not my purpose to take up the time of the House with many general observations in reference to the gracious speech of His Royal Highness the Governor General at the opening of the session. There are, however, one or two remarks I would like to make before I come to the reason for my rising. In my judgment, the Speech from the Throne is remarkable, not for the legislation it foreshadows this session, but for the number of its omissions.

It has been charged again and again on the floor of this House that this Opposition and their political friends in the Upper Chamber are responsible for depriving the farmers of Canada of the aid proposed by this Government on two successive occasions for the improvement of the highways of this country. In my constituency, which is largely a farming one, the road question is one of the most important with which we have to deal. There are districts in that constituency where farmers are 35 and 40 miles away from a railroad station, and road-making in some parts of that constituency is a very difficult proposition. So far as I am concerned, nothing would give me greater pleasure than to assist the Government in voting almost any sum for the improvement of our highways, if the proposal were put in such a form that it would leave the power of spending the money in the hands where it properly belongs, namely, the provincial legislatures of the various provinces. I wish the Prime Minister were in his seat to-day, because I would like to ask him a direct question in reference to this Highways Bill. In his absence, I would like to ask his special pleader in the House, the newly appointed Solicitor General, whether any single amendment made by the Senate to the Highways Bill was in opposition to the expressed intention of the Prime Minister himself with regard to the expenditure under that Bill. I maintain that the Prime Minister expressed on the floor of this House his intention of using the money identically in the same way as the Senate proposed in their amendment. All the Senate did in their amendment was to incorporate therein the expressed intention of the leader of this Government. And yet I, a representative of a farming constituency, and many others in the same position, are to be charged with opposing the passage of this Bill. There is an hon. gentleman in the Government who holds the important portfolio of Minister of Railways. He wished to add to that portfolio the portfolio of Minister of Highways. I for one have no objection to his being Minister of Highways, but I had very serious objection to his becoming Minister of By-ways, and that, in my mind, was the ulterior object of the legislation proposed by the Government in respect to highways.

Remark has already been made of the absence of any reference in the Speech from the Throne to the question which occupied the attention of this House for the greater part of last session. The hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder), expressing, I suppose, the farmers' views—and I might also say the view of the Government, because we know that but for geographical reasons the hon. gentleman would have been a member of the Government—tells us that he thinks it would be very inopportune for Canada to undertake the building of ships in this country at this moment, because experts in the old land have not yet decided whether the wars of the future are to be fought by aerial or naval fleets. Is that a hint from the hon. member for Dundas that the position of the Government in regard to naval affairs is still the position in which they found themselves last year—that is to say, very much up in the air? They are so high up in the air that they cannot see any way of getting down again without great damage to themselves.

The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) told us last night that in his view the people of Canada should take this question out of politics, and get together and grant a contribution in recognition of our duty to the mother country. Of course, we recognize our duty to the mother country, and, to ourselves, but the hon. gentleman knows that the contribution policy pressed by his Government last session was passed purely on the existence of an emergency, and to-day the right hon. the leader of the Government cannot get

any of his followers to believe, nor does he believe it himself, that an emergency exists. Now that the emergency has disappeared, surely the hon. member for South York does not want us to get together on a proposition based on an emergency. Let me tell the Government, whether they like to believe it or not, that they have already a permanent naval policy on the statute books of Canada. The anomalous position in which Canada finds herself to-day is, that notwithstanding that the present Government undertook to pass an emergency contribution last year, they had not the courage to repeal the Laurier Naval Service Act passed in 1909-1910. Therefore, whether they like it or not, this country is now committed by legislation to a permanent naval policy of a Canadian naval service, in harmony with the unanimous resolution of this House passed in 1909. That is the situation to-day, and are the Government going to continue that anomaly? In my judgment, if this Government are going to be true to themselves, and to the position they have taken on this question for the last two sessions, they must support the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Lesperance), and they must this session wipe off our statute books the Laurier Naval Service Act which is the permanent naval policy of Canada at the present moment. I say further, this Government has got to deal with the question of the defence of the commerce and of the coasts of this country, whether they like it or not. Whatever may be the internal situation as to the complex constitution of the Conservative party in this House, they have to face the question sooner or later of the defence of our coasts and commerce. So much with regard to the navy.

I especially rose, Sir, to address the House on the particular paragraph in the speech which refers to the bountiful crops with which the Dominion was abundantly blessed during the past season; to these crops having been harvested under unusually favourable conditions; and to the successful transportation of these crops to the markets. Judging from any reference made by any member of the Government to the occurrences of the past year with reference to the great fiscal and trade changes that have taken place on this continent, you would think they had all passed the intervening months since last session in some place absolutely devoid of newspapers, or of any other means of obtaining up-to-date information. Since last session of Parliament, that great protectionist country to the south of us has experienced a change in the governmental control of its affairs, which change has brought about a revolution in the fiscal and commercial situation on this North American continent. The new Administration in the United States, by lowering the tariff and placing a number of natural products on the free list, has compelled our friends opposite, who voted so nobly against giving away the natural products of Canada to the United States in 1911, to look on at the export of hundreds of thousands of live stock from this country to the markets of the United States. Unfortunately a number of the articles placed on the free list by the Congress of the United States are not placed there unreservedly, and while we have been glad in the West—as I have no doubt gentlemen in the East who represent rural constituencies are also glad—to see our farmers getting so much better prices for their hogs and their cattle since the inauguration of the Wilson-Underwood tariff in the beginning of October last, it has been our great regret that the wheat-growing farmers of the West have not received any benefit up to the present moment. I have no quarrel with the statement in the Speech from the Throne, that our harvest last year has been a bounteous one; I agree that the statement is absolutely correct. I believe that this year produced the finest crop of wheat ever grown in the Canadian West without any question of doubt, the finest in quality and the finest in yield; but I do regret that the string in the Wilson-Underwood tariff attached to the putting of wheat on the free list has prevented the farmers of western Canada this year from taking advantage of the market for wheat in the United States, as they have been able to take advantage of it for the sale of their cattle and other live animals. The Wilson-Underwood tariff has reduced the duty on wheat from 25 cents a bushel to 10 cents a bushel, but to all countries which permit United States wheat and wheat products to come in free, the United States allows the wheat and wheat products of these countries to their markets free of duty. I do not purpose, Mr. Speaker, to treat this question in any partisan way.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh.

Mr. NEELY: My hon. friend cannot understand that attitude on my part, and I quite appreciate that it is because he is not capable of taking such a non-partisan position. I wish, as I have said, to discuss this question in a non-partisan way, be-

cause it is one affecting not merely the welfare of western Canada, but every province in this great Dominion of Canada. I would like to ask my hon. friend the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) if the prosperity of the people of western Canada is not just as vital to him and his friends as it is to the people of western Canada themselves. The prosperity of the people of the West undoubtedly means the prosperity of every province in this Dominion. If our farmers are not reaping a proper reward for their toil, then they have not the money to spend for the necessities of life and for those tools and implements by which they dig the wealth out of the soil.

Here is the situation so far as the wheat crop of this year is concerned. Up to the close of navigation over 92,000,000 bushels of wheat and over 25,000,000 bushels of oats were forwarded from the ports of Fort William and Port Arthur. That, of course, is not by any means the total wheat crop of the West. In this connection it may surprise the House to learn that while in former years under Liberal administration —I am not prepared to go the length of saying that the Liberal administration was responsible for this condition, but this condition actually existed then and this dissimilar condition exists at the present time —the port of Montreal received and handled the larger portion of our export wheat. Would you believe, Mr. Speaker, that in the year 1913, with this bumper wheat crop, nearly 100,000,000 bushels of which were forwarded from Port Arthur and Fort William before the close of navigation, the greater portion was forwarded to American and not to Canadian ports, and that American ships and American railways to-day are actually handling the bulk of the western trade? Where is the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), that he has not observed this alarming state of affairs, and that our Canadian shippers, our ships and our railways are to-day handling only a small percentage of the Canadian wheat crop that is exported from this country? Of course, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce cannot be omniscient and omnipresent. He tries to be omnipresent, but that of course prevents him from being omniscient. When he tries to be present everywhere, he cannot know everything. Travelling as he has been doing during the last twelve months in all parts of the habitable globe looking for markets, although he and his friends were returned to power in 1911 on the question of refusing the greatest market in the world, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce cannot be expected to be aware of all these facts. As I do not intend, however, to discuss this question in a partisan manner, I am going to leave my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce at this point.

I have the figures, month by month, in regard to these shipments of wheat. I am giving you round figures. In the month of December, up to the close of navigation, there were shipped to Canadian ports just a little over 2,000,000 bushels, and to American ports over 6,000,000 bushels. In the month of November, the whole month there were shipped to Canadian ports 12,000,000 bushels and to American ports 22,000,000 bushels, and in the month of October, there were shipped to Canadian ports 15,000,000 bushels and to American ports 18,000,000 bushels. These are the figures for the handling of the greatest wheat crop that western Canada has ever produced, and practically the same proportion holds good with regard to the handling of oats and other cereals grown in the west.

It surely ought not to be necessary for me to undertake to demonstrate that the great need of the wheat grower in the West is a market for his surplus grain. Here are the figures as to the crop of 1913. These figures show that Western Canada produced something over 209,000,000 bushels of wheat. If we take the population of Canada at 8,000,000 in round figures, 50,000,000 bushels or at the outside 60,000,000 bushels of wheat would provide for the home market. Of course, we do not use western wheat alone because some wheat is grown in the East. Great Britain can take from sixty to eighty-five or ninety million bushels of wheat. That is our export market for wheat. If we take the maximum figures, 60,000,000 bushels for Canada and 90,000,000 bushels for Great Britain, that makes 150,000,000 bushels. Will any member of the Government, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce or any gentleman representing a western province be good enough to tell this House what the Canadian farmer is going to do with that wheat surplus, which is increasing every year?

Mr. BURNHAM: Tell us about the rebate.

Mr. NEELY: The hon. gentleman must be thinking of some other subject.

It may startle the House when I say that, while this year we have had the best wheat crop in the West so far, it has not been by any means one of the most profitable ones.

What is the situation? As I said, the wheat ripened early; it was harvested early. We have had one of the finest fall seasons that has been seen in the West for many years, with the result that the farmers have been able to get their wheat forwarded rapidly to the market and the railroads have been able to handle it with much greater ease than in any previous fall for many years. The farmers have only one export market. Therefore, they were forced to throw their wheat upon the market before the close of navigation; that is what it means to have only one export market the reaching of which depends upon navigation. As the farmers were compelled to throw their wheat upon the market before the close of navigation, the price was materially affected. Therefore, in the province of Saskatchewan, the farmers received a lower price for their wheat, I think, than in any season for the last ten or twelve years. There was a somewhat unfavourable season in the year 1912, and in 1913 the prices were unfavourable. Therefore, I am not able to report to the House that improvement in the material condition of our western farmers that I had hoped to report when I saw this year the splendid harvest which we had throughout the length and breadth of the three prairie provinces.

Is there any member of this House who will deny that it would be an advantage to the western wheat growers to have access to the mills and markets of the United States of America ? I know we heard that argument a couple of years ago; we heard it about cattle, about swine, about all sorts of agricultural products. But, the experience of the East and of the West in Canada has disabused the minds of thousands of the farmers of this notion, including many who in 1911 were of the opinion that it would be of no advantage to them to have the United States market for natural products. Some may say that the result will be that we would deplete our own farms of the live stock which we need. We would do nothing of the kind. We may do temporarily; but as a permanent proposition we establish so much larger—and consequently so much steadier —a market for these natural products that the ultimate result must inevitably be to greatly stimulate mixed farming throughout the length and breadth of Canada. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in his speech last evening was interrupted by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) with the suggestion that for some months last summer wheat was lower on the United States side than on the Canadian side. That is a condition which, I believe, actually existed for a brief period, a very brief period indeed. But it was at a time when there was practically no surplus wheat in the granaries of either the American or Canadian farmers. But if my hon. friend from East Lambton will look up the prices for that period of the year when the farmers are compelled to put their wheat on the market, he will discover a totally different state of affairs. Under the tariff of 25 cents a bushel which existed until the first of last October, for years the price of same qualities of wheat on the Canadian side was from 8 cents to 10 cents a bushel less than the price on the American side. At the present time, with the reduction of duty from 25 cents a bushel to 10 cents a bushel, there is not so marked a difference in price, but I notice that recent quotations show that there is a difference of from 4½ cents to 5 cents a bushel. Take a crop of 200,000,000 bushels of wheat, and, even cutting the advance of price in two and counting it at only 3 cents a bushel extra profit through access of our wheat to the United States market, what is the net result to the farmers of our western country? At least the net result would enable them to pay their bills for agricultural machinery and other eastern manufactured products very much more promptly, and had the farmers made that profit, many of our eastern manufacturers would probably be in a much happier state than they are at the present moment.

3 p.m.

Now, there was objection, when the reciprocity agreement was under consideration, that reciprocity was an arrangement entered into by the two countries and was not independent legislation on the part of each country. No one can find any objection on that ground with the proposal with which I intend to close my address this afternoon, the proposal that this Government shall take immediate action to enable the Canadian wheat growers to have free entry for their products to the markets of the United States. The American Government has taken action, and all that is necessary is for any other country in the world to take similar action in order that they may gain a free exchange in natural products. Now, Sir, not only have the United States put wheat on the free list but they have also put wheat products, including flour and all the by-products, upon the free list. I remember very well what

the millers said in 1911 in opposition to reciprocity; they said that reciprocity was not a square deal, because they would have to compete with the American miller in paying the price for the wheat, but were limited in their market on the by-products. I am free to say that from their point of view there was some truth in that contention. I am proud to recognize assistance from any quarter in a great cause which I think affects the welfare of our country, and particularly that part of our country which I represent, and so I was delighted to hear the hon. member for South York make the statement he made last evening with reference to the millers of Canada being able to take care of their own industry. I could not possibly use more emphatic words, more wisely chosen words, than the hon. member for South York used in his reference to this point. Speaking of the railways being able to take care of themselves in case wheat was put on the free list he went on to speak of the milling industry in words which, with his permission, I will quote:

The same is the case with the millers. Do you mean to tell me that Canadian millers, with their mills almost at the seat of production of the wheat, cannot compete with the American millers? I say they can; I say that they are ready for the business. Of course they would like to keep the monoply they have to-day in regard to wheat milling in this country, and they have got a great monoply. They are well linked up together and are in a position, by reason of their monoply and the association of the railways, to keep down the price. Thus in two ways the Canadian farmer will benefit.

That is, by putting wheat on the free list.

They will benefit by the competition of American railways and they will benefit by the fact that the millers will have to come up to the scratch and give them more for their Canadian wheat if they want to grind it in their mills.

To use an ordinary expression, that is the case in a nut-shell, as presented by the hon. member for South York. Granted that under reciprocity the miller of Canada would have to compete in the purchase of wheat with the United States miller, and have a limited home market for the by-products of his mill, if we accept the olive branch held out in the form of the Wilson-Underwood tariff, and take the duty off wheat and wheat products, what shall we find? We shall find that there will result a great advantage to the millers of Canada in that they will be given free entry into a market of ninety millions of people, not only for the flour which they manufacture, but for the by-products of the wheat which they have to sell. If any one entertains any doubt as to whether the Canadian miller can compete with the miller of the United States, I think I can very speedily disabuse his mind of that idea by referring to a short article which appeared in the Ottawa Citizen on Monday of this week. I do not think any hon. gentleman in this House would have the temerity to say that so far as the quality of Canadian wheat is concerned, it cannot compete with any wheat in the world if the millers are given the benefit of free entry for their products into United States markets. This is the article:

Canadian flour drives American flour out of the Orient. Hon. G. E. Foster's Trade Arrangement produces great results for the millers of this country and alarms United States Representatives.

The weekly trade report contains an item that is of exceeding significance in connection with Canadian trade with the Orient.

The American Consul-General at Hong Kong, reporting to his home government, states that Canadian flour is practically driving the American product out of the market, and that unless there is some change the American producers will lose this trade. He attributes the popularity of the Canadian flour in China to its high percentage of gluten, and says that no mere drought can explain the American falling-off, which was more marked in November than in any previous month.

It will be necessary, he declares, for the American wheat growers to get new seed and produce a different kind of wheat before they can compete with the Canadian product.

That is, in the market of China. The article then goes on to say:

It will be remembered that Hon. G. E. Foster, after his trip to China last year, predicted that this country would yet take leading place in the flour market of China, and his predictions are being made good.

This is delightful information to receive from such an authority as the United States Consul-General at Hong Kong, and we are delighted with the compliment paid to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and to know that his trip to China was not, after all, in vain. But the point of the article is that Canadian flour is actually driving United States flour out of the neutral markets of the world. We know that our Canadian flour is holding its own not only in China but in the other neutral markets of the world, the British market included. In what position would the taking advantage of the Underwood tariff in reference to wheat and wheat products leave the millers of this country? It would open up to them a market of ninety millions of people, from which they have been up to the present rigidly excluded by a high tariff wall. Not

only the grain growers, but the millers of Canada as well, should be sending deputations to this Government to ask for the right to sell their wheat where they are to-day selling their cattle to such advantage. We quite agree with the hon. member for South York that the putting of wheat products on the free list would have some effect on our Canadian railways, but the evidence which I have produced so far goes to show that the high railway rates charged in this country are already driving the export trade of Western Canada to United States routes, and if the Canadian roads are determined to keep their freight rates at the high-water mark it is for the stockholders of these railroads to deal with the matter; the Canadian farmer should not be obliged to suffer because the railways refuse to bring their rates down to a proper level.

Some reference has been made in this House to the remarkable labour conditions that exist throughout the length and breadth of this country. When I happened to notice in a recent issue of the Labour Gazette a statement showing that in the city of Vancouver the building permits for the month of November amounted to only $300,000, as compared with about $1,500,000 for the same month of the preceding year, I was quite prepared for the information given by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) that there were 10,000 unemployed in greater Vancouver. But, on the authority of a recognized leader of the farmers' movement in the province of Alberta, Mr. George Lane, I can tell the House that the exodus that has taken place from the province of British Columbia in the last four months is actually taking place off the farms in the province of Alberta. More than that, I have information in a less pronounced form that the same condition of affairs is being brought about in every one of the prairie provinces. Sir, what does this Government mean? Do they want the farmers to export their wheat or do they want them to export themselves? That is the issue on this question at the present time, that unless the farmers of western Canada are given free access for their greatest product, which is wheat, into the markets of the United States, we are going to see, not an increased tide of immigration into our country, but an exodus out of the country, which, Sir, has actually begun. That is surely not the object or the desire of the members of this House of either political party. We want to see our country grow, we want to see the population increase; we want to see the people increase in prosperity. But if we are going to say to the western wheat grower who to-day is face to face with a surplus of 50,000,000 bushels of wheat that he does not know what to do with: we, the Government of Canada, will prevent you from getting free access to the markets of the United States, there is only one thing for the western Canadian farmer and that is to pick up his kit and belongings and get out of the country to some place where conditions are more favourable.

Mr. BURNHAM: What about the countervailing duty and rebates and things like that? You have omitted all these points.

Mr. NEELY: I thought I had been discussing the countervailing duty for the last half hour.

Mr. BURNHAM: You have not.

Mr. NEELY: Does my hon. friend understand the meaning of the term? If he wants a definition so that he will understand it I shall give it. All he requires is a definition of the term and then he will know that I have been discussing the countervailing duty during the last half hour. I may say, if my hon. friend does not understand the proposition, it is this, that the United States Government has put wheat and wheat products on the free list for all countries that similarly put the United States wheat on the free list.

Mr. BURNHAM: Why do they not admit it free if they want to?

Mr. NEELY: It is not so much a question as to whether they want it or not, but they want similar courtesies from the country to which they grant the privilege of their market. But, after all, it is not a question of what the United States wants that I am discussing; it is a question of what the Canadian farmer wants. My hon. friend, after he gets through discussing the subject of titles, can go over and reform the United States ideas of what they want if he prefers it, but for the present let us confine our attention to the requirements of the Canadian people.

I was referring to the fact that this condition actually exists and I am glad that the opinion I am giving is an unbiassed one, because it has been echoed in other quarters that I am sure will appeal to every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. During the present session of the Manitoba Legislature, my hon. friends from that province will bear me out, a Mr. Malcolm, Liberal member from Birtle,

placed on the Order Paper a resolution asking this Government of Canada to place wheat and wheat products on the free list so that ours might have free access to the American market. What was the treatment accorded by the Government of Sir Rodmond Roblin to that resolution? The Government of Sir Rodmond Roblin took up the resolution of the Liberal member for Birtle and it passed the Legislature of Manitoba unanimously, so that when my friend says 'Oh!' when I say this is an unbiassed opinion, I leave it to him to say whether that is not so. I am proud to think that I am able to deal with this subject, a subject that is very near to my heart, in a way that I trust will appeal not only to members on this side of the House, but to every member of the House. Surely the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) a late member of the Roblin Administration and representing in this House the people of western Canada; surely my hon. friend the newly appointed Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) whom I congratulate on his appointment and his fitness for that appointment, and the possible fitness of the reward which it means, surely my hon. friend the Solicitor General, also representing the West in this Government; surely the Minister of the Interior who is not in his seat at the moment—surely every one of these gentlemen will agree with me that the necessity of the moment, so far as the western wheat grower is concerned, is that the resolution passed by the Manitoba Legislature at its present session should be adopted and acted upon by the Government at the present time. I say I am looking with confidence to the support of all these hon. gentlemen, not to them alone but to the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins), the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. W. H. Sharpe), the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner), the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury), and I see no reason why I should not have the support of every member of the House. Hon. gentlemen surely do not want to tell me that it is going to be a disadvantage to the western wheat producer to permit United States wheat to come over into this country. Who should be the best judge of that question? Again and again has this Parliament been apprised of the desire of the grain growers of the West and the wheat growers of the West; they were apprised of that desire only a few weeks ago, but, notwithstanding some hon. gentlemen have said in the past that it would be a great detriment to the wheat grower to have this change brought about, the western farmers are still persisting, obstinately persisting, in saying that they ought to be the best judges as to whether or not it is to their advantage to get free access into the United States market. I ask, who ought to be the best judges? and is there an hon. gentleman from western Canada who is prepared to contradict that position? If they are prepared to contradict the position taken by the Grain Growers Association are they prepared to contradict the resolution passed unaminously by the Manitoba legislature this session. The particular fault I have to find with the Government at the present moment is this: instead of calling a special session of this Parliament when the Wilson-Underwood tariff came into effect in the first week of October last, they continued their peregrinations over the four quarters of the globe and left our western Canadian farmers to sell their crop in a restricted market which meant a loss to them of millions and millions of dollars. Instead of calling Parliament, the time was extended for another couple of months and the farmers received practically no benefit this year from the repeal of the duty on wheat. It is not too late, however to get this result so far as future crops are concerned. The situation that existed this year will exist more markedly year after year as time goes on.

Mr. BURNHAM: What did the Americans do?

Mr. NEELY: My hon. friend is still interested in the Americans; perhaps he is thinking of moving over there.

Mr. BURNHAM: Oh, no.

Mr. NEELY: In view of all the facts, and the desire of the grain growers for the market across the line, I must express my regret that the Government have not seen fit to take any notice of this situation in the Speech from the Throne and that they did not call a special session of Parliament to deal with the question. Whilst I agree that nothing can be done to remedy what has occurred this year, yet I hope the Government will remedy the conditions so far as the future loss is concerned. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I move in amendment the following:

The House regrets that, in the gracious speech with which your Royal Highness has met Parliament, the said speech gives no indication of any intention on the part of your advisers to take any steps to secure free access to the markets of the United States for the wheat and wheat products of Canada, by re-

moving the duty on wheat and wheat products coming into Canada from the United States.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to venture into any extended discussion in respect to the Address in reply to the speech of His Royal Highness at the opening of this Parliament, for the simple reason that, in the first place, I do not deem any extended discussion necessary at the present time, especially in view of the fact that I was satisfied, as I believe every hon. gentleman upon this side of the House was satisfied, that when the vote was taken last night it meant the adoption of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. However, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have seen fit to think differently, and perhaps under the circumstances there may be some little excuse for the action which they have taken. When you consider, Mr. Speaker—as hon. gentlemen opposite have had an opportunity of considering, and of reconsidering, during the past ten days or two weeks—the very simple, very harmless and indeed very childish twaddle that was reduced to the form of a motion of want of confidence in this Government, and presented in the House by the right. hon. the leader of the Opposition, I say that I can well understand hon. members opposite feeling that it was necessary to supplement their weak position in some regard in order that they could recover the position they had lost, not alone before this House, but before the people of the country, in attempting to present such a simple motion of want of confidence as that which was defeated by such a large majority in this House last night. So much for the motion of yesterday.

Now we have the motion of to-day, and let me say that if we were surprised at the simple motion of want of confidence of yesterday, what must we say of the motion presented by my hon. friend the member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) this afternoon? And I am more surprised at my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition, for I am sure that no man in this House knows better than he that in allowing one of his followers to present such a motion as this, he was undertaking to break every rule and every practice that has obtained in this House since Confederation. Never in one single instance have there been two amendments from the Opposition upon the motion for the adoption of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, least of all a motion dealing with the tariff. If for no other reason than this, I say that the Government and the members in the majority in this House would fail in their duty if they did not reject the motion of want of confidence in this Government of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. If my hon. friend from Humboldt is as jealous of the interests of the people of western Canada as he would wish this House and country to understand, he has not taken the course best calculated to advance those interests. The hon. gentleman well knows, as does every hon. gentleman in this House, that the day is not far distant when the Minister of Finance will bring down his Budget Speech, and he knows, as we all know, that tariff changes have never been discussed on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The hon. gentleman knows that the proper time and place for the Government to announce and for the House to discuss tariff changes is when the Minister of Finance makes his annual financial statement. It will then be the proper time for us to deal with all the fiscal questions which may present themselves. As a government, we do not propose to make any statement of the intentions of the Government in respect to any tariff matter in advance of the Budget Speech. Then we will be free to discuss this question or any other cognate question, and the Government will then submit its decision with respect to this and other matters to the judgment of the members of this House and of the people of Canada. I do not know that there is anything else for me to say, except to add that even when the discussion of such an important matter as this does take place on the Budget Speech, we shall need to have the very best and soundest reasons—reasons more sound than those which the hon. member for Humboldt has been able to present to the House—before it would be wise for this Government to deal with any tariff changes which would affect important industries. If for no other reason than that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Neely) has undertaken by a motion of want of confidence in the Government to bring to the attention of the House at this juncture a matter which has never been introduced during the lifetime of this Parliament, other than on the Budget Speech, I ask the House to reject his amendment.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): I am sure we have been all greatly impressed by the constitutional and parliamentary

reasons given by the Minister of Public Works for deferring or preventing discussion on a matter of urgent public importance. In order that he may be relieved from any misapprehension, and so that he may not be grieved, as he professes to be, at the action or inaction of the leader of the Opposition, let me quote to him a motion presented to the Parliament of Great Britain—I am sure the Minister of Public Works will not deny the validity of such a precedent—when on the 6th of February, 1893, an amendment to the reply to the Speech from the Throne was moved in the following words:

> At the end of the question to add the following words:
> That this House humbly expresses its regret that no measures are announced by Your Majesty for the present relief of those who are affected by the existing wide-spread depression in agriculture, either by means of readjustment of local burdens, or otherwise.

This motion was debated in the English House of Commons for two days. If such a motion was in order in the British Parliament under the conditions prevailing in Great Britain at that time, surely an almost absolutely parallel motion is just as much in order in this country under the conditions prevailing now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman not see the difference between a general resolution referring generally to the tariff, and a specific resolution calling for action on a specific item of the tariff ?

Some hon. GENTLEMEN: Oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If hon. gentlemen do not see the distinction, I could easily show it to them.

Mr. OLIVER: I am sorry that we on this side of the House are not able to please our friends on the other side.

Mr. FOSTER: You do not try.

Mr. OLIVER: I think I can show the hon. minister that we do try. We have already debated at some length a resolution to which the Minister of Public Works takes objection because it is not specific, and now when we bring forward a specific resolution the Solicitor General takes objection. If we do not succeed on this side in pleasing the Minister of Trade and Commerce and his friends, I am afraid it is that these gentlemen opposite will not be satisfied with anything we may do, no matter what it be. The reference of the Minister of Public Works to lack of precedent was fortunate in that it afforded us an opportunity in the discussion of this question, which is undoubtedly of greatest and most pressing importance in Canada at the moment; to call upon such a precedent, in such a case, on such authority.

Is there a question of importance before the country? Is it necessary or is it desirable that a condition such as exists to-day should be considered by this Parliament without loss of time? Is it not a fact, as the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) has stated to the House, that because the members of this Government during the later months of last year, were paying attention to anything and everything except the business they are there to attend to; Parliament was not called at the usual time, to deal with this question, which would have saved millions of dollars to this country; millions of dollars that admittedly this country needs very much now. We have the attitude of the Government as expressed by the Minister of Finance, to the effect that the Government has no duty to perform except to levy taxes, to make expenditures, and incidentally to draw their salaries. We have his statement that there is no responsibility resting upon the Government to meet the conditions that exist throughout the country. Why, he says, leave things alone and they will get better of themselves. I believe that things will get better, if not by themselves, at any rate without the assistance of this Government. But if and when they do get better, it will be not because of this Government, its policy and its practice, but in spite of this Government, its policy and its practice.

A great deal has been made of the fact that the late Government did not do thus and so. Let me point out that the country is to-day face to face with a condition that did not exist during the term of office of the late Government. It is the fact of the existence of an abnormal condition, abnormal so far as the recent experience of Canada is concerned, that calls for action by this Government, and is our reason, not our excuse, for taking this opportunity of bringing before this House and the country not only the necessity for action but the possibility and the duty of action.

It is true that during the administration of the late Government there was a rise in prices. But it is also true that parallel with the rise in prices, there was a rise in prosperity. So long as I have the means to pay in proportion to the prices that I am asked, what difference does it make to me whether prices are high or low? But when the condition is that prices are higher than they were before and I have not the money to

pay those prices, then a condition exists that calls for action, for consideration. The fact that such action was not taken in previous years is no evidence that action is not necessary now. It was not needed then; it is needed now.

This is a question that is very much greater than a question of the West, as I understood one of my hon. friends on the other side to suggest. It is much greater than a party question. It is a question that touches the very foundation of the welfare and success of this great country of Canada. It is well for us to consider just how the present conditions came about. It will be remembered that some years ago, in fact in the winter of 1910-11, after a considerable amount of agitation had taken place amongst the farmers of the prairie west, a large delegation came to Ottawa to impress upon the Government of that day the desirability, or as they expressed it, the necessity, of the opening of a market south of the boundary line for our wheat and other western products. I am sure there are a great many of our friends, now on the other side of the House, who looked upon this delegation as an aggregation of cranks, as men who wanted something simply because they wanted it and did not know why. Let me point out what was the reason of that delegation and what is the reason of this resolution that is now before the House. We have had in the prairie west a stupendous development in wheat growing. I am confining my arguments to wheat for the moment. In a matter of some ten years our wheat area and production increased something like six or seven fold, from two and a half million acres of cultivation to over seventeen million acres of cultivation. At the same time, there was development in other wheat growing countries. With the increased production throughout the world, throwing that increased production on to the world's markets centering at Liverpool, there had been a continual depression of world prices of wheat, which was within the knowledge of the men who grew it and who, taking notice of that continued and enormous increase of production, taking notice of that continued decrease in world prices, saw that they were heading straight for the position that they are in to-day of attempting to produce wheat at a price that would not yield a fair margin of profit.

I see in the newspapers, and I hear from many of our friends in Parliament and out of it, talk about the farmer as though he were some sort of an altruistic individual who farmed for the sake of being near to nature's heart, and who should be satisfied to enjoy the morning sunrise, the singing birds and the pleasant scenery; and that when he undertook to discuss economic questions he was out of his proper field, and in fact had come into the class of cranks and nuisances. Of course our hon. friends are going to educate him. Let me say, what ought not to be necessary to say, that the farmer's business is just like any other man's business. If it is not done at a profit, he cannot stay in business. It is not a question of whether he wants to stay, it is a question of his being able to stay. What enables the merchant or manufacturer to stay in business? It is the little margin of profit that he makes. Let him have an output of $100,000,000, if his return is only $99,000,000, he goes out of business. If it is $101,000,000, he stays in business. It is the difference of a trifle between success and bankruptcy. As long as the farmer is getting for his products a price that gives him a fair and reasonable margin of profit, he stays in business. If his margin is only 5 cents a bushel on his wheat, it enables him to stay in business, but if he makes 5 cents a bushel less than the wheat cost him to produce, he goes out of business. This is the condition that the farmers of the West saw facing them in 1911. They had seen it years before. They came down and made representations to the late Government on the subject, and that Government acting on these representations, took measures to make it possible for more favourable marketing of the farmers' principal product, thereby assuring him, so far as it could be assured, a margin of profit on that product.

I have figures here which I will place before the House as to what the differences in the world's prices have been. I have acquired this information from a leading grain house in Montreal, and I have every reason to believe that it is reliable. I am informed that in the year 1907, a year of bad crops and hard times—it was as to that year I asked information for the purpose of making a comparison—in December, the average price of No. 1 Northern wheat in Liverpool was $1.23 per bushel. In 1911, the average of the same article in the same market for December was $1.18⅛ per bushel; in 1912, the average was $1.07 per bushel; and I am further credibly informed that in the year 1913 the average price in December for No. 1 Northern wheat was 98 cents. This is a difference as between 1907 and 1913 of twenty-five cents a bushel, or twenty per

cent, if I am correct in my calculation, in the return to the farmer.

Now, I do not know how many classes of business there are that can stand a reduction of twenty per cent in the value of the out-turn and still remain going concerns. And I am here to say, Mr. Speaker, that the fact of that reduction having come to the wheat producers of the Northwest has had the absolutely necessary effect of restricting production and decreasing financial resources, producing a condition that is reflected throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion in the cry of hard times that now prevails. I do not know how far the financial condition will be denied, but I will say that not in twenty years has there been a condition in this Dominion of Canada such as exists to-day. A despatch from Toronto of January 26 says that the total registration of unemployed in the Toronto Civic Registration Bureau up to date had almost reached 7,000 men. I read that in Ottawa, Messrs. Fripp and Chabot are approaching the Minister of Public Works to impress upon him the desirability of pushing work for which money has been voted, as a means of giving employment to two or three hundred men. I find a despatch from Toronto appearing in the London Times and dated 8th of January, stating that it is admitted there are from 10,000 to 15,000 unemployed in Toronto. I read in the Montreal Telegraph of January 26 that at the Protestant House of Refuge the number of night lodgings given last week was 895 and the number of meals 1,331. I give these figures to put it beyond all question that there is a condition in this country to-day that has not existed for twenty years. It is a condition of shortage of money. And I am pointing out where, in one direction, that shortage of money could have been measurably prevented by action of this Government. I maintain that the condition is not only such as to justify the Opposition in moving the resolution they have moved but such as to call upon the Government, if they have any proposals to make, if they have any remedy to offer—as it must be offered in the Budget Speech—to bring down their Budget at once so that such remedy as they may see fit to apply may be applied without delay.

4 p.m.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER: We cannot do it until the Address is passed.

Mr. OLIVER: If my hon. friend will agree that the Budget shall be brought down to-morrow, the Address will be passed this afternoon.

Mr. FOSTER: You are nearly exhausted already, and of course you are taking advantage.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend need not fancy that this subject is exhausted. It is too important a question, it touches the vital interests of every man in Canada too closely, to be exhausted by anything I could say, or by anything that even he himself could say.

Now, I do not wish to delay the House, but I desire to draw attention to a special feature of this matter that has been alluded to but is perhaps not as thoroughly understood as it should be. The argument has been made that because the United States produces wheat in large amount, and exports wheat in large amount, therefore there is not and cannot be a market for Canadian wheat in the United States. On this point I asked a question of this grain house in Montreal of which I have spoken. I asked if it was a fact that in the Liverpool market American wheat was sold at a higher price than Canadian wheat of equal quality. And here is the answer I get:

> With reference to your last question, I presume that statement has reference to American winter wheat. As regards Australian wheat, as you are aware, that is a white wheat. It is quite true that at times all these classes of wheat will sell at a higher price than your No. 1 Northern Manitoba. That is merely a matter of supply and demand.

That is to say, in the markets of the United Kingdom there is a demand for certain classes of wheat to make flour for pastry purposes. When these classes of wheat are in short supply naturally the price is higher, and when they are in abundant supply naturally the price is lower. Now, what is the case in regard to certain soft wheat in the Liverpool markets is the case in regard to the hard wheat of Canada in the United States markets. In the United States they are producing and milling for a population of ninety or a hundred million and of that product only a small proportion is hard wheat. That which comes from the Red River valley is, I understand, the only hard wheat grown in the United States. For purposes of mixing, I understand that there is a special demand in the United States for hard wheat, and when they have not enough hard wheat to meet their requirements, they import from us and pay a higher price. As a matter of fact, they never have enough

hard wheat for mixing purposes to supply the home market, and for that reason there is a continual demand in the United States for the hard wheat of our prairie provinces at an advanced price. It is because the farmers are entitled to it, and can be given that advantage, that we bring this matter very strongly to the attention of the Government.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: What about the wheat of North Dakota; that is hard, is it not?

Mr. OLIVER: I said the Red River valley.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: The Red River valley must extend over a very wide area.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not mean only the lands immediately adjoining the river; I mean the area known as the Red River valley, the black-soil country of Northern Minnesota and the two Dakotas. That is the hard wheat district of the United States, and although it produces very largely, it does not produce anything like as much as the mills of the United States require for mixing purposes. If there is anything further to be said in that regard, the clipping read by my hon. friend the member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), a quotation from the report of the United States Consul in Hong Kong, published with the authority of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, would perfectly establish the fact. It is specifically stated that flour manufactured from United States wheat cannot compete with Canadian flour in a neutral market. No other evidence is necessary to establish the fact that Canadian wheat can command a premium price in the United States if it is but allowed to reach that market. The Government of the United States is willing that it should come in, and it only remains for the Government of Canada, without entering into any entangling alliances or agreements with the United States, to take such action as will allow that wheat to be marketed in the United States, and to give the Canadian farmers the benefit of the higher price they would thereby obtain.

There are many conditions that enter into the price of wheat. There is production there is consumption, there is transportation, and there are the arrangements that are connected with handling and storing. I am informed on authority that I do not think will be questioned, that for certain special reasons which concerned Canada only, the price of Canadian wheat was lower in Liverpool last year by several cents than the market of Liverpool warranted. Let me read the statement:

> With reference to the last crop in the Northwest which we are now handling, during the months of October and November, the prices for No. 1 Northern almost continually declined, which was due to the great pressure to sell, owing no doubt to the financial situation. We had letters from the other side—

That is, from England.

> —stating that it was the finest wheat and the cheapest in the world, and they could not understand why it should be sacrificed in the way it was. There was no other country selling in competition with us at the time; it simply went down under its own weight.

Mr. BURNHAM: If the United States wants our wheat, and if they have no cogent reason for wanting to send theirs into this country, why on earth do they persist in keeping the balance of trade against themselves year after year as they are doing, and in waiting for this House to give them permission to take our wheat in?

Mr. OLIVER: I am not commissioned to answer for the Government of the United States. The ex-President will be in this city on Saturday, and I would suggest that my hon. friend consult him in the matter.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE: Will the hon. gentleman tell us who made the statement which he has been reading?

Mr. OLIVER: No, I will not tell my hon. friend who made the statement, although I am quite at liberty to do so; because I do not think he has any right to inquire. If he is interested in the matter, he can easily verify the assertion made as a statement of fact. It is open for any gentleman to show that it is not a fact, if it is not. There is no question about the fact that wheat was at a lower point in the Liverpool market last fall than it has been for many years. There is no doubt, as is affirmed elsewhere in this letter, that Canadian wheat was selling below the price of United States wheat of equal value; the reason given for that condition was that our Canadian wheat was forced on the market and naturally the price went down, as the article says, under its own weight. Why, it may be asked, was the wheat sent forward in such large quantities? Partly because of the pressure which was exerted upon the farmer compelling him to sell, and partly the feeling on the part of the farmer that it would be better for him to sell early than to sell late, after a grain blockade had occurred and the price had been still further hammered down. If we had the right to sell to the

United States all the year round, we would have the advantage of the double market; we would have the advantage of winter transportation to one of those markets, and our farmers would not be compelled to force all their grain out before the close of navigation. Free access to the markets of the United States last year would, aside from the advance in the price from the United States market, by making it a business proposition for our farmers to hold back their wheat, have helped the Liverpool price to a very material extent. It is beyond question that, having regard to world products, the wider the markets, the greater their number, and the more easily accessible they are, the better for the producer. That is an elementary proposition that cannot be denied. If our prairie west is to increase in production, our farmers must be able to make a profit. Under circumstances as they are, it is necessary for the Government of Canada, instead of shutting their eyes, instead of asking people to wait until things right themselves, without loss of time to take every means that can be taken to secure to the producer the best price that the world's markets will give him, by decreasing the burden of taxation, by facilitating his means of production, by decreasing the cost of transportation, by improving the conditions under which trade is carried on; and if to attain this end it is necessary for these gentlemen to forswear their settled policy, if it is necessary for them to reverse the position that they took in 1911, I say the needs of the country are such as to demand that action at their hands; and, whatever they may conceive to be their duty according to their belief, we consider it to be our duty to bring to the attention of the House and of the country, in the most emphatic manner that we are able to, the condition as it exists, the need of a remedy and a suggestion as to what the remedy should be.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): I am very sorry that the Government supporters appear to have dropped out of this discussion; it seems to me it is of sufficient importance to justify the Government in putting up men to continue it. In the minds of the farmers of Saskatchewan, at least the question of the removal of the Canadian duty on wheat is one of vast importance. We are told by members and supporters of the present Government that the Government has done great things for the farmers. I am willing to give all reasonable credit to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) for what he has done in the matter of agricultural grants. I believe the estimate for agricultural purposes for the years 1913-14 is something more than $1,000,000 over the estimate prepared by the late Government for the years 1911-12. It seems to me that the boasting we have heard about this great increase is very extravagant, to say the least of it, when we remember that the increase in the general estimates of the years 1913-14 over 1911-12 amounts to $50,000,000, it does not seem to me at least that the increase in the agricultural grant is surprising, except on account of its meagreness. A little over 2 per cent of the increase is given to agriculture. As the people of Canada are generally waking up to the fact that agricultural education has been neglected in our country, that agricultural progress is necessary in order to have progress of any kind, and that it is in the interest of the country generally that agriculture should receive more attention and assistance, it seems to me that the percentage of increase in the Estimates voted to agriculture is small instead of large, and that the minister might very well have made the vote much greater and still have had the general support of all classes of the community. I think his failure to provide for a greater proportion of the general increase being given to the work of his department indicates a want of courage on his part. The amount the farmers of the prairie provinces will gain by the action of the United States in throwing the duty off cattle and decreasing the duty on oats is very much more than they will gain by the Agricultural Instruction Act. The Minister of Agriculture should not allow himself to be outdone in the matter of assisting the farmers of Canada by the President of the United States. We have a right to expect more from our Minister of Agriculture than from the President of the United States; but I do not think that any one will suggest that we get anything like as much. The greatest assistance we have got since the present Government came into power, in fact the only assistance, has come from the other side of the line. We hear suggestions that it would be a bad thing to encourage anything that would create a desire to be annexed to the United States. I do not know what possible condition would make that more likely than the present state of affairs, when we are getting

all our help from the United States and nothing from our own Government. I do not wish to refer to the reciprocity question particularly, but I want to say that this Government deprived us of the tremendous advantage we would have gained under the reciprocity arrangement of 1911. I believe that the action of the Government in that case worked a great injury, not only to the farmers of Canada, but also to the whole of Canada. However, I do not propose to discuss that at this particular time.

In view of the great loss sustained by us through their action on this question, it is only reasonable that they should endeavour to make up a portion of that loss in some other way; and when the Underwood tariff became law in the United States, I for one fully believed that the Government of Canada would have taken immediate action to remove the duties on our wheat and wheat products, in order to allow us an opportunity of having the benefit of the American market in marketing our crops of 1913. I must say that I was seriously disappointed when time slipped by and nothing was done by the Government, and I think we have a right to be disappointed. I think it only reasonable that every farmer in the West should feel disappointed, and I believe that every farmer in the West, Liberal or Conservative, was seriously disappointed—the Conservatives perhaps more than the Liberals, although they may not care to admit it.

We are sometimes told that we cannot gain anything by having access to the American market. The falseness of this is amply proved by the great gains we have made by the removal of the duty on live stock and the reducing of the American duty on oats. I am well aware that the Fort William and Minneapolis reports for the crop year, starting the 1st of September, 1912, and ending with the 31st of August, 1913, can be juggled, and have been juggled in such a manner as to make it appear, to the uninitiated at least, that the western Canadian farmer would not have been a gainer by having had access to the United States, provided, of course, the United States had access to his market as well.

I am well aware that these market reports may appear to casual observers to have that meaning; but even if that were true, I fail to see that it is a good reason why the present request of the western farmers should be refused. We must remember that the crop in the United States in 1912 was handled under exceptional circumstances. There was a bumper crop in the north-western states, greater, I suppose by a long way than they ever had before. That naturally affected Minneapolis and other markets. Our opponents find it very convenient to ignore the vast difference in grade between No. 1 Canadian Northern and No. 1 Northern American wheat. I think most gentlemen in this House who have a knowledge of these things will agree with me that there is a difference of at least three cents a bushel in favour of Canadian wheat. I have made some careful comparisons of the prices in Fort William and Minneapolis for the year during which the 1912 crop was marketed. I took my figures as far as possible from the Winnipeg Telegram. Sometimes when I could not find the reports in that paper I applied to other sources, but only on such occasions. I find that for the month of September, 1912, the average price at Fort William was 96 cents; in Minneapolis 89¾ cents, a considerable difference in favour of the Fort William market. In October they were practically the same, 90 cents each; Fort William was actually a very small fraction of a cent higher than Minneapolis. In November things changed slightly. Fort William averaged 83 cents and Minneapolis 84⅝ cents. December, Fort William 80⅝ cents Minneapolis, 82⅝ cents; January 1913, Fort William 82¼, Minneapolis 86⅝; February, Fort William 84, Minneapolis 87½; March, Fort William 85½, Minneapolis, 86. You will notice that in September the Fort William price was considerably higher, but gradually the Minneapolis price rose. In March we see the Fort William price gaining. In April it makes a further gain. In that month the price at Fort William was 90¼ and in Minneapolis 89⅛; May, Fort William 93, Minneapolis 91¼; June, Fort William 97⅛, and Minneapolis 92⅝; July, Fort William 96¾, and Minneapolis, 90⅝; August, Fort William 94½, and Minneapolis 89½. You will notice that during seven months the Fort William price was the higher. That is why I say it might appear to the casual observer that the Canadian farmer would not be gaining anything by such an arrangement as we are now suggesting. Only during five months was the American price, apparently, higher than the Canadian. I say apparently because it is only a matter of appearances. But even if we ignore the difference in value of grades, it does not necessarily follow that even during that

exceptional year the western farmer would on the whole have done worse in the American market than in the Canadian, provided he had free access to both. It is true that during the twelve months in question there were a majority of the days of the year during which the Fort William prices were apparently higher than the Minneapolis prices, but it is far from true that the western farmers sold more grain while the Fort William prices were apparently the higher. As a matter of fact very little of the farmers' grain was sold by them at that time. Nearly all their grain was sold by them during the months of November, December, January and February, during which, if we allow for the three cents difference in value, the Canadian farmer got 4⅝ cents less in November, 5 cents less in December, 7⅝ cents less in January and 6½ cents less in February, in Fort William than his neighbour got in Minneapolis, and even in March he got 3½ cents less, so that even in that exceptional year, I think I am within the mark in claiming that the farmer who had access only to the Canadian market got on an average 4 cents or 5 cents a bushel less for his wheat than the farmer who had access to the American market got for wheat of equal quality. I am sure the farmers of this House, and especially those from Saskatchewan and Alberta, will fully bear me out in what I say. I think the Manitoba farmers are in much the same position. Besides this, it has been frequently proved by market reports that during five years from 1906 to 1911 the average difference was nine cents in favour of the American market.

While I am quite willing to deal particularly with the year, to which I have referred, which is the most favourable year our opponents can select, we must not forget that in other years the gain by the farmer would have been very much greater. If you look up the inspection reports in the Winnipeg papers, you will see that the number of cars inspected was very, very small during the time that the Fort William price was higher than Minneapolis, and even that does not show the small quantity of wheat sold by the farmers at that time. We must remember that a great many of these cars are filled in the slack months with grain that has been lying in the elevators or stored by the dealers. I do not claim that the opening of the American market would necessarily mean that we would gain the full amount of the difference.

The effect of opening up to us a market in which the price is on the average better than the price in our own markets, would necessarily mean that we would get a better price. I will assume that the opening up of the Minneapolis market to our grain would tend to somewhat decrease the price in Minneapolis. But if we take even one-half of the difference in price, I think the farmers of the West are well justified in being anxious to receive that one-half and I think the western farmers are entitled to it and would be satisfied with it. It will, I think, be generally admitted by all fair-minded men, that it is reasonable to suppose that we would gain at least one-half of the difference in the price between Minneapolis and Fort William.

We are sometimes told that if the price which the farmer gets for his wheat is increased, the price of wheat products to the consumer would be increased to an equal extent; but the fact that during many months of the year the price of wheat at Fort William is higher than the price at Minneapolis will show that such is not the case. In some cases—even after allowing the three cents difference in the value of the grades—the difference in favour of Fort William amounted to ten or twelve cents. Certainly in times like that the Canadian miller could have purchased American wheat more cheaply than he could have purchased the Canadian wheat, and the farmer would have lost nothing by that because the wheat was then out of his hands. The speculator would have received just so much less from the Canadian consumer, and of course the speculator would be a little bit out, but I do not think any one will deny that so far as the general benefit to the country is concerned, the consumer should have the margin instead of the speculator. In discussing the position of the consumer it must also be remembered that the consumer does not consume the raw wheat; he consumes it only when it is turned into flour.

Dealing with the question of flour, we are met with the argument that we would do injury to the millers of Canada; that we would ruin their trade; that we would drive them out of business and cause the wheat to be manufactured into flour in the United States, and that we would have to ship the wheat there and ship the flour back again. I cannot imagine there is any one, in this House at all events, who has so little knowledge of the actual facts as to believe anything of that kind. I had some difficulty in obtaining late reports of the prices of flour at Winnipeg, and the latest

quotation I have is in the Winnipeg Telegram of Monday, January 19, reporting the Winnipeg flour prices of Saturday, the 17th of this month.

The highest quotation for flour at Winnipeg on that date was $5.40 per barrel and the lowest $3.00 per barrel. I give only two quotations, the lowest and the highest, but there were a number of other quotations given for grades of flour in between and dividing the total by the number of quotations given, I find that the average price was $4.47. I arrived at the average price in Chicago by the same process. The Chicago Tribune gives the price of flour for the same date, the highest price quoted being $5.30 and the lowest $2.65, and applying the same process, the average of the quotations is $3.70 a barrel. On the same day No. 1 Northern wheat was 85⅛ cents at Fort William while the Chicago price for American No. 2 Northern was 90¼ cents. I find no Chicago quotation for No. 1 on that date and so I was obliged to take the quotation for No. 2. I think most of us have heard enough of the difference in the prices of these grades to have an idea as to what that difference would be. In other words, the best Chicago flour on that date was quoted ten cents lower than at Winnipeg; the worst 35 cents lower, and the average 77 cents lower, while No. 2 wheat was five and a half cents per bushel higher in Chicago than No. 1 in Fort William. This shows plainly how the Canadian consumer, as well as the Canadian grain grower, will gain by the action we propose. There is no question but that, while the Canadian grain grower will get more for his wheat, the Canadian consumer will buy his flour at a lower price and the millers will not be driven out of business even then. It is safe to say that there is no possibility of the millers being driven out of business by any proposal such as this. I assert that the statement to that effect is not supported by evidence. We are not shown how it costs Canadian millers more than American millers to mill their wheat, but the statement that the Canadian millers cannot compete with the American millers is very easily disproved by the evidence at hand. I take from the Canadian trade reports the exports of flour produced in Canada for the year ending March 31, 1908, to the year ending March 31, 1913, inclusive, and the following is the result:

[Mr. Thomson.]

Exports of Canadian Flour.

	Barrels.	Value.
1908	1,962,740	$ 8,454,954
1909	1,738,038	7,991,413
1910	3,064,028	14,859,854
1911	3,049,046	13,854,790
1912	3,738,836	16,034,064
1913	4,478,043	19,970,689

It will be seen that nearly $20,000,000 worth of flour was exported out of Canada by the millers of Canada, for the year ending March 31, 1913, and in that same year there was exported by the millers of Canada 1,662,338 cwts. of bran valued at $1,603,003. So that in the year ending March 31, 1913, there was exported milled products from Canada to the value of $21,573,692. It is impossible, of course, to give the exact amount that will be exported during the current year which will end on the last day of next month, but judging by the increase that has taken place from year to year in the past, we may safely say that over $26,000,000 worth of mill products will be exported this year by the Canadian millers. It must be remembered that when a miller exports mill products from this country to some other country, he is in open competition with the world; he has to face the Minneapolis millers and millers from many other places. He has no advantage whatever. Unless he produces his flour as cheaply as other millers, he cannot export his flour. Looking over the speech which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) delivered the other day, I find he says that the output of the mills of Canada is now $82,000,000 or thereabouts. If that is correct, as I presume it is, then if the output exported increases during the present year, as it has done in past years, about one-third of the mill products of Canada will be exported to other countries and will come into direct competition with the mill products of every other country, with no advantage, no protection. If the mills can compete with other millers on one-third of their products, there is no reason why they should not compete for our benefit with other millers on the other two-thirds.

I think that makes the matter clear; but to make it a little clearer, even at the risk of repetition, I desire to quote from a news item in the morning Citizen of Ottawa of the 26th of this month. It is headed 'Canadian flour drives American out of Orient.' That is very pleasant reading. It must be remembered that these Canadian millers

are frightened out of their lives of American millers. We are told that they must be protected or our wheat will go to the United States, be milled there and the flour will come back to us to be consumed. On the other hand, however, they are able to go to the Orient, to compete freely with these American millers and beat them out of the market. The news item contains the following:

> The weekly trade report contains an item that is of exceeding significance in connection with Canadian grain in the Orient. The American Consul General at Hong Kong, reporting to his home Government states that Canadian flour is practically driving the American product out of the market.

We have no reason to suppose that this statement is not correct. If it is correct, it proves plainly and conclusively that the Canadian miller does not require any protection from the American miller, from whomever else he may require it.

I wish to say a word in regard to the exporting of bran. We are told it would be a serious thing for our wheat to be allowed to go free into the United States, because it would go there to be milled and the bran would be consumed there, while the flour would be shipped back to us. If the bran exports of this year exceed the exports of last year in the same proportion that the exports have been increasing from year to year, we may expect that in the neighbourhood of 2,000,000 cwt. of bran will be exported by the millers of this country during the present year. If that is so, it is quite plain that we are not likely to be in any great trouble on the bran question.

Our friends on the other side of the House often twit the western farmers on the fact that they are not going into mixed farming, and tell them that they should adopt a system of mixed farming. I am a farmer in the West, and I am fully aware of the fact that it will be to our benefit to adopt a system of mixed farming. I am endeavouring to adopt it on my farm. I am gradually getting into that system. A large proportion of the farmers of the West, so far as they are able, are doing the same. It is all very well to lecture us in this respect. I do not think, however, that lectures will do any good. The western farmer has sufficient confidence in himself that there is no one in this House able to lecture him successfully. There is no one in this House from whom he is willing to take lectures. Perhaps that is wrong of us, but it is a fact.

There are other things which the present Government might do to encourage mixed farming. I do not know what has been done by this Government. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce used to give us periodic lectures on the necessity of adopting mixed farming, but I do not know that he has done anything to encourage us. As a matter of fact the encouragement that we are getting is like other agricultural encouragement, all from the other side of the line. The same unfortunate condition exists that when we look for help, encouragement, assistance, the Government says: You must get all your assistance from the Yankees. They say: We do not want any truck or trade with the Yankees, but if you want any help, you must go to them. I think I am right in saying that all the official encouragement that we have received during the last couple of years has been from the American Government.

When the American Government removed the duty from live stock, they gave us the greatest encouragement we have ever had or are likely to have for some time. The western farmers are not killing their calves now, as they formerly did. Formerly they preferred steers, as the steers brought a little better price than the heifers. Things have changed now. The farmers are looking for heifers. They are saving their calves. In a few years, if the price continues as it is now, you will see lots of cattle in Saskatchewan and other western provinces.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: And no thanks to the present Government.

Mr. THOMSON: Ii is unfortunate that we are not able to give thanks to our own Government, because as good citizens we would like to be in a position to give thanks to our own Government instead of to a government of a foreign country.

We are very often told that it is a dangerous thing to open the markets of Canada to our American competitors; that the farmers of Canada must be very careful; that they want to look out for their own interest; that they do not want competition; that they must protect their home market and keep it for themselves. If I know anything about the farmers of Saskatchewan, that is not their idea of the matter at all. I am satisfied that in considering any policy we must consider its effect on the consumers as well as on the producers.

On these subjects, especially where the farmer is the producer, I feel that it is my duty to look carefully to the effect which the policy will have upon the Canadian consumer, and especially upon the

labouring classes. And let me say this: If I were appearing before the Grain Growers' Association of Saskatchewan and made such a statement as that, it would be cheered to the echo, I am satisfied; but if I made any remark which would show that I did not care a straw what effect this had upon the labouring class, I should be howled down. That is the spirit of the western farmer.

We have heard a great deal about the heads of the Grain Growers' Association. I want to say that there is no class of men in Canada who show better spirit in dealing with other classes of the community than the leaders of the Grain Growers' Association of the West, and I challenge contradiction. There is no class of people in Canada that are more likely to consider fairly the effect of any policy upon the consumers, especially upon the labouring class, than are the farmers of the West. I believe that to be the spirit of the farmers of Qu'Appelle; and I should not wish to represent the farmers of Qu'Appelle were it otherwise.

Now, let me say in conclusion, speaking for the farmers of the West, that all they want is a fair field and no favour. They are prepared to compete with the world. And let me say to the people of Ontario, who sometimes talk about their farmers not producing very much and about protection being of some use to them, that the farmers of Ontario would do well to keep their eyes on that western country. At present we are growing grain, especially wheat. We are exporting wheat, and the price of our product is fixed, almost invariably fixed, by the foreign markets. Some of our friends say that we should adopt mixed farming. We shall adopt mixed farming. But let it be understood that whatever we undertake to produce we shall produce in such large quantities that the home market will not be able to fix the price, but the price will be fixed by the export market. This is a point that should not be lost sight of by our friends in Ontario. I call them our friends. I am an Ontario man myself, born and brought up on an Ontario farm, and I am not ashamed of it. I am the son of an honest Ontario farmer and ask no prouder pedigree. I do not admit that one can have a better pedigree. I say our friends the Ontario farmers should keep in view the point to which I have referred. If we start to produce beef, in a very short time the price of beef will be fixed entirely by the export price; if we undertake to produce butter, the same will be true, or if eggs and poultry, the same will be true. All we ask is a fair field and no favours. We believe we have a country, a soil and a people that are the equal of any in the world. We believe that we have a better country than our friends to the south of us. We believe we have a better soil. And we believe, with all due respect to our neighbours to the south, that we have better men. If we are not prepared to face the world, we cannot say that; for the very fact of our being unwilling to face the world's competition is to say that either our country is not so good or our soil is not so good, or our people are not so good as those with whom we are to be brought into competition, and that we are not prepared for a moment to admit.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): I would not take part in this debate, especially at this stage of it, but for a few observations of a rather personal character, made by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) last Monday evening in my absence. Amongst other things the hon. gentleman said that I had said that hard times were a good thing for the country. Now, he had not one tittle of evidence to warrant any such statement. And in my judgment, there is not very much difference between making a statement that you do not know to be true and making one that you know to be untrue. The address to which he referred, a report of which he read to the extent of one or two sentences, occupied about forty-five minutes. I was speaking of the high cost of living. Among other things I stated that we had enjoyed here in this country for many years a period of unprecedented prosperity, that our people during that period had had more money to spend than usual, that they had spent it freely and that such conditions were accompanied by a rise of prices. I also stated that hard times were generally accompanied by low prices. And I cited, for instance, the period in the early 90's, when we suffered a very severe depression in Canada. There are many gentlemen within the sound of my voice who remember that in those years we sold wheat at 40 cents a bushel. A friend of mine lost a large sum of money buying wheat at 40 cents a bushel. I remember that in those days we used to sell a horse for $60 that would bring $300 now. Prices continued to go down from 1890 until about 1897. Prosperity began then to reappear and prices proceeded to rise, and continued

5 p.m.

steadily to rise until the years 1907 and 1908. We then had a temporary setback financially, hard times for a couple of years. What was the result upon prices? They went down. I think that if you will look at the record of prices you will find that when we have had financial depression, prices have been low, and that when we have enjoyed prosperity and expansion prices have risen. These were the observations that I was making when I had the honour of addressing the Board of Trade in the city of Halifax. The hon. member for Rouville jumped to the conclusion that I had said hard times were a good thing for the country. Now, if the hon. member for Rouville will permit me, I would suggest that if he would rely less upon his imagination, fertile though perverted by political partisanship, and exercise his faculties for the acquisition of facts, he would spare himself much well-merited odium and save this House and the country a great deal of time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The extract which I quoted during the remarks which I had the honour to make to the House was taken from the Montreal Gazette issued the day after the hon. gentleman delivered the speech at Halifax. Besides the Montreal Gazette two days afterwards published a letter from a prominent Conservative in Montreal complaining about the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Labour at Halifax. That was my source of information.

Mr. CROTHERS: The information which the hon. member for Rouville says he received from the Montreal Gazette and from a letter appearing in the same paper did not warrant what he said on Monday night. At the bottom of page 197 of 'Hansard' the hon. gentleman is reported as saying:

> When I read the answer given by the hon. Minister of Labour, that hard times are a good thing for the country, I say that the Government is committing suicide by firing words into its brain.

There was absolutely nothing in the Montreal Gazette or in the letter to which my hon. friend referred which would justify these words.

The hon. gentleman then took up considerable time in referring to the United Shoe Machinery Company and the Combines Investigation Act. He thought great credit was due to the Government of which he was then a member for having passed the Combines Investigation Act, but before he sat down he proved that he had never read the Act, and did not know what it contained. He referred to a statement said to be contained in the annual report of the Department of Labour for the year ended March 31 last, to the effect that after the board made its report, no action had been taken. I will give hon. gentlemen a little of the history of this investigation. The United Shoe Machinery Company some years ago, before the Combines Investigation Act was passed, sued some of the manufacturers of boots and shoes, in Quebec city, if I remember rightly, on some of the leases. The defendants set up as a defence to the action the contention that the leases constituted a restraint of trade, that they were therefore illegal, and that the defendants were not liable. The various courts in the province of Quebec held that the defence was well taken; I think the matter passed through the highest courts in the province. The United Shoe Machinery Company appealed from the highest courts in Quebec to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in England, which reversed the judgment which had been given by the courts in Quebec, held that these leases were not in restraint of trade and, the contention that the leases were a restraint of trade being the only defence that had been set up, that the defendants were therefore liable. The defendants had a large bill of costs to pay, as must be realized by every one who has had the luxury of carrying an appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. They were the people who started the proceedings under the Combines Investigation Act, the only proceedings of the kind that have ever been so instituted under this Act. A board was constituted under the Combines Investigation Act to inquire into the charge as to whether or not the United Shoe Machinery was a combine within the meaning of the Act, and had violated the provisions thereof. A majority of the board made a report during the latter part of October, finding that the leases, especially those portions of them designated as the tying clauses, constituted a restraint of trade and a violation of the Combines Investigation Act. The hon. member for Rouville inferred from the report of that board that the United Shoe Machinery Company at once became liable to a penalty of $1,000 a day. On page 202 of 'Hansard,' he is reported as saying:

> To make a long story short, the board reported against the United Shoe Machinery Company, and the company was liable, according to the law passed in 1910, to a fine of $1,000 per day. In the month of November last, I find in the Labour Gazette, the report of the

Deputy Minister of Labour dated July 15, 1913. After citing facts it concludes with the following significant statement:

The board's report having been published in the Canada Gazette of October 26, 1912, the date on which the company would be subject to the operation of section 23 was advanced to May 1st 1913 [illegible] date of writing the department has not been made aware of any action taken as a result of the board's report.

These remarks made by the hon. member for Rouville show that he has not the faintest idea of what the provisions of the Combines Investigation Act are. The United Shoe Machinery Company, under the 23rd section of that Act, did not become liable, as the hon. member for Rouville has said, to a penalty of $1,000 a day simply because the board reported that they were a combine. The 23rd section of the Act, which is the one imposing the penalty, provides that where a board reports that a combine exists, the penalty shall be enforced unless the people against whom the report has been made cease 'so to offend' within ten days, or within any further time granted by the board. So that if any further time were granted by the board, the company would have ten days within which to cease 'so to offend,' and if within that period of time they did cease 'so to offend', they would not be liable to a penalty of $1,000 a day or any other sum. My hon. friend attempted to convey the impression that immediately upon the making of the report by the board that a combine existed, those against whom the report was made became liable to a penalty of $1,000 a day. As a matter of fact, the board, under the authority of the 23rd section of the Combines Investigation Act, extended to six months the time within which the company must cease 'so to offend,' and within that period the United Shoe Machinery Company did cease 'so to offend.' Having done so, they were not liable to any penalty, so that the charge made by my hon. friend that I have been derelict in my duty has no foundation whatever in fact.

Then, by reading a sentence or two from the report of the department dealing only with the year expiring on the 31st of March last, my hon. friend attempted to make this House believe that on the 15th of July no action had been taken. As a matter of fact, the report was not dealing with any period later than the 31st of March, the expiration of the last fiscal year, and even if you were to take it that it were dealing with a later period the interpretation put upon it by my hon. friend was utterly unwarranted. The deputy minister says:

On the day of writing the department has not been made aware of any action taken as a result of the board's report.

Any one who will read the context will see that by the word 'action' there he is referring to taking proceedings against the board. That is all he is referring to. He was not dealing at all with anything subsequent to the 31st of March; the six months extension did not expire until May, so that the period of time he was dealing with had nothing whatever to do with the question of whether or not the board had ceased to offend within the extended time allowed the United Shoe Machinery Company to cease so to offend. I understand that the objections made by the board to the provisions in these leases were altered by the United Shoe Machinery Company. We have had no complaint, except one, from any one in Canada since the alterations were made in these leases. Of the 145 manufacturers of shoes in Canada 138 use these machines. They are very much pleased with them, they are much pleased with the manner in which they are permitted to use them; they think it encourages the manufacture of boots and shoes. Of course if a man were obliged to buy all the machinery necessary in a boot and shoe factory he would require a very large amount of money. There are some boots and shoes that pass through two hundred hands in the making, so I was told, in factories in Quebec. This company provides all the machines, scores and scores of them, I do not know how many, between one and two hundred. These machines are leased to the manufacturer, who pays a royalty. In some boots and shoes the royalty is one cent a pair, in others half a cent a pair; the highest, I believe, is five cents for a pair of boots. In the aggregate I have no doubt that this company makes a large amount of money, but you will see that an addition of from two to five cents on a pair of boots is not very material. The manufacturers like this way of doing it, they can have all this machinery put in their factories without paying out a dollar, and they proceed to use them. The United Shoe Machinery Company examines them every few days and sees that they are in perfect order. If any new machine is invented the old one is taken out and the new one put in. I do not pretend to know enough about the manufacture of boots and shoes to say whether this is a good system or not, but I do know that there has been only one complaint to the Department of Labour since the finding of this board.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What was the complaint?

Mr. CROTHERS: The complaint in substance was that there were some additional provisions put in the leases that were objectionable. My right hon. friend will know from the provisions of the Act that it will be necessary to have another board go over the whole thing again to determine that. The Combines Investigation Act is a comparatively new enactment. Like almost all other legislative enactments, it has its defects. Time and experience will disclose these defects, and I have no doubt that while this Government is in power and some defects appear provision will be made and the Act amended so as to have more satisfactory provisions. My right hon. friend understands as a lawyer that hardly any statute proves very satisfactory in the condition in which it is first enacted. The operation of the Act very often brings out some defect that was not perceived. We are none of us perfect in drafting statutes, defects appear with experience and the wise legislator, when he is satisfied that the defects are material will make the necessary amendments to meet the objections that have arisen out of the Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understood the minister to say that the United Shoe Machinery Company had complied with the award of the board by altering the one condition which was complained of by the plaintiff in the case. Am I right in this?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think my right hon. friend is rather confining the words I used. What I said was that the board, in making its award, pointed out the objectionable features of these leases, I did not say only one; and I understand that within the six months the objectionable features were removed and new forms made. I may be perfectly frank with my right hon. friend and tell him that the one complaint that was made was, in substance, that the new leases were worse than the old ones; but only one complaint has come to the department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am sorry to say that the answer is not quite satisfactory. However, this discussion is rather foreign to the present debate. There is a motion on the Order Paper on which the matter will have to come up.

Mr. CROTHERS: My right hon. friend says there is a motion on the Order Paper calling for copies of all correspondence and everything of that kind, which will be prepared as expeditiously as possible. This just inspires the thought that in all these cases it will be very much better, before referring to a matter of this kind, to wait until we get the documents and facts. I have suffered before now in cases where, in making a motion for the production of papers a long speech is made, founded on rumour or founded completely on fabrication, and when the papers are brought down it is discovered that there was no foundation whatever for the charges that were made. I think that in this respect we are putting the cart before the horse and it would be very much better to get some facts, as my right hon. friend is proposing to do in his motion, get the facts first and discuss them afterwards, not discuss it first on rumour and fabrication for which, when the papers are brought down, it is found there is no foundation at all.

Mr. GEORGE McCRANEY (Saskatoon): Since the defeat of reciprocity in 1911 no question has excited so much interest in western Canada and attained such large support as the question of free wheat. I am free to say that not only is the question of free wheat supported by those who were in favour of reciprocity, but it is also supported by many influential men and journals who were opposed to the larger measure. Among those who are now supporters of the agitation in favour of free wheat are such newspapers as the Winnipeg Telegram, which is the chief Conservative organ in western Canada; and I know that the organ of the Conservative party in my own city of Saskatoon has also come out in favour of the same measure. The fact that these journals have come to such a conclusion is not the reason why I am supporting this amendment. But it may be a reason why many others will support it and see good reasons why this Parliament should revise the tariff to allow free wheat to come into Canada. In the Legislature of the province of Saskatchewan, on the 26th of November last, a resolution was moved in the following terms by Mr. Scott, seconded by Mr. Finlayson:

> That in the opinion of this House the Parliament of Canada should remove the duty at present imposed on wheat and on flour in order that Canadian wheat and flour may be exported to the United States free of duty.

Thirty-five voted in support of that resolution, and three against it. Those who voted 'Nay' were Mr. Willoughby, the leader of the Conservative party in the Legislature; Mr. Bradshaw, of Prince

Albert, and Mr. Wylie, of Maple Creek. I may add that both Mr. Bradshaw and Mr. Wylie had voted in the same Legislature in favour of a resolution in support of reciprocity in 1911. But as they found that the leaders of the Conservative party at Ottawa did not support that measure, they repented, and evidently concluded that they would not be caught again. The other members of the Conservative party in the Legislature are not accounted for in the division list. They must have shirked the vote or voted for the motion. In the province of Manitoba, however, there was no such division. On the 12th January last the Legislature passed a resolution unanimously which I would like to put on 'Hansard.' The motion was introduced by Mr. Simpson, a Conservative member, seconded by Mr. Taylor, and reads as follows:

> Whereas the Congress of the United States of America have by recent legislation reduced the duty on wheat and wheat products entering the said the United States of America.
>
> And whereas provision has been made in the said legislation for the total removal of such duty on wheat entering the United States of America from any foreign country who would likewise remove such duty.
>
> And whereas it is the opinion of this House that the removal of such duty by the Government of the Dominion of Canada from the United States of America would be beneficial to the agriculturists of Manitoba.
>
> Therefore let it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the Parliament of Canada should enact such legislation as would give the farmers of Manitoba the benefit of the countervailing duty on wheat and wheat products as provided in the Underwood tariff.

As I said, that resolution was carried unanimously, Sir Rodmond Roblin, the members of the Conservative Cabinet and the Conservative members all supporting it. If one reads over the resolution, it would appear that the members of the Legislature who voted for it had in mind that it would be very proper for an Order in Council to bring this result about, because they referred to 'the duty of the Government of the Dominion of Canada to remove this duty.' In the main part of the resolution they referred to the 'Parliament of Canada,' because at that time this House was within three days of meeting.

Throughout western Canada there has been a discussion as to whether it would be a good thing for the wheat growers of the country to have American wheat admitted duty free into this country with the right to Canadian wheat growers of free entry into the United States market. Many Conservative speakers throughout the West have attempted to show that it would bring disaster to the western grain growers. Conservative journals throughout the West have also taken this view, and have given figures showing that at certain times during the year wheat was bringing a higher price in Canada than in the United States. This argument has been made not only in the newspapers but on political platforms throughout the country; and I think as late as last summer the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche) made such a point.

I shall not go into details to prove that the Canadian wheat grower is better off by having access to the American market, even with the liability of having to meet the American wheat grower in his own market; but I am going to take it for granted, in view of the changed attitude of the Conservative leaders, especially in the province of Manitoba, and of the changed front of Conservative newspapers, that this is an accepted fact; that it is to the advantage of the Canadian wheat grower to have access to the American market. To arrive at such a conclusion indicates that there has been a tremendous change of heart on the part of those of the Manitoba Legislature who are now supporting free wheat, and in those journals which were opposed to it formerly.

Let me remind you of some of the arguments used in western Canada against free wheat. One was that the American market was not as good as the Canadian market, and that the Canadian farmer would suffer in competition with American wheat in Canada. Another argument was that our raw products would be shipped into another country to be manufactured, thus making our staunch Canadian farmers 'hewers of wood' and 'drawers of water.' A third argument was that it would give Washington control of our tariff. A fourth that it would spoil the reputation now held by our grain, as the Americans would mix it with their own baser grades. A fifth argument was that our grain would be deflected to United States channels, to the injury of our Transcontinental system. Another reason was that it would give the United States millers a supply of hard wheat, and enable them to drive Canadian flour out of the markets of the world. Another reason was that it would destroy the Canadian flour-milling industry. A further reason was that it would encourage wheat mining,

that is to say our people would be so devoted to the growing of wheat that the soil would give out. Another reason was that it would prevent Canadian farmers from getting preferential treatment from Great Britain in any scheme that might be propounded under the Chamberlain proposals; and when one bears in mind that Sir Rodmond Roblin and all the Conservative members of the Manitoba Government had all used these arguments, one must conclude that the argument to-day in favour of free wheat must be overwhelming to make these gentlemen swallow themselves in this way.

It is said in the press that the resolution of the Manitoba Legislature was brought about at the instance of the Minister of Public Works of Canada. If so, it is altogether to his credit. But I am very much afraid, judging from the tone of the questions which have been addressed to speakers on this side of the House, that free wheat will not be the result of that resolution, and it was no doubt in the knowledge of the Minister of Public Works what was likely to happen when we came to discuss the matter in this House.

If, in the face of the attitude of the Conservative party in the Manitoba Legislature, and the attitude of the Conservative party newspapers in that province, this Parliament does not extend sympathetic relief to the farmers in western Canada, by giving them free wheat, there are some conclusions which might fairly be drawn. One conclusion we have the right to draw is that the resolution of the Manitoba Legislature is a piece of political humbug; another conclusion we might fairly draw is that the men who instigated it are political tricksters, and I would also say that it was put up for the temporary purpose of assisting the Conservative party in the coming provincial elections and in an endeavour to stave off defeat. If we do not get free wheat after such a strong resolution, it will show how completely tied up this Government is in the hands of the combines which gave it such support last election.

The wheat of western Canada is hard wheat; it is required in all markets where flour of high quality is made, and the endeavour of our farmers in the West is to make it a still harder and still better wheat. There have been three occasions on which the superiority of the wheat of Canada has been demonstrated over all other wheat in the world, and especially over the wheat grown in the United States. I refer first to the Land Show held at New York in 1911, when Seager Wheeler of Rosthern, in my own riding, took the prize given by Sir Thomas Shaugnessy of $1,000 for the best wheat produced in the world. In the next year, 1912, at the Dry Farming Congress held at Lethbridge, and which was more largely an American congress than a Canadian congress, Mr. Henry Holmes, of Raymond, Alberta, took the first prize for the best wheat grown in the world, and exhibited at that show. Only last year, at the Dry Farming Congress held at Tusla, Oklahoma, Paul Gerlach, of Allan, in my own riding, took the first prize for the world's best wheat, and to show how the cultivation of wheat has progressed and what high quality it has attained, I may mention that this wheat ran 71 pounds to the bushel, whereas the standard is 60 pounds to the bushel. That improvement in the quality of wheat is going on all the time in western Canada, and the example of those Canadians who have given such effort to the cultivation of wheat is doing a great deal, not only to encourage wheat growing, but the growing of wheat of the very best quality. I am not familiar with the land on which Mr. Henry Holmes of Raymond grew his wheat, but I think I may fairly assume that it is land somewhat similar in character to the land in the neighbourhood of Lethbridge, and that the same results could be obtained from any of the neighbouring lands into which the farmer puts his industry and skill. I have some familiarity with the farms owned by Mr. Seager Wheeler of Rosthern and Mr. Gerlach of Allan, both in my own riding, and they are not farms which are in any way exceptional to lands in that part of the country; they are what might be described as average land. I would say, however, that Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Gerlach are exceptional men in that they are experimental farmers, and they have shown great care and great industry and are doing great credit to Canada. The same results can be obtained by farmers of equal experience and knowledge and industry, and I have no doubt the same results will be obtained by others. I am told that the results in wheat growing obtained by these gentlemen in Alberta and Saskatchewan will do a great deal of good to western Canada in the way of inducing immigration. The Dry Farming Congress which was held at Tusla, Oklahoma, was attended by very many who lived in the more southern parts of the United States, and I am informed that there is going to

be a large immigration of persons from that portion of the United States to a country where such grand wheat can be produced. I would like to see the Government of Canada make more suitable acknowledgment in the future than they have in the past of those whose industry, enterprise and scientific knowledge are putting our wheat in the forefront of all the wheat of the world.

Sometimes our western people are told that they are doing too much wheat farming. In view of the fact that, notwithstanding the large crop, the price of wheat is going down, the growers are told by bank presidents and sometimes by daily newspaper editors that they should work harder and go into mixed farming. This question of mixed farming is having the attention of our western people. Stock farming has been taken up by the people in my part of the province and they are making progress in it as they are able to build barns and take care of the stock, and the results are most encouraging. Western Canada has obtained almost as good a record for its live stock as it has for its wheat, because at the International Live Stock Show held at Chicago only last month, Mr. J. D. McGregor, of Brandon, for the second time won the grand challenge cup with one of his animals, as against the animals from all over the United States which competed at that show. It was the first time that stock from the province of Saskatchewan had been exhibited there. The item in the Winnipeg Free Press of December 4, 1913, dated at Chicago, in regard to the Saskatchewan exhibits, is as follows:

> Judging of all horse-classes in which Saskatchewan was interested is complete and the western horses have a phenomenal record of wins to their credit. Twenty prizes to carry home. In only one class did they show and not get in the money. The exact number and character of the wins is as follows: 3 first prizes, 6 second prizes, 2 fourth prizes, 3 fifth prizes, 2 sixth prizes, 1 seventh prize.

I am mentioning these matters to relieve the minds of any persons who may think that we are doing too much wheat farming and too little stock raising. I want to show them that not only do we excel in wheat farming, but we are doing all we can to excel in live stock raising.

I wish to give very briefly my reasons for desiring to see free wheat in this country. In the first place we have a better market by having two markets, and we do not fear competition from the United States. Secondly, we have an opportunity to secure this market without disturbing other schedules of the tariff. Thirdly, the cost of farm labour has doubled in the past few years, thus reducing the margin of profit. Fourthly, the price of wheat has gone down. Another reason is that the effect of the imposition of the United States tariff of 10 cents a bushel is the same as an export duty on our own wheat, except that the duty does not go into our treasury, but into the treasury of a foreign state.

Mr. J. P. MOLLOY (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a word or two upon the question of free wheat, largely on account of the position taken by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) today. If my memory serves me, shortly after the reciprocity pact was brought before the people, the first and most pronounced opposition that we received came from the Legislature of Manitoba, of which the hon. Minister of Public Works was then a member. I understand that a friend of his made the statement that it was thought that the hon. Minister of Public Works was responsible for the action taken by the Manitoba Government, and its leader Sir Rodmond Roblin. How true that is I do not know except that the Manitoba Government, headed by Sir Rodmond Roblin, was the first to begin the opposition to reciprocity. Now, he and his entire party without one exception, supported by the Liberal following in the House, voted the other day for free wheat. What is the reason? Why the change? Why do these two men, who worked in harmony for so many years leading the Conservative party to victory election after election, disagree now? We are told to wait until the Budget is brought down. Every hon. member on the Liberal side of the House, who has given the question any thought has no hope that, when the Budget is brought down, there will be free wheat. We believe that the thing has been a bluff from start to finish, a bluff for the provincial elections which will come on within the next five or six months. As a result of the action which will be taken by the Government, the hon. Minister of Public Works will simply ask his supporters to vote against free wheat and they will support him without fail, because they will do anything he tells them to do and do it quickly and mildly. They are going to vote against free wheat. They may offer any excuse they like to the farmers of Manitoba, but it will not be accepted by the people who are not earning a living after working earnestly for it. This

is the position in the province of Manitoba to-day and in the province of Saskatchewan also, that the people, who are raising wheat and selling it upon the markets of Manitoba and Saskatchewan to be shipped to the markets of the world, are losing money.

I heard an hon. member on the other side of the House say that the farmers of the West were clearing from ten to fifteen thousand dollars a year by raising wheat. I make the statement and I can prove it, that the farmers are not making fifteen per cent on their money, nor yet five per cent on their money. More than that the majority are not in a position to pay interest on what they owe, let alone making ten or fifteen thousand dollars a year.

It will be interesting to wait and see what will become of the action which will be taken by the Government. The Winnipeg Telegram, the organ of the Conservative party in the province of Manitoba said: 'Give the people free wheat.' We do not believe it will have the effect that a great many people think it will have, but let us try it anyway. The people in the West, Conservative or Liberal, Grit or Tory, say: Let us try it anyway. After reciprocity was defeated, a great many people said: Well, if we had known that reciprocity would have been defeated, we would have voted for it. But when they have another chance, the hon. Minister of Public Works will find out if he consults the farmers of western Canada that at least ninety-five per cent of the Conservatives of the West desire free wheat. They desire an entrance to the American market. It cannot possibly do any harm; and if it does any harm, it can be revoked. It is bound to do good and nothing else will satisfy us.

The raising of wheat in the West is not paying. The majority of No. 1 Northern wheat sold in my district this year was sold for seventy cents a bushel. What has the farmer got left? Ten cents a bushel for the threshers. Labourers get $3.00 a day and teams are worth $6.00 a day, and there are all the other costs of operation, to say nothing about the capital invested.

It is all very well for people to go into mixed farming. What is the situation regarding mixed farming in the West? Farmers will not go into mixed farming so long as there is so much virgin soil. That must be admitted. Those who are able to do so will go into mixed farming, but men who are bound down with debts which they owe on their land with banks refusing to lend a dollar, with the interest going up year after year, are in no position to go into mixed farming. If a man owes ten thousand dollars on a section of land, where is he to get $5,000 to go into mixed farming? If his land is mortgaged for all it is worth how is he going to get $5,000 to go into live stock raising? Stock may not always bring the same price that it brings now. Stock raising of course is safe; it is surer. That is quite true, but people are not going to labour from the first day of January to the last day of December if they can possibly make a living by working less. Mixed farming is the last resort, where the farmer, his wife and his family have to get up every morning at daybreak, and do not get to bed until ten o'clock at night. They will not do that if they can possibly get out of it. Free wheat is the position the western farmers are taking; that is the demand they are making, and they are going to see, as far as they can, that it is carried through.

The farmer in the West is hampered by the banks increasing the rate of interest. Interest on land is now nine per cent. The manufacturer gets his toll out of the farmer. The railway gets his toll out of every bushel of wheat. The farmer is in a position in which he is despondent and losing heart.

My reason for voting for free wheat, as I said, is that the farmers as a body demand it, and as I represent a farming community it is my duty to vote with the people I represent. The position of the Government is entirely different. They are afraid to grant free wheat, and they are afraid to oppose it. But they must do one or the other. If they turn to the right they will get punched; if they turn to the left they will get punched. But they cannot get away from it. The talk about this not being the proper time and this not being the proper way to do it will not be accepted by the ordinary farmers like myself. So far as the railways and the millers are concerned, it has been demonstrated time and again in the history of Canada that the railways and the millers will take care of themselves. They will have to face competition, as the farmers of Canada have always said they were prepared to do. The farmers ask for no protection, they are willing to go into the markets of the world and compete with others who are in the same industry as themselves. So far as mixed farming is concerned, I have explained that. I know dozens, yes, hundreds, of farmers in Provencher and Lisgar and Mac-

donald who would gladly go into mixed farming if they had the money. It is all very well to tell people what they ought to do, but I notice that the advice is generally given by those who toast their shins at coal fires paid for by the Government. It is near to six o'clock, and I will close with the quotation of a few paragraphs from a statement by Mr. E. A. Partridge. I understand that the Prime Minister the other evening quoted from statements made by Hon. Walter Scott, Premier of Saskatchewan, and Hon. A. L. Sifton, Premier of Alberta. But on the very same page is this statement by Mr. Partridge of Sintaluta, one of the most prominent farmers of Saskatchewan, a man who understands what he is talking about as he has demonstrated time and again. He said:

> They pay the highest prices for clothing, furniture, building material, such as cement, lumber, lime and hardware, and for all farm equipment, hand tools, harness, implements, power machinery, power fuel and fencing materials, of any agricultural population in the world. They pay the highest rate of interest on bank loans and mortgages and the highest freight and express rates, coupled with the longest haul for outgoing produce and incoming supplies, of any people of the white race with the possible exception of the Russians.

And further on:

> In spite of the fact that the yield was large and the marketing quickly accomplished the position of the average Saskatchewan producer cannot be said to be satisfactory. The best that Saskatchewan people can hope for is that the returns from the harvest of the year will be sufficient to pay the interest on outstanding obligations. The probability is that even this cannot be done, and that additional money will be borrowed to pay a portion of the interest charges.

One more paragraph only I will read:

> No Saskatchewan farmer can borrow money to-day under 9 per cent.

No wonder he is asking for free wheat.

> To secure this rate he must be able to give a first mortgage on his improved land. If he requires additional money he must pay from 10 per cent per annum to one or two per cent per month. It is no exaggeration to say that there are thousands of Saskatchewan farmers whose entire output for the future time will be completely absorbed by the payment of interest charges and who will inevitably in the course of time lose their holdings.

This reflects the state of affairs in my own neighbourhood. A short time before I came here a man in a position to know told me that unless there was a most miraculous change within a short time, what Mr. Partridge said is likely to take place in Saskatchewan, is likely to take place in the portion of Manitaba in which I live.

[Mr. Molloy.]

On motion of Mr. MacNutt the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the House adjourned without question put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, January 29, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Statistics of Railways and Canals for the year 1913.—Mr. Cochrane.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, part 2, for the year ended March 31, 1913.—Mr. Foster.

FENIAN RAID BOUNTIES.

On the Orders of Day being called:

Mr. EMMERSON: In the absence of the Minister of Militia, I would ask the Prime Minister if the time for filing applications in the matter of the Fenian raid bounties has expired?

Mr. BORDEN: I will bring the hon. gentleman's question to the attention of the Minister of Militia.

Mr. LAW: In the absence of the Minister of Militia I would call the attention of the Prime Minister to a letter written by the Department of Militia, which reads as follows:

Ottawa, Jan. 15, 1914.

Sir,—In reply to your letter of 23rd instant, I am instructed by Colonel Hughes to inform you that your application for Fenian raid bounty, 1866-1870, has been approved by the Board of Officers examining claims.

I would state, however, for your information that the county of Yarmouth was one of the last visited by the Fenian Raid Commission, and as the Department of Finance have stopped the issue of cheques since the 31st December, 1913, pending requisite legislation by Parliament, it cannot be stated just when the approved claims from the county of Yarmouth will be settled. Nothing, however, can be done until Parliament passes additional legislation.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) Charles F. Winter, Lt.-Col.,
Military Secretary.

Nathaniel Currier, Esq.,
Yarmouth, N.S.

When is this legislation likely to be brought down and when will the veterans of the county of Yarmouth likely be paid? None of them up to the present time have received any payment whatever.

Mr. BORDEN: As far as I am familiar with this matter, a board was constituted in Nova Scotia for the purpose of looking into the claims in the various counties of that province. The number of these claims is somewhat larger than in other parts by reason of the entire population of the province having been called out at the time of one or both of the raids in question. Information as to the legislation as to which the hon. gentleman has asked will be given by the Minister of Militia and Defence in due course.

IRREGULAR QUESTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER: In reference to the practice which seems to be growing of reading articles in the House and basing upon them questions which cannot properly be answered by a minister without his having time and opportunity to consult the officers of his department and secure the necessary information, it would, in my judgment, be much more appropriate if the questions were put on the Order Paper so that they could be answered after a minister has had time to secure the necessary information.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. H. F. McLeod for an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Neely, resumed from Wednesday, January 28.

Mr. THOS. MACNUTT (Saltcoats): Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of taking up very much of the time of the House, but I believe that at least all western members should place their views on record in regard to this very important matter. About two and a half years ago a long debate took place in this House on a similar principle. At that time we had before us an offer of reciprocity with the United States in wheat and wheat products, made especially to Canada—not, as the Wilson Bill does, to the food products of the world; but that offer was rejected. I believe that to-day that question is just as important as it was two and a half years ago and there has been ample evidence since that time that the southern market would have benefited this country to a large extent. I only wish that we had before us to-day the same offer as the previous one and that this Government could be induced to accept it. There has been a change of views in the West. Although the two provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta decided almost unanimously in favour of accepting that offer, the province of Manitoba did not do so. But evidently they have changed their opinion in that province or are prepared for political reasons to swallow themselves, and are ready now to have some truck and trade with the Yankees. We know the attitude of the Roblin Government when a few days ago—a resolution originating with that Government, was unanimously adopted by the legislature of Manitoba in favour of accepting this offer. In the province of Saskatchewan Mr. Haultain was defeated in the provincial election of 1912 largely because of the strong feeling in favour of reciprocity. Although the provincial Government has nothing to do directly with reciprocity, still the people considered that this was an issue, and they preferred a local government friendly to a policy of that kind to one which was not friendly to such a policy. The successor of Mr. Haultain, who is now on the bench, agreed to this resolution:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the Parliament of Canada should remove the duty at present imposed on wheat and on flour in order that Canadian wheat and flour may be exported to the United States free of duty.

A strong delegation, composed of Conservatives from Alberta, led by the leader of the Conservative Opposition in Alberta, came to Ottawa a week or so ago, and it was understood that one of their objects was to ask this Government to accept the offer of free wheat. They did not make this request, it being rumoured that they were headed off; but we know perfectly well that the province of Alberta is strongly in favour of free wheat. What reason can this Government have for refusing this offer? Surely the men who raise the wheat are the persons to be considered. I do not say that they should have protection; they have some now, but they do not want it, and any obstacles in the way of their getting the true value for their product should be removed, no matter what other interests may lose a small portion of their profit in the handling of it or its conversion into flour or in its conveyance to the different markets. There is a decided difference, although it is not so great now as it was previous to 1911, between the American and Canadian prices for wheat. I remember preparing some figures covering ten years, week by week, showing that the average difference

for that period was in favour of the American market by about ten cents a bushel.

The difference is not so great at present; but if the price goes lower on the American side, that is a good time not to sell. At all events this would mean a wider market and that is a very important consideration in itself, regardless of the difference in price. At the present time the English market is the only one that Canada has outside of her own, and our home market could only take care of about 40,000,000 bushels last year. That means that our farmers have to send their wheat to England, often causing a glut on that market. The English market was flooded last fall as the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) read to us the other day. At the time the wheat was going on the market there was no competition from other countries, but the price was far lower than the quality of the grain demanded. I have a table here showing that the prices on the Liverpool market have been going down continually since 1907. In December, 1907, No. 1 wheat was worth $1.23; in December, 1911, $1.18½; in December, 1912, $1.07 and in December, 1913, 98 cents, notwithstanding the wheat was of the highest quality. That means that the Liverpool market is not sufficient to take care of the wheat that is being grown even now in the West. It seems to me that the farmers are realizing the necessity for a larger market because they are not producing relatively what they should produce. I have some figures here—and I think they are authoritative—showing that the West produced 209,262,000 bushels of wheat this year and in 1912, 204,280,000 bushels, an increase of only 4,982,000 bushels, and that can be accounted for to a large extent by a better yield per acre, and the better quality of the crop. The land does not appear to have been occupied by other crops to make up for this, because there was practically no increase in the oats grown in 1913. In that year, 242,413,000 bushels were raised, and in 1912, 242,321,000 bushels, only an increase of 92,,000 bushels. This increase can only be accounted for by the better yield per acre, as I remember well that in 1912 a large portion of the crop of oats in Saskatchewan and part of Manitoba was shed by a hurricane and the yield that year was consequently not so good as usual. As to barley, there were 31,060,000 bushels grown in 1913, and in 1912, 31,600,000 bushels. That is a decrease in 1913 of 540,000 bushels. I have not the figures for flax but there was much less flax grown in 1913 than in 1912. For some reason or other, then there does not seem to be a proportionate increase in the growth of all grains. Why is this? To some extent, I believe it is because the farmers are not anxious to increase their acreage. When you take into consideration the freight rates, the cost of labour and of implements, there is very little margin left for the farmer at the present price of wheat, and the people of the West are unanimous almost, in demanding another market. It is their right and they should get it. It has already been mentioned in this House that for some little time last summer the Minneapolis figures were lower than those on the Canadian side. That is easily accounted for because at that time there was very little wheat on the market. As soon as the threshing was over, however, and the wheat came pouring in there was a decided difference in price. Let us look at these figures, taken from the Grain Growers' Guide. On January 3, No. 1 Northern was 4½ cents higher in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg; No. 2, 4⅝ cents higher and No. 3, 5⅝ cents higher. But you have to add about two cents a bushel on account of the difference in the quality of grades. A week afterwards, No. 1 Northern was 3¼ cents higher in Minneapolis; No. 2, 2⅞ cents higher, and No. 3, 3¾ cents higher. What effect would this have upon the West? About 150,000,000 bushels of the 209,000,000 bushels that Canada raises, would be exported. Apply, say three cents a bushel to that and it would make a difference of $4,500,000. If we apply 5 cents, there would be a difference of $7,500,000. Outside of the great benefit this would be to the farmers, it would make a great difference to the eastern part of Canada. Factories are closed to-day in Ontario for lack of orders; people have not got the money to buy; and there are many unemployed throughout the east. I do not mean to say that this larger market would lower the cost of living to any great extent, but it would give some men who are now unemployed money to buy the necessaries of life. I have an article here clipped from a Toronto paper showing that during the past two weeks ten thousand men have been fed by charity. The article reads as follows:

> Ten Thousand Fed within Two Weeks—Salvation Army Headquarters has Welcomed Many of the Destitute—Soup, Coffee, Bread —Simple Food and Space on the Floor to Sleep not Despised.
>
> During the past two weeks nearly 10,000

meals, consisting of soup, coffee and bread, have been served to unemployed men at the Salvation Army headquarters. Officers responsible for assisting the unemployed men without homes and food have thrown open one of their halls where 250 men sleep on the floor every night. The class of men who avail themselves of the temporary provision made by the Army are generally those out of employment, and, having spent their last cent, are compelled to accept the bowl of soup, the cup of coffee, and enough floor space to give them warmth and shelter for the night. The Army winter relief fund is also being used to assist this huge family of the unemployed.

Several hon. gentlemen have given figures showing that something like 100,000 men are out of employment in Canada to-day. I do not say for a moment that the opening of the American market is going to give employment to all these men, but it would help very materially along that line, and it would also help the farmers very much. To-day if you go into any little town in the West you will find notices posted up of sheriff's sales. That is a very serious matter, and it is not because the farmers are lazy or idle; they are doing the best they can, but it goes to show that the farmers, not altogether on account of the price of wheat and the high cost of implements—although that has a considerable bearing upon it—are not able to pay their way. Relief is going to be given, I understand, not of a charitable nature, but in a businesslike way by the province of Saskatchewan in various ways. It is not that the country is going to degenerate, or is not capable of giving a good living to industrious men, but it is that the conditions are such that they should be improved in order that many of our people in the West may get a better return for their labour. This would assist very materially. It would be an easy matter for this Government to open up that market. It would help not only the farmers of the West, but it would help, I think, the unemployed and factories of the East.

Who are opposed to this? There must be a mandate issued by the milling and railway interests to the Government. They are the only ones that are interested the other way —certainly not the farmer, certainly not the manufacturer nor the consumer. It must be the railway companies and the millers. This is a strong indication that the price must be better to the south and the market more inviting or they need not fear this proposal. It means that in order to retain the carrying trade the railway freight rates would have to be reduced, and in order that the millers should be able to maintain their control over the wheat and get a supply at their own figures they would have to raise the price to the farmer, very frequently, at all events, and they do not like to do this. In the last two years the millers have been making enormous dividends and the railway companies have been doing very well indeed. But I think that the Railway Commission will probably discover that they are well able to get along with smaller freight charges. I remember very well that in 1911 there was a reason given by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) why this request of the western farmers should be refused. It was that if the wheat went to the south the Americans would get the benefit of the bran and shorts for feeding purposes which should be retained in this country. When a man raises wheat he raises it to sell, gluten, bran, shorts and all, wherever he can sell it and get the best price for it. He could easily take care of the feed question; he could grow other feed as far as that goes. I have often known good wheat to sell at sixty cents a bushel—that is a cent a pound—although sometimes it sells at less. It is very seldom that you can buy bran and shorts for less than $20 a ton or a cent a pound. It is not considered good business to sell wheat for a cent a pound and buy back wheat offal for a cent a pound. The millers do not give it for nothing; you have to buy it back. That cannot be a good reason for refusing a better price for the wheat.

But after all is said and done, I think there is only one interest to be considered in this matter. When the farmer raises a bushel of wheat it is his, it could not be in existence if he did not raise it, and, therefore, I repeat, it is his. He should not have any obstacle thrown in his way in marketing his product, and the country is bound to benefit if the farmer benefits. I do not think that I need take up very much more time because there have been so many reasons given in favour of this proposition and after all it is a simple affair. It seems to me that if, in any kindergarten school, you put the whole thing on the blackboard any child would give the answer, and that is that there is no reason or excuse for the Government to put this off.

It has been said that this amendment is brought in at an inopportune time, that it is practically a motion of want of confidence in the Government. Well, if the Government will not accept it, I do not see why we should have any confidence in them. I would be per-

fectly willing to vote along those lines. I think the principal reason why the Government refuse this is that they dare not offend the great milling industries and railway corporations. Possibly they think that the farmers, many of whom are not very well informed, and many of whom are sometimes emotional, can be deceived the same as they were in 1911. The Government know very well that they cannot fool the railway people or the millers in connection with matters of dollars and cents. I am not saying this at all in disparagement of the farmers who, I believe, are the most intelligent people there are to be found in this country, but they have not the opportunity to follow the questions of the day. They are too busy trying to make a living, working from daylight to dark and after with the members of their families, and they often believe what they hear without investigation. But I think that the farmers know a good deal more about this question now than they ever did before. They look upon a matter of this kind pretty much as belonging to their everyday life, which previously they have not done. They are now looking upon politics as something which belongs to them, and they are now prepared to give a more intelligent vote upon questions of this kind. It is recognized in the West by the Conservative Government of Manitoba and by the Conservative Opposition in Saskatchewan that these people have wakened up and that they know what this kind of thing means. They have put themselves on record to the effect that they are not opposed to giving the farmers what they want. It is an admission also that the price must be better to the south than it is on this side of the line. I do not think I need take up any more time. It would not be difficult to speak at some length, but it is not necessary, and all I wish to do is to place my views in a general way before the House on this very important question.

Mr. J. H. RAINVILLE (Chambly-Verchères): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have to take part in this debate, as it seems to be rather a western issue; but I feel it my duty, as an eastern man, to say what I think on the question which has been brought before this House largely by our western friends opposite, and to express my views with regard to the proposals which they have placed before us. We know that nature has separated the West from the East by the Great Lakes and by a stretch of rocky country where no farmers will ever be able to establish themselves. I wonder if our friends from the West realize the great sacrifices that we were called upon to make on this side of lake Superior in order to develop the western prairies. I wonder if they know that the Canadian Pacific railway was built with the money of this country at a time when the largest population was on this side of lake Superior. I wonder if they know that the Transcontinental railway has been built, that the Canadian Northern railway has been built and that we are now building the Hudson Bay railway to help the western country. I would like to know if they appreciate the importance of the building of the terminal elevators at Fort William and interior elevators at Moosejaw, and if they are aware that this Government intends to build another interior elevator very soon near Calgary. These elevators, as well as the one that is being built at the port of Montreal and those that are being built in the big cities of the far East, are all for the benefit of the citizens of the West. I do not know if the intention of the late Government, when they undertook to build these great works, was to direct the freight and the wheat and other products of the West to the United States. Speaking on my own behalf, I would consider it very dangerous if that were the case, and I am not ready to stand for it, because, seeing that we have been building such big works in our country, our duty to-day is to keep our trade and all our trade for our own railroads, for our own ports, for our own workmen, for our own people, in order by that means to unite the West with the East once for all, and to use our money to make this country a great one.

Our western friends are complaining that the price of wheat at certain seasons of the year is higher at Minneapolis than it is at Winnipeg. If the people of the United States want our wheat, why should that be? I am sure that all western members will agree with me that it is because they know the reputation of Canadian No. 1 Northern wheat. The farmers of the West have been complaining that even in our own elevators we have been mixing the wheat in such a way that the trade of the West is being spoiled. The Grain Commission interfered and settled that evil. But I want to ask my hon. friends on the other side of the House, if we have a little difficulty in keeping our wheat, by inspection and other means, in the way it should be kept in our country, how are we going to control the quality of our wheat if we let it go on to the American market where it may be

mixed up with American wheat and shipped to England as Canadian wheat? Of course, I am not an expert on this subject. I am not a farmer. I have no land in the West; but it seems to me that we have built our railroads for some purpose; that we have our ports for some purpose, and that is for the benefit of the Canadian people. If we in the East have been making little sacrifices or big sacrifices—and we were willing to do so and we are willing to do so again—it has never been for the purpose of directing our trade into United States channels. We want to keep our trade here.

At the time that reciprocity was being discussed throughout the country in 1911, in my own county, where I had the pleasure of running and where I had the pleasure of winning, there was a man buying hay. He covered my county and all the surrounding counties with pamphlets stating that, if reciprocity went through, he would pay $2 a ton more on all the hay that he might buy. What has happened now? The only side of reciprocity for which that gentleman was looking is now in existence. There has been a reduction of $2 per ton on hay. Do you think for a moment that that gentleman would come this year and pay $2 a ton more for hay? Not at all.

Mr. PROULX: What is the price paid to-day to the farmer?

Mr. RAINVILLE: I do not know what it is, but I know that it is not $2 a ton higher than it would be if reciprocity were here—

Mr. PROULX: Is the price $2 higher than it was last year?

Mr. RAINVILLE:—because it is not reciprocity that will fix the price of hay. It is the supply and the demand that fixes the price.

Mr. CARVELL: Down in New Brunswick you will find out whether reciprocity means anything or not.

Mr. RAINVILLE: The farmers were very much interested over that $2. Are we going to say that, if the price of wheat at Winnipeg were four, five or six cents lower than at Minneapolis at certain seasons, Americans would come on to the Winnipeg market and pay five, six, seven or more cents for wheat? I do not think they would do so, because they are better business men than that. They want our No. 1 wheat. On account of the splendid reputation that our Canadian wheat has obtained on the markets of the world, we would prefer to keep it here for the good reputation of the Canadian market.

What about our milling industry? Would free wheat hurt our milling industry? I heard some one discussing the question of giving bounties to the milling industry if it would be hurt by free wheat. If it is true that the West is hurt by not being able to send its wheat into the United States, I would rather see this Government pay bounties to our Canadian railroads, in order to enable them to keep their freight, to keep our freight, because it belongs to us just as much as to the people of the West.

Mr. PROULX: Was not the hon. gentleman in favour of reciprocity in his county during the last election?

Mr. RAINVILLE: No. At the very first meeting I held at St. Lambert in the county of Chambly, I took up the stand against reciprocity; but when we saw that man going around and canvassing door by door with that $2 a ton more for hay, we were obliged to discuss it more fully.

Mr. GAUVREAU: You took the wrong track.

Mr. RAINVILLE: I took the right one, and my hon. friend will find, if he runs in the next election, that he is on the wrong track.

Mr. GAUVREAU: You will be in the lake when I am re-elected.

Mr. RAINVILLE: Sir, I am surprised. Our friends the Liberals were in power for fifteen years. And now, only two years after the end of their administration, all these big questions arise at once. It must be that the Liberal members had not opportunity to bring these questions forward on the floor of the House when they were in power. If the questions had been settled that arose in their time, so many great questions could not have arisen all in a moment now. Or, if these questions are really important to-day, then some of them must have existed three, four or five years ago. Why then, did not our friends opposite try to settle these questions, and not propose reciprocity which was not wanted by the people and will not be accepted by the people? We hear of the case of the farmer to-day; we have heard also a little of the case of the people of the towns. Which of these classes needs more help, and more immediate help? I say, that the people of the towns. Why? Complaint is made to-day, and we admit justly made, of the high cost of living.

But on whom does the burden rest mainly —upon the farmer? No; the burden is on the shoulders of the man of the city more than on those of any one else; and no one will make me believe that either in the West or in the East farmers are suffering in a very serious way from what has come to pass in our country. But, how are the people of the cities suffering? Is it because of not having enough work to enable them to earn big wages? That is not the case. The difficulty lies in this, that our population is not ready to produce enough food to feed the towns. That is the case in the West and it is the case in the East. How many of our provinces are able, if left to themselves, to feed their own population? I give credit to the great province of Ontario and its good Government that they can do it. I give the same credit to British Columbia—they can do it. But I will not give that credit to Quebec, for Quebec cannot do it; I will not give it to Alberta nor to Saskatchewan, nor to the Maritime provinces. We do not grow sufficient food. We heard the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) the other day make his argument against the speech of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers). I say the hon. gentleman never read the speech of the Minister of Labour, otherwise he would not have missed the real foundation of that speech and the only argument in it. The Minister of Labour gave this advice to the people of Canada: Grow food. The Minister of Labour was right; to grow more food is the solution of the problem rather than free food, or free trade, or free wheat.

Some speakers in this debate have spoken about the tariff, others about trusts, others about the need of more protection, others about the lack of communication for our farmers. All these things are partly true. As to the matter of tariffs, I am not enough of an expert to say anything on the subject. But I can say this: that if we had to-day the tariff commission that was proposed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) and his colleagues two years ago, that commission would probably be ready by this time to size up the situation of our country and throw more light on the subject that we are discussing. For this would have been a commission of experts, outside of politics, looking at the big problems of our country in an impartial way. The tariff commission was killed, because the Opposition wanted it such a way, and we wanted it another way. Who should govern—the Opposition or the Government elected by the people? I think we should have our say, and I think we should have our say even more than our scrupulous senators. The tariff revision which could be made from day to day by this Government would have but a very limited effect on the high cost of living. And later on I will try to give a solution of that problem which we have to face to-day.

We have talked of trusts. It is all very well to talk about trusts, but to get rid of the trusts is quite a different matter. The United States has been fighting trusts for many years, and the United States is still to day the worst country in the world for trusts. And when I think of the Liberal party as one man wanting reciprocity with the United States, I wonder what they could have been thinking about. Sir, to my mind it would have been giving to the United States a free hand in relation to our railroads, our ports, our trade, our cattle, our wheat; and I am not ready to say that it could have been good for us, a young people, a growing people, needing all our energy to grow independent in an economic way, to mix up with the United States in regard to our trade in general. What does Le Canada of Montreal, a Liberal organ, say about the high cost of living? Does it say that it is due to the tariff, or due to trusts, or due to something else? I have this newspaper Le Canada in my hands and I find that it gives just two reasons for the high cost of living. One is that 18,000,000 pounds of beef were imported into the United States in the month of October and November last, one half of which came from Canada; and the second is that 200,000 head of cattle were imported into the United States in the same two months from Canada and Mexico, half of them from Canada. Le Canada is right to a certain extent. It is hard to imagine the evil that is done to us by this sending away of our cattle to benefit the United States. Bulls, milch cows, sheep, poultry —everything is taken from us. And in order to replenish our cattle in eastern Canada as well as in the West, our farmers will have to begin anew as the world began anew after the flood. Not only will meat be selling at a ridiculous price on account of the condition of the markets, but the land, deprived of its natural fertilizer, will suffer for years to come. It is almost a national calamity, and any action taken to relieve Canada of the effects of this situation will be welcomed by the people of Canada. And this

condition has been brought about through what? Through half of what the Liberals were preaching in 1911—half of reciprocity. What would it be if we had all of reciprocity, when one-half of it can do so much harm in the country? But to my mind these are not the principal causes of the high cost of living. The three causes of that condition lie, first, in immigration; second, in the need of greater production, and third, in the need of a better system of distribution and co-operation. These three causes are immediately connected with agriculture. Rousseau has said somewhere: 'Agriculture is like a slide or calculating rule which allows us to measure the prosperity or decline of empires. Whenever it wanes or succumbs, they sink into the same grave.' Firmly convinced of the truth of these words, I will try to deal with these three causes from an economic point of view, and try to suggest the best remedy for the situation.

So far as immigration is concerned, I think I am right in saying that the immigration policy carried out in Canada in the past has not always tended towards the welfare of our country. Of some kinds of immigration we have had too much, and we have paid too much for some of it. But it is not my intention to talk about that phase of the question to-day. I will let the past be the past; I want to talk about the conditions of to-day in order to try and improve the conditions of to-morrow. The problem of to-day is the need of farm hands on the farm, and the need of to-morrow is to settle the high cost of living. The people of the country have paid out an immense amount of money in aid of immigration to our country, and this immigration, or at least a large part of it, has been directed to the West. We do not regret having paid so much money, and I would not wish to stop immigration to the West. We know we have great prairies that have to be occupied, and we are ready to stand by a good and a sound immigration policy. What did the Liberals do in all their sixteen years of office for immigration, so far as the country between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic is concerned? Practically nothing. All we can say is that they left some immigrants in Montreal, Toronto and other cities of eastern Canada. The fact that the people of our towns and cities find it so difficult to provide themselves with the necessities of life is largely due to an immigration policy which kept the workingmen to the cities instead of sending them to the farms in order to help the farmers to change their methods and enter into intensive farming. We want good immigrants who will stay in Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime provinces. Our farmers are discouraged over the situation. Having no help on their farms, nobody to work with them, they raise hay only, especially in Quebec, knowing themselves that they are wrong. Any action to relieve that situation would be welcomed by the farmers of my province.

4 p.m.

I want to ask the hon. Minister of Interior to organize immediately, in six or eight big cities in the eastern part of our country, a staff of good officers having special instructions to secure real farm hands for the provinces already named. If I say that this staff should be organized in six or eight big cities, it is because a common action should be taken at different points in order to help the farmers in the immediate neighbourhood of those centres where the people are most suffering from the high cost of living. Would that be sufficient to relieve the situation? No. To a certain extent it would help, but we need more than that. The farmers need to grow more food, as the Minister of Labour has said. So long as the cities are congested and the farms deserted, as is the case to-day in many parts of eastern Canada; so long as consumption exceeds production, we will not be able to escape the disparity which exists between the supply and the demand, and the prices of foodstuffs will go still higher. The best solution of the whole matter is to get at the root of the whole evil, and increase production as much as possible by intensive farming; that cannot be done by money alone. If it had not been for the enormous crop of last year in the West, I think we would have had to face a serious crisis.

Last year we were saved to a great extent by our immense crops in the West; but the atmosphere is not so clear to-day as to allow us to say it is all over, and we must take care of ourselves, take care of our markets, take care of our farmers, and get ready for to-morrow, because we do not know the time or the day that another crisis may fall on our country.

Last year, in moving the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I asked this Government to appoint demonstrators all over the country to teach our

farmers how to farm. I come again this year and ask the Minister of Agriculture, whose devotion to the farming interests of the country we all know, to come into the province of Quebec and perhaps into the Maritime provinces and ascertain for himself in what way the farmers need his help and his immediate help. I would not be satisfied with the establishment of one, two, three or four experimental farms in the province of Quebec. I do not believe in these big farms, they cost too much and they do not reach the people closely enough. I would prefer, from the point of view of practical utility, a system of agricultural stations, school-farms and, even better, demonstration farms to be established not only in each electoral division but, I think, in each parish. I am going to tell the House how this can be done, and I think we will all conclude it can be done without an expense of one cent to the Government. There is a very simple way of establishing these demonstration farms very economically, which was suggested to me by a farmer of my county, and I think it only fair that I should give out his name. I am sure the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) knows him, he is Mr. L. A. Massue of Varennes, in the county of Verchères, a member of a great French family which has always been attached to the land. He says: Pick out a particular farm in a particular parish; ask the farmer what profit he gets out of his farm on an average and suppose, for the sake of the argument that it gives $800. Let us leave that farm under the administration of the owner; leave him free on that farm to a certain extent. We will guarantee or we may not guarantee him, but say we guarantee him $800 profit if he wants to follow the instruction of a demonstrator appointed by the Government. The demonstrator would tell him what kind of farming he was to do, in what way he was to do it, and the farmer would follow all instructions so received. The farmer would pay all farm hands, he would pay for any expense that would be incurred on the farm; he would keep books so that his neighbours could come in and look in the books and find out right in their own parish the cost and profit of different kinds of farming. This will be education by demonstration, education by seeing, education by example—and that is what our farmers need most in our province. If the farm yields more than the $800 profit, the farmer keeps it and if it is under that amount for the first year I think we could well afford to reimburse him; but I am sure we could get people who would put their farms at the disposal of such an organization without having any guarantee at all, having confidence that what is going on here on the experimental farm in Ottawa, would, if applied to a small farm, be not experiments but would be results taken from the farm in Ottawa and applied to the small farm. The farmer would run no risk by letting his farm be used for demonstration purposes in such a scheme. Some people may think that this would be an extravagant system to organize and that it would be a dangerous thing for the Agricultural Department to undertake. I am sure that one officer connected with the experimental farm in Ottawa, under the guidance of the Minister of Agriculture, could take charge of twenty or thirty or maybe forty farms so organized and none of them, I believe sincerely, would cost more than the expense of maintaining a special demonstrator. I think it is time we had some kind of action for the farmers and even if it would involve some expense.

I have been here many a time with farmers from Quebec visiting the Experimental Farm. I have enjoyed what I have seen every time I have come. So did the farmers who came with me, so do the farmers who are coming every summer. But what is the result after a day's visit to the Experimental Farm at Ottawa? We return happy, having come, but what is left? The farmer is not encouraged to imitate what he has seen on the Experimental Farm at Ottawa. He rightly thinks that what is going on there costs too much money for him to undertake on this own farm. On every experimental farm a great deal of money is spent in experiments; some of them are a failure and some succeed. But the ordinary farmer has no time to read the literature published and inquire into the details of these experiments, and very often he comes to the conclusion that it is impossible for him to do anything on the lines suggested by the experimental farm. The big centres are the ones that suffer most to-day, and I think that some of these farms should be stationed near all the big centres and in a very short time, if that were done, we would be able to relieve the distress in our towns and supply them with the necessaries of life. I would suggest that at first five or six towns be taken, and I invite the Minister of Agriculture to come to Montreal. The county of L'Assomption lies next to Montreal, and I could name other coun-

ties pretty near: Chambly, Vercheres, Laprairie. Let him take three or five parishes and try the system on the nearest farm to the city of Montreal. Let us see what can be done. If it does not cost much to the Government—and I do not believe it would—we could extend the system, and thereby do a great deal to relieve the situation of which we have heard so much to-day.

The hon. Minister of Finance mentioned the other day that our country has, by the action of our senators, lost $2,500,000, which was to have been expended on roads. He also mentioned the Agricultural Aid Bill. I wish to give credit to the Minister of Agriculture for sending me a pamphlet last year about the distribution of pure bred animals. I talked to the farmers in my parish about it. I have talked to the farmers in Chateauguay. Every time I met a farmer I would tell him about this proposal of the Minister of Agriculture in regard to pure bred animals, but there is one thing I would like to say to the minister. In his pamphlet he states that these animals will only go to the newly organized districts, but in Quebec we have no newly organized districts, but our cattle have gone over to the other side in such a way that I say that we should be considered as new districts by the Agricultural Department. We need to be considered as new districts otherwise we shall not be able to build up our cattle trade again; and I pray the Minister of Agriculture in the name of my people in Quebec, and in the name of my two counties to consider us as new districts, and to give us a chance to rebuild our cattle trade, which 'the-half-of-reciprocity' has taken from us. When the Minister of Finance spoke of the $10,000,000 grant in aid of agriculture I heard an interruption from the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark). He asked 'With what result?'. Speaking on behalf of Quebec, I admit that we have had very poor results, and if the hon. member for Red Deer has as good reason for complaining as we have in Quebec, I would not, if I were him, attempt to blame this Government; he should go, as we in Quebec should go, to the provincial legislature and lay the blame where it belongs. I am not going to deal with this question further to-day, but I want to tell my hon. friends from the province of Quebec that I intend to deal with it when the Estimates come down or when the Budget Speech is delivered, and on that occasion I am going to tell what has been done with the money given the provincial Government of Quebec by this Parliament, and how it was used for political purposes in Quebec.

The third point I wish to make is the need of a better system of distribution and co-operation. We should cut out the middleman who gets rich too quickly.

The Solicitor General the other day dealt with the Highways Bill very fully, and I am not going to say much about that; but I hope to see again this year a measure to help the roads in our country. I hope to see provision made in the Estimates or by a Bill similar to that of last year and I am willing to stand by such a law because I believe it is the best law this country can expect from us. I am not going to discuss whether hon. gentlemen opposite were right in getting their friends, the senators, to kill the Bill, or whether we were right in not accepting their amendments. I know that the people of our country will not have patience for any great length of time with this discussion, because what they want is good roads, and they expect us to give them help in that direction. They will not stand for any technical objections or any surgical operations like the one that was mentioned by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). Whether the Bill was killed by the Senate, as I am convinced it was, or whether it was killed by the refusal of this Government to concur in the wonderful surgical operation that was performed, the people of the country know and feel that they got nothing out of the fight, and they know and feel that they never had any hope of getting anything of that kind from the Liberal regime. It was never before attempted to give the people any assistance of that kind. It is a good thing, says the hon. member for Red Deer with which to get votes. I am glad to find that the hon. member for Red Deer begins to realize that the liberal policy of the Borden Government will be more popular and will give more votes than their free food and free trade.

The first and second points which I have made in my remarks this afternoon may not be sufficient to induce the Minister of Public Works to contribute his share towards the solution of this problem. The Liberal party, and the Conservative party before them, have expended an immense amount of money for the construction of railways, the development of ports and the building of elevators for carrying export

grain from the West to the eastern seaboard of our country. But what has been done for the farmers of the East? I know that the answer can be given that large public works have been constructed in the East, and I admit that they have. I shall not enumerate these public works, we know they have been constructed, but what I want to know is what has been done for the farmers of the East? I asked that question of Mr. Fisher, the ex-Minister of Agriculture, during the fight in Chateauguay. He never dared to answer it, he had nothing to say. If the minister in charge of the immigration work of our Government would help the farmers of Canada, and especially those from Lake Superior to the Atlantic, to secure good farm hands, and if the Minister of Agriculture would establish demonstration farms right at the doors of the farmers in order to show the results which have been obtained at the Central Experimental Farm and demonstrate to them the economical side of advanced methods, they would be doing something big for the farmers of this country. Our one crop a year matures at about the same season each year, and the farmers have to sell their products all at one time, because of the fact that a large proportion of them are of a perishable nature, and they have no place to keep them. They are obliged to sell, and they have to take the price they can get. This is where the middleman comes in. He has a refrigerator and a housing system of his own. This is the trust that my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) has talked about, and he is right. The middlemen go out through the country and they buy up all the produce, much more than is necessary for the immediate needs of the people. They store this produce in order to husband it for the winter season. Then, what happens? They sell it at any price they want and they make the people in the cities pay for it. The people in the cities are at the mercy of the middlemen.

This is where the intervention of the Minister of Public Works would be useful in solving the problem of the high cost of living and relieving the farmers as well as the people of the towns and cities from this situation. How can he do this? By adopting the same policy with regard to the farmers of the East as that which the Government have adopted in regard to the farmers of the West. The Government have at the public expense built grain elevators for the housing of the farmers' grain in the West. Let the Minister of Public Works build at Toronto, Montreal, Halifax, St. John and other centres, a housing system with cold storage attached where the farmers could get together upon a co-operative basis and could husband and store their goods and food stuffs until there was a market available for them. All they would have to do would be to appoint one man who would sell everything belonging to all the members of this co-operative movement, and that one individual could deal with them in the same way as the representative of the fruit growers organization in California represents the members of that body. They would have one man to represent them who would tell them what they should do and what they should not do. He would be able to advise the members of the association as to what things were needed at a particular time and at a particular place. It seems to me that this would be a practical solution. I know that there may be some one who may criticise my suggestion; I do not pretend that it is perfect, I am only a new member of this House, but I am suggesting what I think is best for my country. I think that it will be found that this system of co-operation would be the most economical and satisfactory system that could be devised and we would get rid of what is so much deplored by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition: the wide margin between the price that is paid to the producers and the price that is paid by the consumer, this is my programme; I am giving it out to-day. I am going to fight for it with all my power, because I think it is most necessary for our country. If we would take the trouble to study the question, we would find that it is applicable to the West just as much as to the East, because in the West we have towns that are growing in a wonderful manner, and anything that would help the cities of the West would help the cities of the East, would help the people, would help the farmer who is the producer and would help the consumer to get rid of the middleman who gets rich too quick.

That state of affairs did not come into existence to-day; it has existed for the last ten years. I remember the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) once saying that they saw the crisis coming and were trying to relieve it by reciprocity. If they saw the crisis coming, in my judgment reciprocity was not a good remedy, no better remedy than the surgical operation that the hon. member for Red Deer mentioned the other day. The Liberal party were in power. Did they lift up a finger to relieve the situation, except by reciprocity? They

call themselves 'Liberals.' They are proud of their name. What is there except the name? I remember the old programme of the Liberal party. While they were in power, did they carry out all their promises? During the last two years they have been criticising the programme of the right hon. the Prime Minister. If I should take up the Liberal programme of 1896 and make a little criticism on it after the Liberals had been fifteen years in power, would I not find more to say against them than they can find to say against the Administration of to-day? What did they do about the North Atlantic Trading Company and immigration? Is the Sunday Observance Bill that they passed very Liberal? Is what they did in giving the money for the Quebec bridge to political friends very Liberal? Did they cease for a single moment giving, what we used to call tin-pot titles? Did they cease appointing members of Parliament to official positions? What about their programme of 1893—free trade? Did they try once to put that into effect in the country? Never.

But there is something more. Did they reform the Senate in any way? The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) said the other day that my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Lavallée) came from pure Liberal blood. I was once a pure-blooded Liberal too, and when we used to talk about the Senate my blood boiled. We were ready to fight for the abolition of the Senate. Have the Liberals abolished it? Look at the Senate to-day; it is worse than ever it was.

Did they curtail the expenditures? No, they increased them all the time. Did they stop election corruption during the time they were in power? Never. That was a portion of their programme. But we have seen that while they were in a position to carry out their programme, they did not do so.

We had an example not very long ago of an ex-minister of agriculture, whom I do not intend to name, running in Chateauguay and then hiding himself in order to avoid the service of a counter petition, contesting the election. We shall see what will come out of the case. Maybe we on this side of the House shall have more fun than our hon. friends opposite.

During the fifteen years the Liberals were in power what did they do in regard to agriculture? I think I can prove that they did nothing. They failed in 1911 with the reciprocity cry, because the people were against reciprocity. They have failed with their free food policy and they would not dare to bring it about. If they ever come along with free trade, they are going to fail in a worse way than they ever have failed, and they will die over it if they endeavour to bring it in.

Mr. ROBERT CRUISE (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I represent a constituency composed mostly of farmers; and, as this amendment is for free wheat, for which the farmers of the West are asking, I think it is my duty to say a few words on the question.

In the first place, I would like to refer to a few remarks that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) made yesterday. He said:

> When the discussion of such an important matter as this does take place on the Budget Speech, we shall need to have the very best and soundest reasons—reasons more sound than those which the hon. member for Humboldt has been able to present to the House—before it would be wise for this Government to deal with any tariff changes which would affect important industries.

I presume these industries are the milling industry and the farming industry. I would just like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works what better reason does he require? The organized farmers from Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta met the organized farmers of Ontario and discussed these questions before they brought them before the Government. The organized farmers are not the only people who are in favour of free wheat. We have also the Conservative Government of Manitoba, the leader of which is Sir Rodmond Palen Roblin, a man who, with his followers, opposed reciprocity to the bitter end. We have these men converted—if you will allow the expression, Mr. Speaker—to the belief that free wheat is in the interest of the western farmers. I do not know what stronger reason the Minister of Public Works requires than to have the Prime Minister of his own province, a province he represents in this House, requesting the Government to give the farmers free wheat. The Conservatives of Manitoba are holding conventions to nominate their provincial candidates, and in some of these conventions resolutions have been passed endorsing the Manitoba Government for taking up the question of free wheat. This is a farmer's question; free wheat has been asked for by the farmers; and we have a Government here that pretends to be the friend of the farmer. They told the farmers in the West, before the last election, that if they were given power they would do all

kinds of things for the farmers. It is a very small concession that is asked of the Government, and I hope they will grant this small measure of relief to the western farmers.

The Minister of Public Works objected to this amendment being introduced at this particular time. I am not very well versed in parliamentary procedure, but it seems to me that had this question not been taken up at this time the result might have been very undesirable. When the Minister of Finance has brought down his Budget and settles the tariff for this year, what good would it do for the Opposition to bring in a resolution for free wheat? They would say: Why did you not bring that in before? There is nothing like being on time; we want to put our vote on record in favour of free wheat for the western farmer. And in asking for free wheat for the western farmer we ask something which will not hurt the eastern farmer; if it were otherwise, we would not ask for it.

Another question that members on the Government side talk a great deal about is the education of the farmers. I do not know how that appeals to other farmers, but I know how it appeals to me. I have been a practical farmer in Manitoba for twenty years and I do not need any education to enable me to raise more beef and more pork, and more wheat than I do. Give me the market, and I will raise the goods. These hon. gentlemen are on the wrong track; they are trying to educate the wrong people. It is not the farmers who need to be educated, but the manufacturers. Educate the millers and manufacturers so that they will be able to compete with their rivals on the other side of the line. I am quite satisfied that the farmers will be quite willing to have the Minister of Agriculture —whom I am sorry not to see in his seat— appropriate money to educate the manufacturers to be men, to get off the farmer's back and to compete with the American manufacturers. Compare the Canadian farmer on our side with the American farmer on the other side;—would any man in this House like to go to the Canadian farmer and tell him that he could not raise hogs as cheap as the American farmer,— or beef, or wheat? If you told that to the farmer he would hit you. No Canadian will admit that he cannot raise food as cheaply as the American farmer can. Why, then, cannot the Canadian miller produce flour as cheaply as the American miller? Is there any reason? There is no reason. We have good millers in Canada, and they are willing to compete with the Americans if we take the duty off wheat. They are not opposing this change.

But one reason why this is opposed is that some people say: If you give the farmers free wheat they will never stop until they get everything else free. That is the argument that was used in the last elections. The most prominent Conservatives said: We do not object to this reciprocity arrangement, for it will not hurt the manufacturers; but if we give the farmers reciprocity, they will never stop until they get free agricultural machinery and everything else? This is the thin edge of the wedge. But I venture to prophesy that the day is coming, and before long, when, if our governments, whether Liberal or Conservative, do not study the wishes of the farmers, you will have a farmers' government in Canada. For they are educating men in western Canada who study economic questions more than most members of Parliament do, and these are the men who will legislate in the future if our governments do not wake up to the fact that they have to legislate in the interest of the farmers. I am sorry this resolution does not include also free oats, free barley and free flax. But, as I said before, we will be satisfied with a small concession for the present and see how it works. I am going to ask the Manitoba members, —a number of whom I see before me— I am going to appeal to them as representing the western farmers, to support this resolution, and not only to support this resolution but to try to convince the Government that we have got to have free wheat, barley, oats and flax. If that concession is given us, we in the western country, will produce the goods for you —lots of them.

A great deal has been said about the high cost of living and about the many unemployed in the cities and towns. Where do the bulk of the unemployed come from? When your farmers are not prosperous and not able to keep hired help, where do the hired men go? They go to your cities and towns, and the cities and towns have to support them. Put the farmer in a position to be able to keep his hired help winter and summer, and you will not have the congestion in your towns and cities, you will not have hard times.

Mr. BRADBURY: Wheat growers do not need much help in the winter time.

Mr. CRUISE: My hon. friend butts in just at this time, and I am glad he does.

Gentlemen on his side talk a great deal about mixed farming. If the farmer goes into mixed farming, he will need help in the winter-time as well as in the summer. And the western farmer is going into mixed farming, and he will produce all the wheat and beef and pork you want. The high cost of living, everybody knows, is due to lack of production. How are you going to regulate supply and demand? If the farmers of the West go into mixed farming too strongly, what will happen? They will flood the home market, the prices will go down, and then they will have to go out of mixed farming and into something else. Give the farmer the market so that he may be sure of finding a sale for what he raises every year, and he will keep on year after year producing the goods, and that will certainly reduce the cost of living to a great extent.

Now, let me say a word in regard to reciprocity. During my election, it was laughable to hear the arguments that were used in opposition to reciprocity, mainly by men from the towns and cities—we know that it was the towns and cities in Manitoba that defeated reciprocity, not the farmers; the farmers gave a majority of over 900 in its favour. These people told the farmers: You must not support reciprocity; it would be disloyal to do so, if you trade with the United States, you will be annexed to the United States. I do not know how a more foolish argument could be thought of. You might as well tell an Englishman that if he trades horses with a nigger he will become a nigger as to tell us that we could not trade with the United States without becoming Americans.

Another thing I want to refer to is the farmers' delegations that have come to Ottawa time after time. They have waited on the late Government, as well as on the members of the present Administration. I am not here to defend the late Government, as I was not sitting in the House when the late Government was in power. But we have been told that the late Government did nothing to relieve the situation for the farmers. There is no getting away from the fact that the late Government went to the country on a measure to relieve the farmers, and they were defeated, so that they risked their political lives in trying to give the farmers relief. They were put out of business by whom? By the railway companies, by the manufacturers, by the gentlemen that own the present Government. The present Government cannot do anything; they cannot bring down any measure providing for a change in the tariff without first submitting it to the Manufacturers' Association. It is a fine situation in an agricultural country like Canada to have a Government owned, controlled, and operated by the manufacturers. But I was going to speak about organized farmers waiting on the Government, and the treatment they received. They were told: Oh, yes, we will consider your case—but how far were their cases considered? I am sorry to say that the farmers of western Canada are not making money to-day, and it is not a good advertisement for any country to preach that its farmers are not prosperous. But you have to face the facts, and it is a fact that in Manitoba to-day the farmers are not prosperous; many of them are leaving the farms because they cannot make money. When those men come down here and pay their expenses to Ottawa out of their own pockets, it must be admitted that they are sincere. They do not come here for the fun of it; they are sincere in the demands they make. Has the Government conceded anything to them? Has the Government promised them anything? Here is a chance for the present Government to show the farmers of western Canada that they are in sympathy with them, and if they do so I believe they will have good results when the next election comes on. If the Government could only see its way clear to give the farmers the benefit of free oats, free barley, free flax and free wheat, I am sure the people would appreciate it. The farmers of western Canada are waiting patiently for this concession, which has been promised by hon. members from Manitoba. The hon. Solicitor-General has in the past spoken about free implements. I hope and trust that he will never let the present Government alone till we do get free implements and I almost feel satisfied that we will have them probably before this session is over.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I want the attention of the House only for two or three minutes to refer to this matter and to explain, if I can, why I intend to vote for the amendment now before the House. I have always been in favour of relieving the western farmer in the matter of freight rates almost before doing anything else, and it is because I see that free wheat will at least give the farmer of the West the benefit of competition in railway rates that I feel justified in the action I propose to take. I have spoken in this House year after year in favour of lower freight rates. I have suggested publicly to this Government that the first thing

5 p.m.

they ought to have done when they came into office was to give the farmers of the West some kind of relief in regard to freight rates. I am more confident to-day than I ever was that if there is free access of wheat, the greatest product of the West, to the United States markets, the western farmer will have the benefit of lower freight rates, and I think no injury will result ultimately to the railroads. So far as I can see, there has been no opposition to this proposal in the House up to the present time. Probably the greater number of the members on this side, as well as the members from the West, irrespective of politics, are in favour of the motion. The people of the West have asked for this concession, and, considering the fact that it will have an important effect on the railways, I hope the motion will carry. The only opposition I find to the motion comes from the railways and the mill-owners, and I do not think their argument is a good one, nor do I think it should prevail against the desire of the people of western Canada. The people of the West have unmistakably declared what they want. The Conservatives of Manitoba, and the members of the Legislature of Manitoba, irrespective of party, have declared what they want. The members of the Grain Growers' Association have declared what they want. The members from the West are almost unanimous in the support of this proposal, and there is nobody from the East, so far as I can gather, who has any serious objection to it, other than the railroads and the mill-owners. This being the case, I hope the Government will take this matter into consideration and give relief to the farmers of the West. There is nothing like the relief that goes direct to the point, and this direct relief would widen the market of the farmers, would give them a better price, and would, I believe, give them better freight rates. The arguments I listened to yesterday in regard to this matter were largely arguments that commended themselves to my mind. Now that we have established what I consider one of the greatest things ever established in this country, the right to make our own tariff laws, independent of any outside action, and now that the people of the United States have made concessions on their own account, we should certainly take advantage of the wider market when it comes our way. The people of the United States have taken down many of their tariff walls. Our National Policy was largely based on the United States tariff; there has been a modification of that tariff in one direction, and we ought to be governed by it.

I want to tell the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce where this matter comes home to him. He has put up what I consider to be a very good proposition for better trade relations with the West Indies, and the matter of sugar figures largely in that proposal. Any deal we make with the Caribbean people in the matter of trade would depend largely on sugar. In the meantime the United States comes along and proposes that sugar shall enter that country free—not just now, but in a short time—and that policy that we entered into in regard to the West Indies will be greatly affected by this action on the part of the United States, so far as sugar is concerned. As protectionists, as National Policy people, we must adjust the fiscal policy of our country to these new conditions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend has just stated that the National Policy was based on the American tariff. Does he refer to the permanent offer of reciprocity which was in the Canadian tariff?

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not want to go into details on that; I want to deal with the issue as it presents itself to me. The Americans are a great nation, our near neighbours, our greatest consuming market, and we are their best customers for manufactured goods. When great changes take place in reference to particular articles we must adjust. Let me give an illustration. It has been said of Shakespeare by another great Englishman that he wrote for all time. You know that very charming love scene between Henry V and the French Princess Katherine where Henry says; nice customs curtsey to great Kings. That exactly describes this situation, the customs must curtsey to great Kings in this case and the great King happens to be the United States who have shown a disposition to come our way and to take more of our products. They have offered to take our wheat and a lot of other things, and they are taking them, and we will do no harm to the National Policy by adjusting it to meet that condition. If this is the case and if the Government have not yet made up their minds that the farmers of our Canadian West to-day are feeling stringent conditions, we will hearten them up if we tell them that they have this wider market. If we can hearten them up

so that they will prove to be more successful wheat farmers they will become better mixed farmers and they will produce more; our railways and millers will have more to do even if rates have to be reduced to some extent by reason of this result. Most of all the people of Ontario see a larger market for their products in the great West if the West improves in population and in production and if the people there are contented. We have got to make our Canadian West contented and Ontario to-day, if she is proud of anything, is proud of the fact that the great Canadian West has sprung from the loins of Ontario very largely. We are proud of these three great provinces that have been established on the prairies and the people of Ontario, and I think I speak for the people of Ontario and for a large number of the Conservatives of Ontario, who wish prosperity to come again to the West and they wish to see it peopled more. They wish to see more ground broken in the West and more people going in there. There has been a let up more or less pronounced in regard to settlement in the West and there is more or less of a let up in the immigration going to the West.

A friend of mine, a constituent, sent me yesterday a Wisconsin paper containing a statement in regard to immigration which I hope will command the attention of the House and the Government. This statement is signed by B. G. Packer, Wisconsin Immigration Commissioner. In the statement he tells the farmers of Wisconsin, as they are being told all over the Western States, that Canada is not quite such a good country as it was to go to, and he gives the figures as to the movement of population. These figures are somewhat surprising as showing the number who have come into Canada and the number who have gone back to the United States. I shall read the concluding paragraph signed by this Commissioner of Immigration for Wisconsin—and similar statements are being published in all the Western States, upon which we draw largely for that fine population of men ready to take up land and who know how to farm it. That paragraph reads:

> High freight rates and interest charges, increased cost of protected implements, food, clothing, lumber and other necessaries coupled with frequent low prices for grain apparently convinced many that farming pays best 'back home.'

That is, these Americans who are said to be leaving our Western country and going back to the United States. I do not want to see immigration disturbed or checked in regard to the West; I do not wish to see production disturbed in that country. I want to see our railroads get an immense freight to move out of that country, and to see that freight moved, as has been said here this afternoon, by Canadian channels instead of American channels. But if we do wish to see that, we have got to try and give our own people in the West what they are asking for, to make them contented, and to encourage them in these times of stringency. We must show them that we are willing to co-operate with them in the great work which they have at hand, and on the line of conciliation and of encouragement of that country I think it would be wise on the part of the Government, when they bring down their Budget speech, to have in that very prominently the recognition of the cry of the people of the West for free wheat and for admission to the United States market. It shall not change the National Policy, it will not hurt the people here in the East; but it will be an illustration of what ought to be the inspiring principle of governments, and that is to readjust their course by the compass to new conditions as they arise.

Mr. JAMES M. DOUGLAS (Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal said during this debate as to the reason why production of food stuffs in Canada has fallen short of the market demand. To my mind the only thing that can induce the people of Canada, which is essentially an agricultural country, to produce the required food products for this country is to give to the farmer every facility in the power of the Government in the matter of market. To my mind the question of markets is one of the most important questions with which this present Government or any other has to deal in connection with the farming industry in this great country. The late Government went down to defeat in an endeavour to ameliorate the conditions in Canada in regard to the production of food products. We had it admitted to us on all sides that the reciprocity pact would not interfere with the manufacturing industry any more than that it was a step in the direction of opening the markets and a step in the direction, possibly, of free trade. We have also had a great deal of advice as to

the style of farming which should be followed, particularly in Western Canada.

The section from which I come is essentially a mixed farming district. We were a mixed farming district even before the Minister of Trade and Commerce gave his famous advice to western Canada; and we are so, because conditions there lend themselves particularly to that kind of farming. We also produce a certain amount of grain, but the transportation problem is such a serious one that we do not pretend to ship a great deal of grain. We use it as feed and ship it in the shape of cattle, swine and other live stock. We have had some figures both during the regime of the late Government and of this Government, showing the magnificent proportions of immigration into Canada. I have taken pains to analyse these figures and I have found that notwithstanding the tremendous immigration into Canada from the United States, the net gain to Canada for the past five years is only something like 20,000 people. I would like to place these figures on 'Hansard' showing how this loss has been suffered.

	Canada to U.S.	U.S. to Canada.
1907-8..	58,826	58,312
1908-9..	84,564	59,832
1909-10..	94,496	103,798
1910-11..	105,512	121,451
1911-12..	107,943	133,710
1912-13..	143 578	139,009
	594,919	616,112
Gain in Canada in six years..		21,193

You will notice that there is an increase every year, both coming into Canada and returning to the United States.

Mr. EDWARDS: Will the hon. gentleman give his authority for these figures?

Mr. DOUGLAS: The figures of the immigration into Canada from the United States were taken from a hand book published by the Minister of the Interior of this Government. The figures showing the number of people going into the United States were published by the Commissioner of Immigration of the United States. There is certainly a reason for this condition of affairs, and to my mind it is this: The farmers have not been receiving a commensurate return for their products. Farming should have been exceedingly attractive to the producers of agricultural products owing to the extremely high prices which farmers have been receiving during the past four or five years. Every condition has been favourable such as free land, homesteads and all that sort of thing. The farmers have been well treated by the Government, they have had every facility granted them, and yet in spite of that we find an enormous number of people returning yearly to their own country. This does not apply to European immigrants, simply because conditions in European countries are not as favourable as in the United States. To my mind the market of the United States is the best market in the world for farm products. The effect of the tariff reduction undertaken by President Wilson has been to make that market of inestimable value to the people of Canada, in so far as they trade there. The hon. member for Dundas quoted figures in his speech the other night showing that in the last nine months of 1913, our exports to the United States had increased enormously. He might have simplified that by giving us a concrete case. He might have told us that in the month of December the exports of animal products and foodstuffs into the United States increased by nearly $13,000,000 and all that occurred in one month's operation of the new tariff. What would it mean, Mr. Speaker, if we had the advantage of that market for all our farm products? As has been very aptly stated, no one is more qualified to speak for the farmers than the farmers themselves. My experience with farmers—and I have had a long experience—has been that in the main the farmer thoroughly understands his business. We have heard a lot said about wheat mining in western Canada, but I venture to say that a great deal of that talk is largely ignorance. Conditions in the particular section where wheat mining is going on are not conducive to the raising of live stock, and it is absolutely impossible for those farmers to go into mixed farming. There are, of course, many sections in which mixed farming can be very profitably carried on, but without a market it is of little use for the western farmer to go into mixed farming. At the United Farmers' Convention held recently in Lethbridge, the Commissioner of Live Stock for Alberta made the remarkable statement that if it had not been for the Wilson tariff the province of Alberta would have raised more hogs this year than she could sell in her home market, and the result of that would have been that the old price of six years ago would have prevailed this year in Alberta. The only thing that saved the situation was the throwing open of the American market. The statement has also been made by the Swift Packing Company—the largest of its kind in Alberta—that last year was

the first in the history of Alberta in which the people were able to produce sufficient poultry for their needs. I heard the hon. member for Chambly (Mr. Rainville) state this afternoon that the province of Alberta did not raise enough foodstuffs for her own people. That is absolutely incorrect. The province of Alberta is an exporting province, and is admirably adapted for the raising and exporting of all sorts of agricultural products. He also stated that British Columbia was one of the provinces which raised sufficient foodstuffs to feed her own people. I have not the figures, but I very much doubt that statement. We have heard a great deal about what this Government is doing to further agriculture. I am willing to give them all credit for what they have done for agriculture. We cannot get away from the fact that agriculture is the basic industry of the country, and I am radical enough to believe that if there were no manufacturing industries whatever and the people devoted the energy to the raising of foodstuffs that they do to the manufacture of a great many articles that they cannot produce profitably, the country would be more prosperous than it is to-day.

We in the province of Alberta have a progressive Minister of Agriculture and I venture to say that he has done more to further the science of agriculture in that province than the whole Dominion Government put together for many years back. They have established schools of instruction in a great many districts in Alberta and more will be established as time progresses. These schools have the effect of giving the farmer and the farmer's sons instruction without giving them the idea that they are becoming professors of agriculture. The boy goes to one of these schools and he is taught practical methods of running a gasolene engine, of running a steam-engine and of raising, breeding and feeding cattle. The result of this short course of instruction is that the boy goes back to the farm with an incentive to do more and to do it more scientifically than his father did before him. I claim that the province of Alberta stands in the forefront to-day in the matter of agricultural education. If this Government would do more of that style of thing the people would appreciate it.

I wish to say a word upon this subject of unemployment. I would not like to accuse the present Government of being to blame for this particularly, but it is a peculiar coincidence that hard times began to come after the late Government was defeated. In Edmonton a most remarkable condition of affairs exists to-day. One of the most prosperious cities in the Dominion of Canada is the city of Edmonton. We have expended a large amount of money on public improvements, our expenditures run into the millions, and yet, in spite of that, we have to-day on our hands unemployed who are being fed by the tax-payers of the city to keep them from starvation. We have expended within the last four weeks no less than $25,000 to feed people who had no means of producing a livelihood. I was through the so-called panic of 1907 but I never saw such a condition as this in my lifetime. The only thing that prevents us from feeding 2,000 or 3,000 people is that the people have risen in arms and have said: We will not feed you any longer; you will have to get work and do the same as we do.

That the country as a whole is prosperous I will admit. We have been growing very rapidly but we must not pursue the ostrich policy of not recognizing that something must be done to relieve the people. A prominent wholesale man told me this summer that the wholesale people selling in the province of Saskatchewan particularly, in a great number of cases had only been able to collect of their bills ten per cent, leaving renewals to the extent of ninety per cent. This is a most remarkable thing to say and I would be very loath to think that such a condition could long continue. In view of facts of that kind it is up to the Government to recognize the conditions as they exist. We are not living in a fool's paradise, we know that our prosperity is not such as we have had it depicted by some hon. members on the other side but we likewise feel that it is no disgrace to Canada that in a widely and sparsely settled country we are in this condition. It is absolutely necessary for the Government to do something to relieve the situation. I am pleased to see the hon.member for South York (Mr. Maclean) taking the stand that he has in regard to this matter. If he will vote right he will accept our proposition and I trust that he will give us his support in the vote which he gave us in his speech here to-day.

Mr. DAVID WARNOCK (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavour to take up as little time as possible, as I understand it has been arranged between the whips that the vote shall be taken before six o'clock. But this question of free wheat is of so

much importance to the West that I desire to put myself on record as being strongly in favour of the request made by the western farmers. I do not propose to enter into a comparison of the prices in the United States and Canadian markets. The opponents of reciprocity, in the late reciprocity campaign, always assured us that the United States market would be absolutely valueless to the live stock producers of Canada. But since the Underwood tariff has come into operation we have had ample proof that the United States market is a most valuable market for our live stock producers, and the western wheat growers ask our Government to remove these duties so that the countervailing duty may be taken off and thus give them an opportunity of getting into the United States market just in the same way as our live stock growers have got into it and with the expectation of equal benefit. The hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder), speaking the other evening, informed the House that the farmers of Ontario were more prosperous than they had ever been. Why? Is it not the case that they have the United States market for their live stock, milk and cream? Certainly the Ontario farmers never would have been as prosperous had that market not been thrown open to them. The western farmers ask that they be permitted to share in this prosperity. Our live stock growers in western Canada are getting better prices for their live stock, their hogs and cattle, than they have ever done in the history of live stock raising in the West.

About six weeks ago there were hundreds of cattle on the hands of feeders in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, a constituency lying south of Calgary. These cattle could not be sold at a profitable figure, but when the Underwood tariff came into effect buyers from big packing plants at Tacoma and Seattle came into Calgary, purchased these cattle at a very profitable price to the producer and shipped the cattle to the large packing plants in the Pacific Coast cities.

Let me deal shortly with conditions as they exist in southern Alberta to-day. We have heard a great deal in the East about the bumper crops that the western farmers have had during the past season; in fact, I remember reading some interviews given by Cabinet Ministers on their return to the East from the West, and some of them were so optimistic that they said that there was a large enough crop in the western country this year to relieve the whole of the financial stringency all over Canada. But in the winter wheat district we found that conditions were not quite so good. I know that in my own part of the country the yield of winter wheat was a great disappointment. Many crops only threshed out about an average of twelve bushels to the acre, and the farmer being compelled to sell at the prices prevailing in the West, had to sell at a loss of from $1 to $5 per acre on the cost of production. No farmer can continue to farm under these conditions. Even the farmers who had good crops realized very little more than what it cost them to produce their crop. In past years our farmers have tested the United States markets by paying the duty and shipping a portion of their grain across the line, and I have never yet met a farmer who was not thoroughly satisfied with his experiments in this direction. For that reason, I am strongly in favour of free wheat, and I hope that the Government will see fit to grant the request of the western farmers. As the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) pointed out this afternoon, it is not the request of a few agitators of the West. I believe that 90 per cent. of the farmers, no matter what their political persuasion may be, are in favour of free wheat, and the bulk of the Conservative press in the West is advocating free wheat.

I should like to put on record an article which appeared in the Calgary Herald, a paper which is friendly to the Borden Government, and which is looked upon as one of the staunchest party papers in the West. This article was written in regard to a letter received from Mr. Kelly, president of the Western Canada Flour Mills Company, with important interest in Calgary. The article, which is dated January 13, 1914, says:

> What the president says, in effect, is that if the Dominion Government removes the duties against United States wheat and flour there will be an end to milling development in the West.
>
> Perhaps Mr. Kelly didn't mean it exactly that way, but what he says sounds very much like a threat, and if there is one thing more particularly objectionable than another to the average westerner it is the threat, no matter from whence it comes or by whom given.
>
> Mr. Kelly will forgive us if we suggest that the issue concerned in the matter of free or taxed wheat is something of far greater importance to the people of the West than the development or stagnation of any single industrial enterprise, even though that enterprise is of such magnitude as the milling industry. Involved in it is an economic question affecting practically the whole population of the West. And if the Borden Government decides that it will be for the general financial betterment of the people of the West to remove wheat and flour duties, it is not at all likely those duties

will be retained in order to meet the desires of the Association of Millers.

Originally designed to foster home industry and develop the Dominion industrially and agriculturally, the policy of protection has not always been operated in accordance with its original design. Various industrial interests have, with more or less success, persuaded governments to manipulate the tariff in such manner as made it the servant of special rather than general interests. It would be better for the protective policy if this sort of thing ceased entirely.

We may be excused if we refuse to believe everything in the way of calamity Mr. Kelly in his letter assures us will follow to milling interests of the West if wheat and flour duties are removed. It would be an insult to the intelligence and business ability of the managers of this business in western Canada to suggest that, located as they are in the heart of the finest wheat growing country on the continent, and having as cheap and ready access to Pacific coast and other markets as their western American competitors, they would fall down if forced to meet their rivals in open competition. Possibly their dividends might not figure so largely in financial statements, but that they would fail or cease to progress! Well, we simply cannot believe it; that's all.

Viewing the free wheat and flour proposal as it applies economically to the people of Canada to-day The Herald is quite well satisfied to see the experiment tried out. We do not believe that in operation it can work any great injury to even a section of the people, and there is the possibility it may work benefit to a great majority, in which event the removal of duties would be justified. And if, as has been contended, Canadian millers are at a disadvantage in meeting their American competitors because of duties on mill machinery and equipment, why not remove these duties also? The Government of R. L. Borden in giving justice to the majority has no desire to work any injustice to the minority, if it can be avoided. If the people are given free wheat and flour the millers should also be given free access to markets from which they obtain their equipment and other supplies.

Therefore even the Conservatives of western Canada are not afraid of free wheat.

It looks very much as if the farmers of western Canada were going to be driven out of business unless they are given an opportunity to sell in a wider market at better prices. It would appear, as pointed out by the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Douglas) that considerable emigration is taking place to the south. In fact, I believe the statistics show that there has been a greater migration from Canada to the United States during the past twelve months than from the United States into Canada. If an exodus should set in from our western provinces, what would happen to our eastern industries and our great transportation companies? They would face bankruptcy, and instead of opposing the giving of free wheat, the removal of the duty, they ought to do everything in their power to encourage the Government to grant the request of the western farmers.

With regard to the education of the farmers, we have been told by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) that this Government has been doing a great deal in that way. Scientific education in agriculture is a good thing, but it will not enable any farmer to make money when he is compelled to sell his agricultural produce at a loss. In the constituency which I have the honour to represent, I have a number of graduates of Guelph Agricultural College and also of the Manitoba Agricultural College, and I think I may safely say that, although these men are farming along scientific lines, farming according to the most advanced methods, not one of these men is making more than a bare living out of his farm to-day. The only men who are making money are the men who have live stock to dispose of.

As regards the advice of the hon. member from Dundas (Mr. Broder), re going into mixed farming, the farmers have had a great deal of that advice from governments, from presidents of transportation companies and from presidents of our banking institutions. It requires, however, capital to go into mixed farming, and very few of our western farmers at the present time have the capital to embark on mixed farming. It is to be regretted, partly for that reason, that there has been so much delay in putting into effect the recommendations of the Ranching Commission appointed some time ago to look into the ranching and grazing question. In 1911 or 1912 the commission was appointed; the report was handed in, and so far the Government has not put its recommendations into effect. The hon. member for Chambly and Verchéres (Mr. Rainville) was speaking of the large number of cattle that had gone out of eastern Canada into the United States. If the farmers and stock-men of western Canada had been assured of a grazing area, they would have bought a large number of these young cattle and breeding stock that were for sale in eastern Canada, would have shipped them west and so done something to stimulate mixed farming. A great deal of that stock would have been taken out there, held over the winter and sold to small farmers who could afford to buy cattle in the spring. I trust that before very long the recommendations of the Ranching Commission will be put into operation.

Recently the Government was visited by the Conservative members of the Alberta Legislature; and before these gentlemen left

the West they gave the people to understand that they were coming here for the purpose of impressing upon the Government the importance of granting free wheat and many other requests of the western farmer. I learn from the High River Times—a paper friendly to the present Government—of Thursday, January 21, that the provincial delegation were much more interested in redistribution and questions of patronage than they were in free wheat. This newspaper states:

> The delegation went fully into redistribution and cutting up of the province in order that the larger centres of population would be distributed so as to offset the farmers' vote on reciprocity as much as possible.
>
> The grievances over the grazing leases and the delay of the Government in changing regulations was discussed, and it is likely that some action in the matter will soon take place. The delegation is reported not to have been in unison on the question of free wheat, but the Government was strongly advised that something ought to be done in order to offset the growing sentiment of antagonism throughout the West.

Evidently, the editor of this paper thinks there is some antagonism developing to the present Government in the West, and perhaps from a political point of view I should not be anxious to see that antagonism removed. But let me say, if there is antagonism in the rural districts, there must be antagonism amongst the people of the towns and cities of the West as well, because the very existence of these towns and cities depends upon the prosperity of the farmers. But I am quite prepared to risk defeat in the next general election by the removal of some of that antagonism to the Government; and if the Government will only grant the request for free wheat, I can assure them that they will rise very appreciably in the estimation of the western farmers. I have tried to deal with this question from a non-partisan point of view. I am actuated by a sincere desire to see a betterment in the conditions of the West, and therefore I shall be very pleased to see this Government grant free wheat, thereby acceding to the demand of the western farmers.

Mr. WILLIAM A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, my observations on this amendment will be very brief. I desire to summarize the argument put up by the members from western Canada on behalf of this measure, which we believe will be an inestimable advantage to the farmers of the western provinces. The demand is general; it does not represent one political party only, but represents, I can safely say, the unanimous sentiment of the people of western Canada. In my own community I have come in contact with men who are leaders in the Conservative party, and they declare themselves in favour of free wheat, realizing that it is in the interest of the farmers of the West. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) yesterday was looking for reasons, and I think enough have been offered him to induce the Government to provide, in the Budget, for free wheat. Now, I believe every man in this House is anxious for the development of the western provinces; and I will be candid enough to say that western Canada is not developing at the present time. I am speaking from experience. I have travelled through my constituency, and have met the people, and they are discouraged and dissatisfied; and the result is that some of them are leaving Canada. Now when our Cabinet ministers come to the West they come on a special train or on a special car. They visit the members of the party in the chief centres; but I will guarantee this, that not one of them who came to the West last year came into contact with the farmers themselves or went out and met them on their farms and tried to find out the conditions existing there. If they had done so, they would realize that every word that the western Canada members have said in this debate is absolutely true, and that free wheat is one of the necessities for the western Canadian farmer. I am an optimist in regard to the West, I believe in the West, it is a country with untold riches. But we must have our people there living under conditions satisfactory to them; conditions must be such that as a result of their labours the people may be able to make a profitable living, and that they cannot do under present tariff conditions. If I were to outline the needs of the West at the present time as presented by the farmers and others, I would speak also of a general reduction in the tariff, more transportation facilities and lower freight rates. Most members of this House think the West has been afforded a large mileage of railway transportation. That is true, but still in my own district, which is 180 miles square, there are points that are fifty and sixty miles away from a railroad, where farmers are endeavouring to farm and where they have been farming for the last three or four years. I will quote one instance. On the 1st of July last, I had occasion to attend a de-

monstration in a district known as the Altorado district. At that demonstration, at a place fifty miles from a railroad, there were a thousand people in attendance, among them some farmers whose places were sixty and seventy miles from railroad connections. These people cannot help but be discouraged in their efforts. What is the cause of these people going to live in such places? Homestead lands were opened, railroads promised to build and the people went in. And let me say, one of the most unpopular measures passed last year was the subsidy to the Canadian Northern railway—unpopular in a district which is looking for a branch line of the Canadian Northern railway. That company had made promises, time and time again, to those people, and yet in all this time they have not laid a mile of track in that district. That is one reason why the people are discouraged; they want more transportation facilities, a general reduction in the tariff and lower freight rates. Let me say for the western people that, while they are free traders in sentiment and belief, yet they are not asking for something that is going to injure eastern Canada. While desiring a general reduction of the tariff, they will be prepared to stand for protection for the eastern Canadian industries. But they feel that when their own industry, the great agricultural industry, asks for free entrance into other markets and is prepared to compete on a free trade basis with other countries, their request should be granted. And they are looking to this Government, which has promised so much for the benefit of this country and especially for western Canada, to grant that request.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Neely:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bickerdike,
Boivin,
Bourassa,
Buchanan,
Cardin,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clark (Red Deer),
Delisle,
Demers,
Devlin,
Douglas,
Fortier,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Gauvreau,
German,
Graham,
Guthrie,
Loggie,
Maclean (Halifax),
Maclean (York, O.),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCraney,
McCrea,
McMillan,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Michaud,
Molloy,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Oliver,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Proulx,
Reid (Restigouche),
Ross,
Sinclair,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Truax,
Turgeon,
Verville,
Warnock and
White (Victoria, Alta.),
—57.
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Kay,
Lachance,
Lanctot,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Lapointe (Montreal, St. James),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Law,
Lemieux,

NAYS:

Messieurs

Achim,
Alguire,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York, O.),
Arthurs,
Baker,
Ball,
Barnard,
Barrette,
Beattie,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Best,
Blain,
Blondin,
Borden,
Boulay,
Boys,
Brabazon,
Bradbury,
Bristol,
Broder,
Burnham,
Burrell,
Clare,
Clark (Bruce),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cromwell,
Crothers,
Currie,
Davidson,
Doherty,
Edwards,
Elliot,
Fisher,
Foster (Toronto, N.),
Fripp,
Garland,
Gauthier (Gaspe),
Girard,
Glass,
Green,
Guilbault,
Hanna,
Hartt,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hepburn,
Hughes (Victoria, O.),
Lamarche,
Lancaster,
Lavallée,
Macdonell,
McCurdy,
McKay,
McLean (Queens P.E.I.),
Marshall,
Meighen,
Merner,
Middlebro,
Mondou,
Morphy,
Morrison,
Nantel,
Nicholson,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Paquet,
Paul,
Pelletier,
Perley,
Porter,
Reid (Grenville),
Robidoux,
Roche,
Rogers,
Schaffner,
Sevigny,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Shepherd,
Smith,
Smyth,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Sutherland,
Thoburn,
Thompson (Yukon),
Thornton,
Tremain,
Walker,
Wallace,
Webster,
Weichel,
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox,
Wilson (Wentworth),
and
Wright.—102.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
White (Leeds),	Emmerson,
Chabot,	Béland,
Osler,	Pugsley,
Rhodes,	Macdonald (Pictou),
Coderre,	Lafortune,

Stewart (Lunenburg),	McKenzie,
Fowler,	McLean (Sunbury),
Cockshutt,	Charlton,
Taylor,	Martin (Regina),
Stanfield,	Pardee,
Kemp,	Robb,
Lalor,	Richards,
Aikins,	Turriff,
Bowman,	Knowles,
Foster (Kings),	Carroll,
Ames,	Kyte,
Forget,	Bureau,
Munson,	Cruise,
Boyce,	Tobin,
Edwards,	**Wilson (Laval),**
McLeod,	Clarke (Essex),
Monk,	Power,
Morris,	Brouillard,
Jameson,	Boyer,
Barker,	Ethier,
Rainville,	Séguin,
Carrick,	Champagne,
Bellemare.	Chisholm (Antigonish).

Mr. BELAND: I was paired with the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Chabot); had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. CRUISE: I was paired with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Munson); had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. RAINVILLE: I was paired with the hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Séguin); had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. STEWART (Lunenberg): I was paired with the hon. member for North Cape Britain and Victoria (Mr. Mackenzie); had I been free to vote I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. CARROLL: I was paired with the hon. member for Kings, Nova Scotia (Mr. Foster); had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. FOWLER: I was paired with the hon. member for Queens-Sunbury (Mr. McLean); had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. EMMERSON: I was paired with the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White); had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Main motion agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

On motion of Hon. G. H. Perley (for the Minister of Finance) it was ordered that the House on Friday next go into Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS.

On motion of Mr. Perley, it was ordered that the House on Friday next go into Committee of Ways and Means.

ESTIMATES FOR 1914-15.

A message from His Royal Highness the Governor General transmitting estimates for the year ending March 31, 1915, was presented by Hon. G. H. Perley, read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and, on motion of Mr. Perley, was referred to the Committee of Supply.

On motion of Mr. Borden, the House adjourned at 6.20 p.m.

Friday, January 30, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 41, respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

Bill No. 42, respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company—Mr. Shepherd.

Bill No. 43, respecting Queen's University at Kingston—Mr. Nickle.

Bill No. 44, respecting the Vancouver Life Insurance Company of Vancouver, B.C., and to change its name to 'The Vancouver Life Insurance Company'—Mr. Stevens.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO moved:

That the Auditor's General's report and the Public Accounts for the year ended March 31, 1913, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

INTERPRETATION OF RULE 17.

Mr. BORDEN moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that with the consent of the House no motion is necessary. If the House does not consent, the motion will have to be made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We are for the first time applying the rule which was adopted last session in regard to going into Committee of Supply, and which is a departure from the rule formerly in existence. Before we proceed, I would like to ask my right hon. friend the Prime Minister for his understanding of the rule, so that we may know in the future exactly the position we are in. The rule reads as follows:

> On Thursdays and Fridays when the Order of the Day is called for the House to go into Committee of Supply, or of Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker will leave the Chair without putting any question, provided that . . . the Estimates of each department shall be first taken up on a day other than Thursday or Friday.

My understanding of the rule is that if the House is moved into Committee of Supply on a day other than Thursday or Friday, and if at the conclusion of the day the subject matter of the department under consideration has not been exhausted, then when the House goes into Committee of Supply on Thursday or Friday, Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair without any motion. My understanding is that when you commence the consideration of the Estimates of a department, it must be done by the making of a motion. To-day we have no department whose estimates we have commenced, and therefore my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has moved the House into Committee of Supply. If we had commenced on a department on a day previous to to-day, Mr. Speaker would have left the Chair without any motion.

Mr. BORDEN: For the purpose of the estimates of that department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: For the purpose of the department. In other words, I take this to mean that the consideration of the Estimates of any department must be first commenced by a motion, and, if not finished within the day, it goes on automatically, Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair, and it is taken up again on Thursday or Friday.

Mr. BORDEN: That seems to be the understanding.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Then, as that seems to be the understanding, what are we to understand by the word 'department' which is used in this rule:

> On Thursdays and Fridays, when the Order of the Day is called for the House to go into Committee of Supply, or of Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker will leave the Chair without putting any question, provided that, except by the consent of the House, the Estimates of each department shall be first taken up on a day other than Thursday or Friday.

To-day I understand we are taking up Civil Government, and taking it up as one department. On page 8 of the Estimates we have these words, 'Civil Government, amount to be voted, $6,413,378.75.' That is what is required for Civil Government. In this amount is included the expenditures of the various departments for the Civil Service at Ottawa; for instance, there is for the Customs Department $615,987, and again on page 96 we have another vote, item 342, amounting to $4,210,000, for the Customs Department. If we take up to-day all the departments and exhaust them, I suppose this will not be considered as having gone into the Interior or Customs or Excise or any other department, but that when the time comes for us to consider these appropriations, the House will have to be moved again into Committee of Supply?

Mr. BORDEN: I understand it very much in the way that my right hon. friend understands it, except that I think he has perhaps construed the rule a little too favourably to the Government, if I apprehend him correctly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am too generous to the Government; it is a fault of mine.

Mr. BORDEN: Only unintentionally. I would think that every one of the departments which are enumerated, commencing at page 8, would be regarded as a separate department, and not as one department, as the right hon. gentleman suggests. In so far as I understand the construction of the rule, I think there is no difference of opinion between himself and myself. I would further say that we are taking this up practically by consent to-day, as the Government could not reasonably ask hon gentlemen to go on except by consent, and I would not regard any commencement that we may make to-day as bringing the case within the operation of the rule. We must bring each one of these departments before the House on some other day before we can make use of the rule in regard to Thursday and Friday.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Other than Thursday or Friday?

Mr. BORDEN: Other than Thursday or Friday. I think that is quite fair and reasonable, and I assent to it at once.

THE STEAMER ALERT.

On the motion of Mr. Borden for Committee of Supply:

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to read the following article dated North Sydney, January 27, 1914, which appeared in the Sydney Record:

> The Government revenue steam tug Alert, which is owned by a Sydney real estate broker and incidentally receives the princely sum of $18,000 per year of the people's money, was pressed into service yesterday to convey Tory organizer Hayes and Tory candidate Philip McLeod from North Sydney to the northern parts of Victoria county. The primary object of establishing this branch of the preventive service was to put a stop to the traffic of contraband liquor into Cape Breton seaports. Prohibition is one of the planks of the Tory platform. It is also an offence punishable by fine and imprisonment to carry intoxicating liquor from one part of the province to another. Notwithstanding all this some of the barrels placed on board of the Government boat on its northward journey looked uncommonly like vessels containing ordinary booze. But although taken from a bonded warehouse and conveyed on board the ship by a teamster employed by a wholesale liquor dealer, they might have contained nothing more harmful than tomatoes of the Colchester county brand. In any event it is safe to say that the Government never intended to furnish Mr. Philip McLeod with a private yacht for electioneering purposes, even if he is the Tory candidate for Victoria county.

For the information of the House I may say than an election for a member for the local legislature of the province of Nova Scotia is taking place in that county and the election will be held on the 12th day of February. My only intention in reading this article is to bring it to the attention of the Government, or I suppose, more particularly of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen). He is not in his place at the present time, but I would be glad if he would tell this House whether or not the tug Alert, which is in the Government service, has gone to either one of the ports of Victoria county on an electioneering service and whether or not she has been ordered there by the department. If the hon. gentleman does not know these facts, I would ask him to have an investigation made and to give an answer to the House later.

Mr. BORDEN: I know nothing of the matter to which the hon. gentleman has referred beyond what he has stated. I shall direct the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to it. I would say to my hon. friend that this is not the first occasion I have heard such complaints raised in the House. Before the advent of the present Government to power, similar questions were frequently raised about the use of Government steamships.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And there has been no change whatever since the change of Government.

Mr. BORDEN: I think there has been a change; at least I hope there has been. I am free to admit there ought to be a change.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

On the motion of Mr. Borden for Committee of Supply:

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.): I call the attention of the Prime Minister and of the Minister of Railways to the very large increase which has taken place recently in the freight rates on the Prince Edward Island railway. I understand that the matter has been brought to the attention of the Minister of Railways by the supporters of the Government, and by deleations from my province, but so far no redress has been obtained. I also understand, there is very little hope that there will be any relief given. The increase in the rates on the Prince Edward Island railway is twenty-five to thirty per cent over the former rates, which were in themselves quite onerous. In the judgment of the people of my province the existing railway rates are not in the best interest of the railway, and they certainly are not in the interest of the people. On some commodities the rates have been increased to such an extent that they are actually prohibitory, the increase ranging from sixty to one hundred per cent.

Mr. COCHRANE: Keep on, you are doing well.

Mr. HUGHES: I can give you an instance of that. From my own personal knowledge, the rate on firewood or cordwood, hauled from New Zealand station, Harmony station, and New Harmony station to Souris, was formerly $3 and $3.50 and it is now $7. That rate is prohibitory.

Mr. COCHRANE: That means $7 a car.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE: How many miles.

Mr. HUGHES: Between five and ten miles.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I wish we could get it hauled in Ontario for that.

Mr. HUGHES: The people engaged in that traffic are hauling by team rather than by railway.

Mr. BRADBURY: It would cost double that in the West.

Mr. HUGHES: I am addressing my remarks to the Minister of Railways. I have letters from the most reputable and largest business men in the province asking me to bring this matter to the attention of the Government. Carvell Brothers, the largest wholesale business men in Charlottetown, and who I think are supporters of the present Administration communicated with me on this matter, as have also Messrs. Poole and Thompson of Montague who do a large produce business. I quote a paragraph from a letter received from this firm:

> In addition to the above we are informed that all freight rates on the Prince Edward Island railway have been advanced, except on Mussle mud, and the rates on cordwood, lumber, coal, hay and straw, lime, limestone, cement, brick, sand, gravel, stone, live stock, fertilizer, &c., are practically prohibitive, and will certainly result in loss of business for the railway as well as tying up the commerce of the country.

That is a condition of affairs that ought to be looked into. I am surprised that the Government did not take more heed of the representations made by their supporters in this House and by the delegations that have come from Prince Edward Island to interview them on this subject. The Prime Minister will remember that he visited Prince Edward Island shortly before the last Dominion election, and he held meetings there which were largely attended. There was a meeting held at Souris, the town in which I live, and the day being fine the meeting was held in a field, and it was largely attended by farmers and others. The Prime Minister referred to the grievances under which the people of the province were labouring in the matter of transporting their products. The right hon. gentleman stated that if he should come into power, one of the first things to which his Government would address its attention would be to redress these grievances. Well, there has been no redress in the line of reduction of rates, but on the contrary the rates have been increased. That is why I make a special appeal to the Prime Minister. I am quite sure he made that statement and that promise in good faith, and I am also sure the people who listened to him thought it was in good faith. And yet we see the result. I do not think the Prime Minister would wish to have a result of that kind. I would ask him whether we may expect these grievances to be remedied and what action the Government will take.

I want further to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that last autumn, in Christmas week I think, about one-third of the trackmen were discharged, temporarily, as I understand it. At all events, one of the permanent men from each section of the road was discharged. That was a cruel thing to do right at the beginning of winter. The wages received by these men is barely sufficient to support themselves and their families, and yet right in the beginning of winter, in Christmas week, the Government dismissed them for the winter season. The men could not get any other work at that season of the year. From what I know of the Minister of Railways, I do not think that personally he would approve of conduct of that kind, but, nevertheless, his department did it. Possibly the man responsible for that is the General Manager, who is receiving a princely salary, I understand $20,000 a year. That man is in a position in which he is not obliged to feel the necessities of men who are earning a bare living wage of from $1.50 to $1.70 per day. Why, if you had a horse which had served you faithfully during the summer season, you would not turn him out at the beginning of winter to starve; if you did you would be put in prison at the instance of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to animals. I repeat that I do not think the Minister of Railways would personally do a thing like that, but being the head of the department he must be held responsible. I would now ask the Minister what redress these poor men are going to get. So serious was the matter that the trackmen held a meeting amongst themselves, and the men who had not been discharged agreed to work only alternate weeks so that they would thus share their wages with the men who were thrown out of employment. They knew thier comrades could not support their families during the winter months. That is a condition of things that is quite serious. Now, will the Minister of Railways take steps to reinstate these men, and to prevent the issuing of an order of that kind in future? I believe that personally his better nature would prompt him to take action of that kind.

I also wish to ask whether we may expect any redress so far as decrease in rates—which are excessive and which were certainly not contemplated—on the Prince Edward Island Railway. I am satisfied that if the present Prime Minister, when he went before the people of Prince Edward Island previous to the last general election, had told the people that if he were placed in office he would raise the rates on the Prince Edward Island railway to the extent they have been raised, he would have received very few votes indeed in that province.

I wish that the minister would give me an answer on these points.

Mr. COCHRANE: As to the raising of the rates, the increase has taken place just as on the main line of the Intercolonial railway. I may say, however, that before I came into office, and continuously for a long time, there has been a deficit on the Prince Edward Island railway, and that deficit is still about $100,000 a year.

Mr. EMMERSON: And it always will be so.

Mr. COCHRANE: I suppose it will.

Mr. EMMERSON: The very necessities of the case make it inevitable.

Mr. COCHRANE: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) did not say that we had raised the men's wages about 25 per cent since we came into power. It is to be remembered also that all kinds of materials have increased in price, and consequently it costs a great deal more to run now than it did a few years ago. Instructions were given to the officials at Moncton six months ago that if hardship arose in regard to any item they must inquire into the matter. According to the statement the hon. gentleman quoted he could haul wood five miles, as I understand him for $7 a car. I can only say that that rate is cheaper than it can be done in any other place in Canada that I know of. I am confident it is not the usual rate. With reference to the laying off of section men, I know that has been a hardship. But all other railways do it, and I do not know why a government railway should not be run like other railways, in a business way. If we are to continue to support government ownership and operation, we must have the ordinary business course of management.

Mr. HUGHES: Then no redress need be expected?

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. J. J. Hughes.]

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply (Mr. Blondin in the Chair).

Civil Government—Governor General's Secretary's Office—Salaries, including A. F. Sladen, $3,300—$24,725.

Mr. CRUISE—What is this special provision for?

Mr. BORDEN: This is according to the practice that has been followed for a good many years in the case of the Governor General's Secretary's office.

Mr. EMMERSON: How does it arise?

Mr. BORDEN: I could not inform the hon. gentleman at present as to the origin of it.

Mr. EMMERSON: Is it the usual vote, or exceptional?

Mr. BORDEN: It is usual—in this way, that it has been voted in this manner for a number of years.

Civil Government—Privy Council Office—Contingencies. $8,400.

Mr. MURPHY: There is an increase of $1,000 here.

Mr. BORDEN: There has been an unusual number of appeals from the Board of Railway Commissioners to the Privy Council, and in connection with some of these, I think, stenographers have been employed to take a note of the arguments. So far as I recollect, that is the purpose of this increase.

Civil Government—Royal Northwest Mounted Police, $19,675.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: To what position has Mr. Hamilton been appointed?

Mr. BORDEN: To the position of Assistant Comptroller.

Mr. MACLEAN: Does the business of that office require all Mr. Hamilton's time?

Mr. BORDEN: So far as I know.

Mr. OLIVER: Is that a new position?

Mr. BORDEN: No.

Mr. PROULX: Does Mr. Hamilton come under subdivision A of the First Division?

Mr. BORDEN: Yes, the First Division.

Mr. EMMERSON: Is he appointed under the Civil Service Act?

Mr. BORDEN: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has this appointment been made by promotion?

Mr. BORDEN: No, Mr. Hamilton was not in the Civil Service before.

Mr. McCRANEY: Who was the former occupant of this position?

Mr. BORDEN: During the period when Colonel White was comptroller of the Northwest Mounted Police, Mr. Fortescue, the present comptroller, was assistant comptroller. Upon the superannuation of Mr. White, Mr. Fortescue became comptroller, and Mr. Hamilton has been appointed assistant comptroller.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Has Mr. Hamilton entered upon his duties?

Mr. BORDEN: I understand that he has about entered upon them; I think that the Order in Council has been passed, but I am not absolutely sure of it.

Mr. NEELY: Having been appointed under the Civil Service Act, I presume that he has passed the usual necessary examination?

Mr. BORDEN: He has complied with the provisions of the Civil Service Act as they have been understood for many years and as they have been interpreted by the Department of Justice under the late Administration as well as under the present Administration.

Mr. MURPHY: That is to say, he was appointed under section 21, under which no examination is held?

Mr. BORDEN: He has been appointed as an assistant deputy minister. I think it has been ruled, if I remember correctly, that the assistant to a deputy minister may be appointed in the same way as a deputy minister. I think several illustrations can be given of that procedure.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is Mr. Hamilton's salary?

Mr. BORDEN: $2,800.

Mr. PROULX: Is it a fact that the Government cannot obtain a sufficient number of men in Canada as recruits for the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, and that they have to obtain them in England?

Mr. BORDEN: I will have full particulars of that when we come to the main Estimates of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. The recruiting has been almost altogether carried on in the British Islands; I am speaking from recollection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Recruiting is always easy when there is a will.

Mr. BORDEN: I do not think that recruiting for the Royal Northwest Mounted Police has been easy in Canada during recent years.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We always got a full supply in Canada. I am glad that so many of those who came from the British Islands were good men.

Mr. BORDEN: Did not my right hon. friend obtain recruits in the British Islands?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Perhaps so, I did not say no.

Mr. BORDEN: I do not say yes, but that is my impression.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It seems that we can get good officers, however, without going outside of Canada.

Civil Government — High Commissioner's Office, London, $45,955.

Mr. GRAHAM: Many prognostications are being made in the newspapers as to who is to fill the office of High Commissioner, and we are unsettled as to who is to be the successor of the late High Commissioner. Can the right hon. Prime Minister give us any information?

Mr. BORDEN: Except in so far as my hon. friend can get relief from the newspapers, I am afraid he will have to remain unsettled at present.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who has charge of the office now?

Mr. BORDEN: The secretary.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it the intention of the Government to permit the office to remain vacant for any considerable length of time?

Mr. BORDEN: Naturally the Government is disposed to fill an important office of this kind as soon as it can reasonably be done.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Has the Prime Minister had any applications for the position?

Mr. BORDEN: Up to the present time, not one.

Mr. MURPHY: Is there any intention on the part of the Government to change the location of the office in London? Has the Government given any attention to the purchase of a site somewhere in the Strand, to the acquisition of which it is understood

that the late Lord Strathcona was very much opposed?

Mr. BORDEN: Does my hon. friend refer to the Aldwych site proposal?

Mr. MURPHY: I think that is the name, yes.

Mr. BORDEN: The Government has not come to any conclusion in regard to securing a site in London beyond this: that for the time being at least we do not intend to take any steps in the matter without very careful consideration. Certain negotiations were had in regard to what is known as the Westminster Hospital site, but these negotiations have been discontinued, and no arrangements are pending with regard to any other site.

Mr. GRAHAM: The ex-Governor General has taken quite an interest in one of the projects, and I am not prepared to say that I am not somewhat impressed with his arguments in reference thereto. Has the Government any correspondence in regard to the matter which might be fairly placed on the table?

Mr. BORDEN: I will consider my hon. friend's suggestion, and see if there is at the present time any correspondence which it might be desirable to lay upon the table of the House. In any event, whether or not it is desirable to lay correspondence on the table at this juncture, I shall be very glad to give my hon. friend, or any other hon. gentleman on the other side of the House access to any correspondence that has taken place.

Mr. EMMERSON: I understand that the former Governor General, Earl Grey, is in favour of one central overseas Dominion building, to be occupied by representatives of the dominions. Has that question to be determined before anything can be done?

Mr. BORDEN: I do not know that that question has absolutely to be determined excepting in so far as it might be determined by the selection of some other site, than the one suggested. As I have said, the Government has discontinued negotiations with regard to the acquisition of any site. While representations have been made to the Government, as well as to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, setting forth the advantages of the scheme to which reference has been made, the Government has taken no action whatever with reference to that scheme. If any action is taken in that regard, we will, of course, communicate our position to the House during the session, at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. OLIVER: I may be out of order in bringing this matter up, but it is well known that the late High Commissioner discharged the duties of his office with very great credit to himself and to Canada, and was able to do so only because of having large private means. Now that the Government is faced with the necessity of selecting a successor, the question of the financial circumstances of the possible successor may come under consideration. I do not know that I will be warranted in asking the Government if they have decided upon any change of policy as to the amount of remuneration granted to the High Commissioner—that is if they have felt that the remuneration should be on a basis that would enable a man without fortune to occupy the position or if they have decided to leave it as at present so that the post can be filled only by a person having large private means.

Mr. BORDEN: I think my hon. friend's question is a very proper one, and the subject which he mentions is one proper for the consideration of the Government. Up to the present time it never has been formally considered by the Government, although doubtless in the minds of the members of the Government as well as in the minds of hon. gentlemen in this House generally there has been the knowledge that some addition would require to be made to the salary, unless we are to be restricted to the appointment of persons possessed of very great private means. The subject will have to receive consideration by reason of the vacancy which has taken place through the lamented death of Lord Strathcona, and it will receive consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM: I noticed a despatch the other day in nearly all the Government organs saying that Lord Strathcona, near the close of his life, had made a suggestion that the Hon. Adam Beck should be his successor. Have the Government heard anything of that?

Mr. BORDEN: I am not aware that Lord Strathcona made any suggestion to
4 p.m. the Government with regard to the subject.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Government, of course, would not take my advice.

Mr. BORDEN: Do not be too sure.

Mr. GRAHAM: But it might be good nevertheless. There is no question but that the late High Commissioner was a credit to himself and to all concerned, and it would be very difficult, practically impossible, to fill his position in every respect. We in Canada are advancing now to a higher status than we have ever had before; our business interests are greater than they have ever been, and are rapidly developing. My own view is—and I have no particular individual in mind—that the Government would be well advised to select an active man for that position who knows Canada and Canadian affairs generally. It would be a great mistake to select a man who is not in close touch with Canadian affairs, merely as a recognition of past services or anything else. The interests are too great to be trifled with, and I think it would be wise for the Government to consider carefully the selection of such a man as I have spoken of; but at all events they should not consider the appointment of any man who is not in close touch with Canadian affairs. Such a man could be of great assistance both to the empire and to this Dominion in that position.

Mr. BORDEN: At pages 30 and 31 there are the details of several votes for the Commission of Conservation and the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. GRAHAM: Could my right hon. friend give us the names of the officers of the Conservation Commission ?

Mr. BORDEN: If my hon. friend desires that information I shall ask that the item be not taken up.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is the Government satisfied that there is justification for the rapid increase in the cost of administering this commission ? I think there is room for doubting the wisdom of the wide latitude given this commission in the many matters in which they are supposed to take an interest. For instance, a publication was issued the other day in reference to oyster culture. Their investigations and the publication of that book alone would mean the expenditure of a considerable sum of money. At the same time the Department of Marine and Fisheries are naturally specially charged with the administration of all fisheries, and I know they have devoted considerable time and made considerable expenditure of money of late years particularly in connection with oyster culture. This is one instance of overlapping of work between the Conservation Commission and one of the departments of government, and I think there are other illustrations of this. I have not given very much consideration to the matter, but I think it is worthy of a little consideration and investigation by the Government whether or not the Conservation Commission are infringing upon the duties of some of the departments of government. I think further that it is worth while considering whether, after all, the services done to the country by the commission are worth its cost or whether the same services could not be as well administered by some other department of government. I recognize the fact that the commission have performed some service to the State, and the crusading work having been completed, it may be that the work can be better performed by other departments of government.

Mr. BORDEN: I would not care to enter upon the discussion without better preparation than I have at the moment. Some question was raised about this item, either last session or the session before. On that occasion I procured the very fullest information as to the work which the Commission had performed, and placed it upon 'Hansard.' On that occasion also, the Committee listened to a very instructive speech from the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland), who is a member of the Conservation Commission and thoroughly familiar with his work. I supported the appointment of a Conservation Commission and the legislation by which it was constituted, believing it would be of great service to the country, and I have no reason to change the views I then entertained. It is quite possible there may be some overlapping of work; that is to be avoided as far as possible, and I would like to remind my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) that overlapping of work sometimes occurs even between different departments of the Government. Therefore, the mere transference of the work of this Commission to a department of the Government would not remedy the overlapping of which he complains. If my hon. friend would let the item stand, I will give him full information as to the work.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Commission was appointed some four years ago on the model of the Commission appointed in the United States, and so far we have every reason for believing that the work done by the Commission has been extremely useful. They have gone very far in many directions

and particularly in one direction. I say the work which is being done by the Conservation Commission in regard to forestry is beyond praise. Last year there were less fires, at all events in the southern part of Ontario and in parts of Quebec, than in any previous year, and this is largely attributable to the efforts of the Commission. If the Commission had done nothing more than that, it would have more than justified its existence. The Chairman of the Commission, Hon. Clifford Sifton, is a very able man, and I do not think a more competent man could be found for the work. I do not know what the Commission have achieved in other directions, such as tuberculosis, but with regard to the conservation of forests I cannot for my part sufficiently emphasize my appreciation of what they have done. There is no subject of greater importance at the present time, especially in the southern parts of Ontario and Quebec, and if the Commission were to do nothing more than to teach the people the importance of this matter, I repeat they would more than justify their existence. I have taken but a cursory view of the Estimates, but I have not found any appropriation this year for a Forestry Congress. From time to time forestry associations have met in British Columbia and in Quebec, and in bringing to the attention of the people the great necessity of forest preservation have largely justified the small expenditure they involved, and I would suggest to my right hon. friend to put in an appropriation in the forthcoming Estimates for a forestry congress.

Mr. BORDEN: I entirely concur in the appreciation which my right hon. friend has expressed of the work of the Conservation Commission, in the prevention of forest fires. In one way and another, I have been brought into touch with their work in that regard, and it is not too much to say that the saving which they have effected to the material wealth of the country in that regard would pay all the expenses of the Commission, not only ten but a hundred times over. So far as the proposal to hold the forestry congress is concerned, I should be very glad indeed to take into consideration the suggestion which the right hon. gentleman has made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If I remember correctly there was one held about two years ago, in British Columbia, I think.

Mr. BORDEN: But not here.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That was an association, not a Government affair.

Mr. BORDEN: At all events I shall look into the matter and give consideration to what my right hon. friend has suggested.

Mr. GRAHAM: Might I be allowed to give a concrete case of the good work done by this commission—a case where they were useful to at least one department of the Government. It is true they may overlap but I am not sure that that is to the detriment of the public. When the question of protecting forests along the lines of railway came up, there was very strong objection on the part of railways to legislation that was being discussed at that time by private members in the House. As it was a very serious grievance, I called together on one occasion, one or two men who are deeply interested in the protection of forests, as individuals, two representatives of the railways and two of the representatives of the Conservation Commission including the Chairman, I think, and one other, and before they separated they handed me a draft section for the amendment to the Railway Act. It was acceptable to the railways and to the lumbermen and is now part of the Railway Act, and of great benefit I am told. Had it not been for the Conservation Commission, I am afraid we should not have been able to come to such a satisfactory conclusion. Although I would like to know the names of the officers for one or two reasons that I may discuss later on, I am strongly in favour of the work of the commission and if they do occasionally make mistakes, I have known even Governments to do that.

Mr. BORDEN: Former Governments.

Item stands.

Mr. MURPHY: May I ask my right hon. friend, before we leave this item, whether in connection with the representations that are made from time to time to his Government with regard to a supply of pure water for the city of Ottawa, he has had the benefit of the advice or co-operation of the Conservation Commission? I ask that because the commission carried out an inquiry with reference to the typhoid epidemic and perhaps other epidemics. They made extensive inquiries and published one or two reports and it occurs to me that the officers of the commission would be in possession of valuable information which the Government ought to have before entering into any arrangement in regard to our water supply.

Mr. BORDEN: The answer which the Government made to the application of the city of Ottawa involved as its first condition, an abundant supply of pure water. Up to the present time, the city has never been able to come to us and say they are ready to proceed with a certain proposal. When they do come to us with the assurance that they will be able to carry out a certain proposal, we will avail ourselves of the technical assistance of the officers of the Conservation Commission as well as all other necessary technical assistance, in order that we may be sure the country is not spending its money on an imperfect or poor supply. Up to the present day I have not had occasion to ask the assistance of the officers of the commission in that regard.

Civil Service Commission—Commissioners' salaries, $15,000.

Mr. MURPHY: This is a department which comes, I think, under the administration of my hon. friend the Secretary of State. I do not see him present, and we require some information which perhaps my right hon. friend would not have in his possession.

Mr. BORDEN: No.

Item stands.

Civil Government—Department of Trade and Commerce, $103,237.50.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the occasion of the increase over last year?

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Speaking generally, there is nothing but the statutory increases. Then, specially, there is an increase of one in the first division, subdivision A and of two in the first division, subdivision B, making the number of increases three in the whole. That is for the Department of Trade and Commerce proper. In the Census and Statistics branch there is provision made for three at the minimum in the third division, subdivision A, because in the arrangement for the statistical work of the department for next year we shall need to have some more help in the way of stenographers and clerks.

Going back to the Department of Trade and Commerce, we are making provision for the establishment of the grain laboratory in connection with the grain work of the department. In the United States they have of late been paying a great deal of attention to the more scientific investigation of grain as regards the qualities of grain, the moisture contents and problems that arise in storage and transportation, with the idea of getting at a scientific basis for coming to better conclusions as to the management of the grain itself and also as to the value of grain distributed under the different standards. It seemed to me that some such work as that ought to be undertaken as soon as possible in Canada where we have so large an output of grain at present with almost illimitable possibilities for the increase of the output. Our grain production is going to be one of the great productions of the future, and we need as good scientific knowledge as we can get in reference to it, as well as good distributive and administrative knowledge in the practical working out of the Grain Act. The Grain Commissioners took up the matter, and after a pretty thorough investigation they made a report recommending the establishment of a laboratory. We propose to start it with two chemists, one an over chemist who is the real grain chemist, and the other whose duty shall be more in reference to arriving at the values of grain as regards milling, baking and bread-making properties. It is proposed to establish this at Winnipeg, and to conduct tests there mainly. We shall have to get accommodation, which is now being arranged for, and a certain amount of laboratory material will be necessary to enable the chemists to carry on their investigations and make their experiments. In connection with that, as the work goes on, there will be a deeper and more thorough experimentation and analysis required which will necessitate larger means at the disposal of the chemist in the shape of laboratory facilities to enable him to thoroughly carry these investigations out. It is proposed to accomplish that part of the work in affiliation and co-operation with the laboratories either in Montreal or in Toronto in connection with the universities. That will be for taking certain matters up and submitting them to laboratory tests of a rather delicate and thorough nature. It would be too costly for us to equip the laboratory at Winnipeg to enable the chemist to carry on that work.

The board were instructed to make inquiries and to get information as to the proper officials for this and as a result they recommended the appointment of Dr. Birchard, who had a distinguished course in the University at Toronto and who since then has been employed in Washington in the prosecution of this kind of work under the Government there.

and in the Government laboratories of the United States there. He has, as I have said, had a distinguished career and his qualifications seem to be of a very high character and such as would indicate him to be a man thoroughly qualified to carry on that work. Then, in regard to the other side of the work, which, in one sense, is the more practical, or at least has the more practical side to it, we had to arrange and after a good deal of search we hoped to be able to get a man from the University at Minneapolis who has been engaged in that kind of work for the State authorities there, but we were not able to do that. In the end we have been able to get a man who has been connected with the same kind of work under the Government of the United States at Washington and he was recommended to us by the authorities as being as good a man as can be obtained in the United States for this work.

These two will form the staff as far as the scientific part of it is concerned. A stenographer and a clerk, the two combined in one, will do the rest of the work that is necessary and a moderate supply of laboratory equipment will furnish them with what is necessary for carrying on their work. The head chemist is already at work and naturally his duties fell in with the general work of the administration of the Act, but after considering the matter it seemed to me that the staff equipment of the laboratory for carrying on this investigation might well be provided by the Government from the general fund and that we might thus relieve the fund which arises from the imposition of fees upon the grain that passes inspection and leave that free from this part of the work. Therefore, I introduce it here, and I would like the committee to give the necessary authority for the employment of these chemists, and vote the necessary sum so that at the beginning of the fiscal year these officials shall be a charge upon the general consolidated fund.

Mr. DEVLIN: Was it impossible to get competent officials in Canada?

Mr. FOSTER: We have had practically no experimental work of that kind in Canada, and in the inception of the work you can only get your expert men from places where they have had training and experience. We could not find these men in Canada just at this time. But our chemist is a Canadian by birth and education, and his family live in Canada.

Mr. DEVLIN: But the other one?

[Mr. G. E. Foster.]

Mr. FOSTER: I do not think it is best, at the inception of this, to take men without experience and without training, because we want to start in the very best possible way.

Mr. DEVLIN: I agree with that.

Mr. McCRANEY: Have not experiments been carried on at the Experimental Farm at Ottawa, in reference to the milling qualities of wheat?

Mr. FOSTER: Such experiments may have been carried on in a very casual way. What the experimental farms are chiefly after, is, to get a variety of grain which as a seed will have good qualities and will ripen as early as possible.

Mr. DEVLIN: Are the duties of the Commissioner of Commerce superior to those of the Deputy Minister of the Department; I see he is paid a higher salary than the deputy minister.

Mr. FOSTER: It sometimes happens that a salary is paid to a man in the service which may be higher than the salary paid to another man, who, in certain respects, has wider duties and greater responsibilities. The deputy minister is the sole deputy minister of the department. The Commissioner of Commerce is an official with special qualifications and special experience, and I was able to get his services from the British Government for the special purpose for which I desired them, and I paid him exactly the same salary as he was being paid by the Colonial Office for the work he was carrying on as British Trade Commissioner in Canada.

Mr. NESBITT: What is he supposed to do?

Mr. FOSTER: The Commissioner of Commerce, under the direction of the minister, has to pay special attention to the commercial exchanges, their source, their destination, and the process of interchange. I placed under his personal supervision our trade commissionerships in different parts of the world, and all our transactions with the British consular service in so far as they relate to trade and commerce. I am not saying anything as to the previous work done in the department, but any minister who has had charge of a department knows that the work of a deputy minister must extend over every part of the department. He has to be general supervisor of everything, and it is not possible for a deputy minister who has a

large department to spend too much time on any one service. This service was, in my belief, of sufficient importance to have direct supervision, and a directing officer, in order to get from the expenditure of a large amount of money, something like the return we ought to have. I am not at all satisfied we are getting all the return we ought to get from the trade commissionerships at the present time, but we are improving that service. One of the most effective ways of improving it is to have that service understand that there is some man who is especially charged with seeing that the work is being carried on properly. I have had the Commissioner of Commerce visit all the trade commissionerships in Europe, and China and Japan. I was fortunate enough to be able to look in upon them in Australia and New Zealand, so that during the past year we did, what was never done before, and which I am sure every one will admit ought to be done. The change has resulted in the very best influence, and I purpose that every year in some way or other an officer from the head department shall get into communication in the locality with the trade commissioners, and in that way come to a better appreciation of the work that is being done and that is to be done.

Another very important part of the work, and which I think has been neglected in the past, is, that after we had been successful in getting valuable information from the outside, a great deal of that information has not been able to penetrate to the points in Canada where it might come into contact with those whom it would benefit. It is one thing to gather good information; it is another thing to see that information properly and widely distributed. It is the design of the department to make that information thoroughly available and to distribute it more widely than in the past. Then the man who is outside, in order to do good work on the outside, must occasionally refresh himself at the fountain-head, and I am not sure but what, taking year in and year out, three months or so spent by one of our trade commissioners from abroad in Canada interviewing the men with whom he has had a good deal of correspondence in the course of the year, would be a good thing for the service.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This is not going to be one of these commissions whose reports are shelved?

Mr. FOSTER: It is very unkind to make that remark at the present time when I am serious.

Mr. NESBITT: In my judgment the appointment of the trade commissioner is a good idea, as is also the bringing of the commissioners home to interview those in Canada who have trade with foreign countries. I do not understand yet, however, how the deputy minister, who is over the whole department, should get less salary than the man who is in charge only of a branch of the department. I would like to know how the producer in the West can be benefited by the work of the grain chemist?

Mr. FOSTER: As a general proposition, the producer will get the most benefit in proportion as he has larger knowledge with reference to the article he produces.

Mr. NESBITT: I refer to the ordinary farmer.

Mr. FOSTER: If these officers can come to correct and scientific conclusions as, for example, to the moisture in grain and how it affects storage and transport and get it down to the point where it will be made as safe as it possibly can be made, that will have the effect of standardizing conditions under which grain may be marketed, and stored and transported, and the producer, of course, will benefit from that.

Mr. NESBITT: How does the minister propose to distribute that knowledge?

Mr. FOSTER: That will be distributed broadcast through our bulletins and the newspapers. One looking at the number of bulletins distributed every week would be apt to say that it bore a very small proportion to the number of people who ought to be reached. But I have had that matter particularly followed, and I find the bulletin is multiplied a thousand, perhaps ten thousand, times by reproduction in the newspapers of pertinent information contained in these bulletins. I am trying to get the trade commissioners to appreciate what it is the most important for our people here to know and to put that into pithy and luminous reports. These reports are given in the bulletins, and when you get such matter into the bulletins, the newspapers do not have to be solicited to put it into their columns. It is very gratifying to see the number of extracts made from our bulletins and given wide circulation in the newspapers throughout the Dominion. The processes discovered by these chemists

will be published in bulletin form and distributed as widely as possible.

Mr. DEVLIN: Speaking of trade agents, has Mr. Poindron of the Paris office been replaced? He has been removed, I do not know whether by death or resignation, and I believe there is no trade agent there now. Am I correct in that?

Mr. FOSTER: No, my hon. friend is not correct, if he says there is no trade commissioner there. When I came into the department, I found a double-headed arrangement in Paris. At the head of one part was a commissioner, and at the head of another, Mr. Poindon. It became possible to do away with one section of it, and the trade commissioner in Paris now is Mr. Roy. Mr. Roy is not in any sense one who represents Canada in a diplomatic or financial way. He is charged with the trade commissioner's work and is doing that work. It would not be fair, and it would not be correct, to say that we have no trade commissioner in Paris. The business of the trade commissionership is being done by Mr. Roy and very much more effectively than when I took charge of the department.

Mr. DEVLIN: I know Mr. Roy to be highly competent in his work, and I know he has given Canada great satisfaction. But I did not think it possible in France to have the commissioner general act as trade agent when in other countries there are several trade agents. That is why I asked the question.

Mr. FOSTER: There is not in any sense a separate form of agency in France any more than in other countries. Mr. Roy does in Paris what the trade commissioner does in Australia. He is the commissioner and represents Canada. All questions regarding trade are directed to him, and the answers so far as he can give them are sent from his office. He also carries on communications with inquirers, and for any information that he has not, he applies to us. The whole modus operandi, so far as the trade commissionership is concerned, is in full operation between this department, Mr. Roy and inquirers in France.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: And the minister may fairly claim that he has made a necessary economy?

Mr. FOSTER: I did not see that it was necessary to have two separate establishments doing the same business and quarrelling with each other while doing it.

Mr. McCRANEY: The minister has spoken about the distribution of information obtained by his department. He deals first with the bulletins. Can he tell us through what means and to what persons and bodies these bulletins are sent? In my own city of Saskatoon I have never seen the bulletin except as I receive it as a member of Parliament. It may be that the board of trade receives it, also the university library, and the public library, and others. If they do not, I would suggest that these are very popular bodies to be in receipt of the bulletin. Perhaps the hon. minister could tell us what rule is followed in regard to that.

Mr. FOSTER: What we have to guard against is the sending of bulletins to persons where they simply become material for feeding wastepaper baskets. We want to get the bulletin into the hands of those who will really appreciate it. So, there has been a good deal of sifting in that respect. All boards of trade get the bulletin, and all boards of trade are notified that if any member of the board or any person in the trade would like to have the bulletin sent regularly, he has only to send in his name. We have advertised also quite widely in that direction to get people to tell us who would like to receive the bulletin. When we send to such people we have the best ground possible for believing that they are utilizing it and getting some good from it. Not only boards of trade, but associations and public bodies of all kinds connected with trade are being made aware that we are trying to get the bulletin into the hands of those who would like to read it and file it as a means of information. Perhaps I ought not to pass an opinion on it, but I think I am right in saying that any one who will read the bulletin from week to week will find it very useful and well worth filing and keeping for reference. Last year, Mr. Poussette, our trade commissioner in South America, who is a very efficient man, acting under my instructions, made a tour of South America, visiting every one of the constituted governmental divisions, making inquiries and examinations into trade conditions, products, resources and the possibilities of interchange of goods with Canada. Mr. Poussette embodied his in-

vestigations in reports which have been published in the bulletin, and I think that any person who has had the pleasure of reading them appreciates the information given.

Mr. MURPHY: Early last year it was announced that my hon. friend was extending the work of his department by opening up an agency or agencies in South Africa. Is that work under the supervision of the Commissioner of Commerce, and how has it resulted?

Mr. FOSTER: Yes, it is in charge of the Commissioner of Commerce. Our former trade commissioner in South Africa is no longer in the work, and I transferred to that office one of the most efficient trade commissioners in Great Britain, Mr. Egan, who, I think, came originally from Montreal. Mr. Egan has taken charge of our interests in South Africa, and, I must say, is conducting a most energetic canvas of the country. His principal office is in Cape Town. I have had him make a tour of South Africa, and we are establishing in five or six different places a correspondent, in each case a resident, who will work under the instructions of the Commissioner, answering all inquiries, and keeping the Commissioner generally posted with reference to trade requirements at these points. These officials are contributories to the information that Mr. Egan must himself gather, and which he reports to the Department. The system is, I think, a good one, and is working well. Once or twice a year Mr. Egan makes a tour of the country and consults with the correspondents. The correspondents work at a smaller salary, not devoting all their time to the work, but, by means of a judicious selection of men at each point, an official is generally obtained who is capable of doing the work, first because he has a tendency and a liking for the work; secondly, because it is a somewhat honorary position, and thirdly because he is doing a good service for both countries. The enlargement of trade with South Africa during the last year, so far as our exports are concerned, has been very satisfactory.

Mr. OLIVER: What will be the total cost of the chemistry office in Winnipeg?

Mr. FOSTER: The fittings of the laboratory office will not be expensive or palatial. We have a couple of rooms which have to be fitted up with special plumbing and the necessary laboratory material. There will be the cost of installation and the rental, services of a clerk and stenographer—one official will be necessary to do this work—and other expenses will run up to somewhere about $6,000 or $7,000 a year.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Are the trade representatives doing any practical work in the way of putting the people in touch with business men in this country? I understand that the commercial agents of the United States in foreign countries very often succeed in bringing orders to the business men of the United States by letting them know what is required in the places where they happen to be. For example, if a railroad were being built in Australia, would your commercial agent, if he discovered that 2,000 tons of steel rails were required in the construction of that railway, endeavour to put the contractors in touch with the steel people of Canada? Do they do practical work of that kind, or do they simply collect information and submit it to the department in the form of a bulletin?

Mr. FOSTER: They are supposed so to keep their eyes open that not a single transaction of that kind will escape their notice. Their duties do not consist of merely sitting in their offices and gathering statistical information. The official statistical information is good, but it is the smallest part of the information that a trade commissioner ought to be able to furnish the department. We have trade commissioners and trade commissioners; of course you have to have a man who is wide-awake, and who likes to work rather than sit in his office. I could name a good many of these commissioners who are doing invaluable work.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Referring to the example I cited to the hon. minister, how would the necessary information reach the manufacturer of steel rails in Canada?

Mr. FOSTER: In the first place, the trade commissioner keeps himself alive to what is going on, say in New Zealand. He sees the New Zealand papers; he has access to Government and official information, and if he is alive to his work he knows in a general way, what is going on in every department of the Government. He knows also

what is going on so far as general expansion, improvement and development of the country is concerned; he knows what is going on in the way of railway and power development. When machinery, for instance, is required, he presents to those concerned the possibilities of satisfying their wants in this or any other respect in Canada. He puts them in direct connection with the department here, and so with the manufacturers or producers of the articles which they may require. That is the general modus operandi.

Mr. MURPHY: In connection with the information which the hon. minister was good enough to give the committee with regard to the new grain department at Winnipeg, may I ask him if it is open to the general public to avail themselves of the services of these experts, or will these gentlemen perform only such services as they are directed by the department to perform? Would they make tests at the request of the grain growers, for instance, the same as would be done at the experimental farm?

Mr. FOSTER: Their main object will be to take up, analyse and experiment upon grain, and the result arrived at will be published and become the property of everybody. In so far as that is concerned, they are doing a general service, and the results will be for general use. For instance, suppose some new kind of grain, thought to be of good quality, has been raised in some part of the West, it would be the duty of that department to look into that, to analyse it, find out its qualities and in that way they would be able to advertise to the producing public the different kinds of grain of largest value and therefore the best to be raised by the producer in order to get better value and better results. We have to take care to guard against making it a dribbling office which will fritter away its time on requests, here, there and everywhere. It must keep in view the main object. If any result should come from it it must be a practical result in the end because that is the whole design of the formation of the commission.

Mr. NESBITT: If an individual farmer had a new kind of grain he would be allowed to send it to this commission to be analysed and then the result would be made public.

[Mr. G. E. Foster.]

Mr. FOSTER: That is one of the ideas.

Mr. PARDEE: Is it the practice to bring the agents once a year from their stations to this country and then have them get in actual touch with the manufacturers to explain personally just what can be done in trade with the various places at which they are stationed?

Mr. FOSTER: That is the idea. There has been no fixed rule but my view is that every year, as nearly as possible, the agents should renew their youth and help us here by coming to Canada. Mr. Poussette has come back after that long trip and he finds openings, for instance, for large lumber trade in some parts of South America. He has been in communication with the lumbermen in Canada and letters at long range have passed. He went through the country as far as British Columbia and got in contact with the lumbermen who can especially provide that side of the South American continent with lumber. His expedition has been very successful. Not only have the lumbermen at first hand got information from a man who has been there but they have rather got the spirit of the thing as well by actual conversation with him. He has had letters from every part of the Dominion of Canada during the course of his incumbency of office. He goes to these people, sees them and talks over the matter with them. Then he places himself at the disposal of the board of trade and merchants and producers of the different places he visits and he has conferences with them.

Mr. PARDEE: It seems to me that that is the most feasible and important thing the agents can do, to show what trade can be done between this and other countries by getting in actual personal contact with the manufacturers of this country.

Mr. OLIVER: In regard to the increase in the Census Branch, what is the particular occasion for the extension next year?

5 p.m.

Mr. FOSTER: My hon. friend will recollect that we appointed a departmental commission on statistics and that commission reported last year. Gradually we are strengthening in my department the statistical side. Since I took office I have gone along very slowly, I have made no additions to the working staff particularly,

and I find it is necessary, in order to carry out the work of the department, that we should have more of what might be called secondary help, and we must have the money to pay them.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is the hon. gentleman endeavouring to secure statistical data respecting interprovincial trade? I remember that when in opposition he always urged the necessity of this and quite properly so.

Mr. FOSTER: I have given this matter a great deal of consideration. As a principle it is a very fine idea, if we could only know just exactly the currents of trade between the different sections of our own country in different products according to sectional and seasonal differences it would give us a great insight into the trade and producing activities of our country. When you come to work out a plan by which that information can be secured you encounter difficulties on every side.

Mr. MACLEAN: Did the minister ever try to make any arrangement with the provincial governments to secure this?

Mr. FOSTER: When the report was published I sent it to all the provincial governments and also a letter calling attention to the overlapping of statistics between the Dominion and the provinces and asking their attention and that of their statistical officers to the matter to see whether we could not amongst us devise a system which would co-relate the work better, provide against overlapping and produce accuracy. All of the provincial governments took the matter up in a friendly and kindly spirit and after that I had the Commissioner of Commerce visit all the provincial capitals and get into personal communication with the statistical officers. That has been done, and while nothing has yet eventuated in a plan, yet we have made substantial progress in the general improvement of our statistics in these two ways, by a co-relation of effort, preventing overlapping and in consequence securing greater accuracy. If we could only get fresher statistics of production in this country it would be of great benefit and I hope there is a way by which we can do this.

Mr. McCRANEY: How long is it since the statistical work was taken over by the Department of Trade and Commerce from the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. FOSTER: About a year.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It seems to me to be a time when the hands of the minister should be held up in connection with the trade agencies in these various countries. I have not heard him say whether it is the policy of the department to extend this system to other countries not yet covered. In Brantford we have several firms doing business with twelve or fifteen foreign countries at the present time. In some of these countries we have no trade agents. I think there is not one in Russia.

Mr. FOSTER: No.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: A very large trade is being done from Brantford with Russia. A large trade is being done with some South American republics and with South Africa. I think we have an agent appointed there. I have been a frequenter of some of the offices, having visited Australia not long ago. I then had an opportunity of seeing what is going on there and I must say that the agent in charge, Mr. Ross, was doing very fine work. They have a good office but not too good and I think this House might well be liberal with any appointments the minister might ask with a view to increasing our trade with foreign countries. At the present time, trade is sought very keenly by all the great countries in the world. Canada is comparatively small but has great possibilities, and I think the Minister is doing excellent work and should be encouraged to establish trade agencies in countries where there are none already. It will be easier to get a footing now in those countries than later on, and I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister that if we can establish in the coming year say two or three agencies in the different countries with which we have a large trade, we should do a still larger business with them if our case was presented to the people of those countries. I am speaking of Canadian products, generally, not manufactured articles only. I think it would be of great advantage to open up trade with some of these countries in such goods as we have a surplus of. I wish to speak a word of encouragement to the Minister in this respect. I think he is making his department a real live business affair which is appreciated by business men all over the country. I think an agency should be established at London. An agency there would be an advertisement to the whole world, because people who never come to Canada do visit London, and they could see our products there. With this and a real live trade Commissioner in the heart of the empire, I believe the overseas

trade of the Dominions could be vastly increased in the next few years. It is a trade that is well worth looking after, and now that Canada is beginning to do business in foreign countries I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce should be liberally dealt with in anything he may ask for, either with regard to agencies already established, or proposed agencies. With regard to the dissemination of information I, myself, receive the bulletins regularly. I do not know whether they reach the hands of some people who want them, but I think that any firm sending a request to Ottawa for these bulletins should be obliged in that respect. I do not think it would be wise that the Minister should become, or that his agent should become, the agent of any individual firm, that would lead to confusion. The aim should be to bring together those who have goods for sale and those who want to buy. As has been mentioned by one gentleman opposite, the United States make a very great effort in the direction of having their agents act for one particular firm. They have very live consular agents, who act as trade agents as well, and the spread of United States trade over the world has been largely brought about by the men they have sent out, and who are always ready to draw attention to the trade that may be developed in foreign countries. I think we can take a leaf out of their book, although I am not favourable to copying the United States in a great many things. I just rose to say these few words in appreciation. The strengthening and information we get through these trade agencies is very helpful to the spread of trade, at least so far as our district is concerned.

Mr. NESBITT: I do not know that anybody on this side of the House has been criticising the Minister. We were asking for information.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I did not speak in that sense at all.

Mr. NESBITT: We were asking for information, and I suppose we have a right to that.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: So far as I was concerned I had no fault to find with anything that has been asked for or said.

Mr. OLIVER: It is so seldom the opportunity occurs on which I can agree with my hon. friend, that I take this opportunity of agreeing with him as to the entire desirability of pushing Canadian trade in all her products, whether of the field, the forest, the mine or the factory; and so far as the Minister of Trade and Commerce is minded to direct the efforts of the Government to that end, I am sure he has had evidence here to-day, that although it is our business on this side to criticise, we are also willing to commend where commendation is possible.

Mr. FOSTER: If I am not boring the Committee, I would like to say one or two things. In the first place, with reference to commercial agents and trade commissioners working for special firms, they do not do that at all. They cannot be allowed to do it. Trade commissioners are not supposed, and ought never to be supposed, to be the agents of any particular or special firms. I want to mention another thing, especially to my hon. friend here and such men as he, that no matter how much trade agencies and commissionerships may be perfected, there is nothing in the wide world will do what a manufacturer or producer fails to do for himself outside of all this which is merely helpful. The man who wants to push his trade in a foreign country has to go there himself or send his representative to put his wares before the faces of the people, and talk with them. One of the faults that we have to overcome in our country to-day is this; we do not find our commercial and manufacturing concerns and our producing concerns, in comparison with some other very live countries, pushing their trade in the world. We have not the capable, persistent, uniform representation of goods that we ought to have. Our commissioners, who work some of them very hard and after a length of time get into communication with a man who wants something in another country and the man who can provide it here, and perhaps actually get the orders find that the man here when he receives the order is lax about even answering the correspondence; or having accepted the order he delays in filling it. Or, still further, having accepted an order, after a length of time he writes to his correspondent that he is too full of business here and that he cannot fill the order.

Mr. NESBITT: The hon. minister does not find that generally?

Mr. FOSTER: More generally than I would like to find it. And it does two things: it takes the vim out of the commissioner himself, who has spent a great deal of valuable time in order to make the connection, and it leads the prospective

customer to say: 'Well, I cannot do business with that man; I have given him an order, and now he writes me that he is too full of business, and cannot fill it?' I wanted to speak about that, not in the way of fault-finding, but as something we should make progress in. Another point I might mention is this: My friend here spoke about trade commissioners in foreign countries with which we do more or less business. We have always had a friendly feeling towards Canada and Canadian trade amongst the commercial intelligence officers of Great Britain in their different consulates in different parts of the world. Most of them have been favourably disposed towards Canada and willing to answer questions and to assist us in our trade. But it never was on a basis before where each consulate felt that they were carrying out what the foreign and colonial offices wanted them to carry out in that respect. An arrangement was made, without any great difficulty and very satisfactorily, with the Colonial Office and Foreign Office by which instructions have been given to the British consuls in foreign countries that they are to adopt a certain course in any case where the Canadian department feels that there is some possibility of developing trade for Canada. Instructions have been issued by the Foreign Office to British consuls in these countries, and they may include any country where an application is made by Canada to have such done, that they are to do certain things; in the first place, to forward copies of their general reports to the Department of Trade and Commerce here; secondly, to answer any inquiries from Canadian merchants or traders that are made to them in reference to the possibilities of trade or any question that might come up between a person here and a possible trade opportunity in another country. Under these instructions they will feel that they have a warrant for doing what they did in many cases before of their own good will and of their own good will only. We have made further arrangement and it is this: Go into a country like Russia, which is surrounded by some difficulties in pushing trade from another country, official or otherwise, or go to China and you have established there old and experienced British consulates with intelligent and experienced commercial men attached to them. I am thinking of one now in the far East where I met some of the brightest commercial men whom I have ever met, who have had from fifteen to twenty years of experience in these countries, who know all the ins and outs and customs of the trade, and particularly the things that have to be done in order to get trade and how to approach people. They have had all that experience.

We have made arrangement whereby it is possible that a room shall be provided under the roof of the consulate in which the Canadian commissioner may be placed, for which room, the Canadian Government although the British Foreign Office did not wish it at all, will pay the expenses and charges. I thought it better to do that in order that we should be perfectly independent in that respect than to ask the British consulate to take upon themselves the expense of the rental. Our own trade commissioner will be absolutely under the control of the department. He will take his instructions from here and do his work under these instructions, but at the same time he will have as ready friends and helpers men of wide and large experience right at his elbow from whom he can ask advice and counsel and from whom he can get what is so invaluable—knowledge which has been gained by many years of experience. In some cases I am arranging to place men under these conditions and the British Foreign Office have gone so far as to say that they are willing to open up the consular service to young men from Canada just the same as to young men from the British Islands. In this way we get two things; we get first the value of the co-operation, experience and advice of experienced men and in the other case we are able to look forward to the time not far distant when the Canadian trade commissioner system shall be somewhat of a career which shall approve itself to men and which shall induce young men to fit themselves by a proper course of study to undertake this work. If they do that they have not only this position in the Canadian trade commissionership system to look forward to but, if they wish it, they have also a chance for entrance into the wider British commercial system as well. I talked that matter over in China and Japan with the British Ambassadors and both of them are absolutely enthusiastic in joining in an endeavour of that kind. They say that a capable representative of Canada at their side is of as much use to them in one way as would be a member of their own consulate because he is able to give them just the information that they require in reference to a country with which in China, Japan and other countries the British Consul has a great deal to do in other matters.

Allusion was made to the consular system of the United States. It is not so many years ago, that, I think I may say without saying anything that is not right, the trade consular system of the United States was not a thing that United States people were proud of. From every quarter there were comments and criticisms and very sharp ones of that service. At that time it was absolutely a matter of patronage. To-day the United States consular system is placed on a stated civil service basis. Men must be approved before they enter it and then when they go into service it has its status, its permanency and also its wider horizon. To-day the United States consular service is a service that the people of the United States may very well be proud of.

Mr. PARDEE: Is the trade service of Canada on a permanent civil service basis?

Mr. FOSTER: It is not on a civil service basis theoretically but I intend before long to ask the House to put it upon a permanent basis. My views, when I came into office, of the possibilities and mechanism of that work were somewhat different from what they are now. The two years in which I have had experience of it has been a period in which I have been trying to find out what is the best system.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will the young men that the minister speaks of be required to speak and understand the language of these foreign countries before they receive their appointments?

Mr. FOSTER: That depends. Of course in reference to British countries they have the language already.

Mr. DEVLIN: But in foreign countries?

Mr. FOSTER: In reference to foreign countries, I should like to have, for instance in Japan, a man sufficiently young and sufficiently well trained as a basis and with sufficient vim in him to say to himself. I will acquire the Japanese language before I am long in this country and I will learn to speak the language that the people speak, try to think what the people think and try to enter into the true spirit and genius of the people. You have to carry that out as best you can; in some cases it can be done and in others it cannot. There is where we get the benefit of having a commissioner in the office of the British consulate where there are men who understand Japanese, and Chinese, and Russian, and our man gets the benefit of that to some extent.

[Mr. G. E. Foster.]

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to put my opinion against that of the minister, on the matter of doing work jointly with the British consular service, but I venture the opinion that it is possibly not the best way to advance the trade interests of Canada. Is the increase of help required in any particular branch of the statistical work or is it due generally to the expansion of trade?

Mr. FOSTER: It is due to the expansion of the work generally.

Civil Government—Department of Marine and Fisheries, $309,650.

Mr. HAZEN: In the second division, subdivision A, there is a decrease caused by dropping two clerkships in the naval architect's office.

Mr. DEVLIN: What does the naval architect do?

Mr. HAZEN: Mr. Duguid is the naval architect, and he was employed on the recommendation of Lord Strathcona, before the present Government came into power. The department at that date wrote to Lord Strathcona asking him to recommend a suitable officer, and he recommended Mr. Duguid. The naval architect designs all the ships that are required for the service of the different departments of the Government. The designs and plans and specifications of these vessels are prepared by Mr. Duguid and the officers of his department.

The vote for contingencies is increased by $20,000, due to the fact that the travelling expenses of officers at Ottawa were formerly charged to the different votes, and it is now proposed to charge all the travelling expenses to civil government contingencies. The increase is merely a matter of book-keeping. Formerly, for example, if the engineer of lights travelled, his travelling expenses were charged to the general vote for aids to navigation, but these expenses will now be charged to the item of contingencies.

Mr. EMMERSON: Is the general vote reduced correspondingly?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think the vote for aids to navigation has been reduced. Parliament makes generous appropriations for that work, and there is generally a surplus at the end of the year. Of course, this whole $20,000 would not be charged to aids to navigation but would be spread over the different appropriations, and we thought it hardly worth while to reduce

the votes by the amount that would be chargeable to each on this account.

Mr. DEVLIN: None of these appropriations have to do with the naval service?

Mr. HAZEN: No, these are all Marine and Fisheries estimates..

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is there provision made for the appointment of a law clerk in the Marine and Fisheries Department?

Mr. HAZEN: Mr. Bourgault has been the law clerk for a number of years past.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is there more than one law clerk.

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is it intended to fill the position made vacant by the resignation of Mr. Martel?

Mr. HAZEN: That is a different position. Mr. Martel was appointed, I think, about four years ago, at $1,600, and has had his annual increases since, to $1,750 or $1,800. He is retiring from the department to engage in the practice of his profession, and it is necessary to appoint a gentleman to take his place, and that appointment will be made at a similar salary.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Were any increases made in the case of Mr. Martel since the change of Government ?

Hr. HAZEN: He got his statutory increases.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What was his salary on leaving ?

Mr. HAZEN: It was $1,750 or $1,800.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is to be given his successor ?

Mr. HAZEN: The same salary—$1,800.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Then his successor goes in at the same salary as that which Mr. Martel was receiving on retiring.

Mr. HAZEN: It is thought that a man should be engaged who has a knowledge of law. Mr. Martel when appointed was a very young man—I think he is only twenty-six years of age now. I doubt if we could find as young a man to take the position. Then there is the fact that during the last few years there has been somewhat of an increase in the expenses here, because of the cost of living and so on. So, it is not unfair to appoint him at $1,800 a year.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Were other increases made in the branch of which he was a member ?

Mr. HAZEN: None but the statutory increases.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have been informed, I do not know whether correctly or not, that the Department of Marine and Fisheries in making appointments of technical officers has not observed the Civil Service Act with regard to the qualifications required. Possibly I am not well enough informed to put the question now in a form which will entitle me to an answer from the minister.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not know to what my hon. friend refers. So far as I know there has been nothing of that kind.

Mr. MACLEAN: I will have to instruct myself more fully and ask the question later.

Mr. HAZEN: When technical officers are required, we apply to the Civil Service Commission under the Act. They advertise and get applications from gentlemen who state their qualifications. As a rule, they submit to us the number whom they think qualified for the position, those to whom they are ready to grant a certificate of qualification, and from that number we make our appointments. That is the way it has been done ever since I took charge of the department.

I wonder if I may be permitted, as the Marine Estimates are still under consideration, to refer to a statement made by my hon. friend from South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) this afternoon. I was not in the House at the time, and I have obtained a copy of the report. The hon. gentleman read an extract from the paper to which he said he wished to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, which was to the effect that the steamer Alert had been pressed into the service ' to convey Tory organizer Hayes and Tory candidate McLeod from North Sydney to the northern part of Victoria county,' and further that, ' the primary object in establishing this branch of the preventive service was to put a stop to the traffic of contraband liquor into Cape Breton seaports. . . . . Notwithstanding this, some of the barrels placed on board the Government boat on its northward journey looked uncommonly like vessels containing ordinary booze.' I do not know why the hon. gentleman called my attention to this matter, as the Alert is is no way con-

trolled by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. CARROLL: What did the department pay for the Alert?

Mr. HAZEN: We did not pay anything.

Mr. CARROLL: Who did pay?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not know. The article refers to the 'preventive service.' If the steamer is under the Government control at all, I should infer that it is under the Department of Customs.

Mr. CARROLL: That makes it no better.

Mr. HAZEN: No, but surely the hon. gentleman does not accept every newspaper paragraph as being true.

Mr. CARROLL: I think the hon. Minister will do me the credit of believing that I was asking for information. As this statement has been made broadcast in the press of the Maritime provinces, it should be investigated. If I made a mistake in calling it to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it is only because I thought all these boats were under his jurisdiction. Perhaps the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) will explain the matter?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will the Minister of Customs promise to look into this matter tomorrow?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): I had not heard of it before, and I think the article—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It may be a case of smuggling liquor from St. Pierre Miquelon into Cape Breton. That has been done before. I think the hon. Minister should inquire into it. Will he let us know the result of his inquiry on Monday?

Mr. REID: I will. I do not know whether this steamer belongs to the Customs Department or not. But I will make inquiry and shall be glad to give the hon. member a reply on Monday.

Mr. CARROLL: I desire to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if the Gladiator is under his Department?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not recollect that name as that of one of our vessels.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I would like the Minister of Customs to know exactly the information we desire with regard to the Alert. We would like to know if the Alert is at present in the employ of any department of the Government. If so, did she sail from North Sydney towards the coast of North Cape Breton recently, and if so did she have Dr. Hayes, the organizer of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia aboard? And did she carry any freight on that occasion? These are the questions we would like answered.

Mr. REID: If the steamer is under the control of the Customs Department, I shall be glad to give the hon. gentleman the information on Monday next.

Mr. EMMERSON: I think we should know also whether the Tory candidate was on board or not.

Civil Government—Department of Naval Service—Salaries, $107,300; contingencies, $37,000.

Mr. HAZEN: Last year this salary vote was $100,500. The increase is chiefly made up of statutory increases. The contingencies also show an increase in this branch, just as in the Marine and Fisheries, and for the same reason, that is that all travelling expenses are charged under the head of contingencies. Now they are divided between what is the Navy, the Hydrographic Survey, the Fishery Protection Service, the Tidal Service and the Wireless Department, all of which come under the control of the Naval Department. It is proposed to have this vote under the head of Contingencies, so that it will be seen what the travelling expenses of the department as a whole are during the year.

Mr. DEVLIN: Is any of this money expended under the operation of the Naval Service Act of 1910?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, I fancy the bulk of it is expended under that Act. Provision is made for the appointment of an inspector in the radio-telegraphic branch, to meet the increasing work in that office. Hon. gentlemen know that during the last year a number of wireless stations were erected, and it has been found necessary to appoint an additional inspector in order that the work may be carried out with efficiency; the appointment being under subdivision A of the second division, at a minimum salary of $1,600. The other changes shown are to provide for the promotion of certain members of the staff and for statutory increases in salary. I have explained the increase in connection with contingencies; it is merely an apparent increase, as the charges for travelling will be no more than they were last year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The vote asked for by the minister under the heading of the Naval Service is one, I think, in respect of which hon. gentlemen on this side of the

House may very well request more detailed information, and if very good reasons are not given we should refuse our assent to the voting of these moneys. There is no attempt on the part of the Government of the day to administer the Naval Service Act; on the contrary, so far as we can gather, it is their public policy to allow it to remain in abeyance. There is not a ship of the Canadian navy now in service. The Rainbow, which was stationed on the Pacific coast, has, I think, been sold.

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. MACLEAN: At least, the Rainbow is not in active service. The Niobe has during the whole summer been tied to a wharf in Halifax harbour—a condition of affairs most humiliating, I am sure, to every respectable Canadian. I have no hesitation in saying that the Government were a party to forcing men to leave the ship Niobe, and I am sure I am correct in saying that they have never yet made an effort to complete the enlistment of that ship. Notwithstanding the fact that the Government refuses to administer the Canadian Naval Service Act and does everything it can to discourage the enlistment of men under that Act, we find that the cost of administering the naval service increases. There should be some greater justification for the request which the minister makes to Parliament for the passing of the items now before the committee. Personally I do not think that this House should give its assent to the passing of these items, which are particularly referable to the Canadian Naval Service Act. The officials of the Canadian Naval Service, for whose salaries the minister now asks the voting of money, cannot be rendering any service to Canada. It may be necessary to have in the Civil Service men to administer the fisheries protection service, the wireless telegraphy service, and the like, but I submit that there is no justification whatever for the minister's asking Parliament to vote money for the administration of a service which the Government have been taking great pains to inform the Canadian people that they do not intend to maintain, for the present at least. I was told by the minister last year that the department was not encouraging the departure of men from the ship Niobe, and that the Government were not averse to securing, if possible, further enlistments to fill the vacancies that were occurring from time to time. I was also specifically told last year, in answer to a question I put to the minister, that a programme of service was contemplated for the Niobe during the summer in the way of cruises, manoeuvres, and the like, but judging by the actions of the department since then I am bound to say that I question the bona fides of the minister and his department in the answer that they gave to me last session in reference to this matter. I think that Parliament is entitled to a reason from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Government before a single dollar of money is granted for the Naval Service as now requested. The minister must clearly see that to ask for a vote of practically $100,000 when there is no service to administer, is simply fooling and trifling with the Canadian public and wasting the money of the people.

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend is, by his remarks, unintentionally giving the House a wrong impression of this matter. The hon. gentleman speaks as if he were under the impression that the money we are asking for the Naval Department of the Civil Government is all for the purpose of carrying out what may be called the work in connection with the navy.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The larger part of it, you said a moment ago.

Mr. HAZEN: I said the smaller portion of it. The Naval Department, as I have pointed out, administers the fisheries protection service, the hydrographic survey, the wireless service, the tidal service, and certain other branches of the public service. Of these Estimates, $31,060 is for the naval portion of the service, and $76,490 is for the other branches.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Where do you put the deputy minister?

Mr. HAZEN: One-half of the deputy minister's salary is charged up to the naval branch and one-half to the others; this, I think, is as fair a division as may be made.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Has the cost of the marine and fisheries branch of the service decreased in the last year, or is it just as it was when the department administered the fisheries protection service and the other branches which have been mentioned?

Mr. HAZEN: I cannot answer my hon. friend, because in order to do so I would have to go back to a time before I was Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The classification of the branches of the ser-

vice took place before the present Government came into power, and I am not familiar with the figures. The Estimates for 1911 were made by friends of the hon. gentleman; since 1911 there has been very little increase in the cost of the service, and any increases have been due to the provision for statutory increases and the appointment of new officials.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend knows that when the late Government determined to have a Naval Service Act and a naval service, a naval department was established, and to this was attached certain of the branches of the service which were formerly attached to the Marine and Fisheries Department. We created, amongst other offices, a Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs, and, of course, in connection with this office there were secretaries and so on. If it be the intention of my hon. friend to vote for the Bill which is now before the House to repeal the Naval Service Act, what is the use of these estimates? The matter has only to be referred back to where it was. The hydrographic survey, the wireless service, and other branches referred to, have only to be restored to their original positions. But my hon. friend will apparently do neither the one nor the other. He will not carry on the Naval Act. As I understand it, he has discouraged the training of officers for the naval service and the enlistment of men. I do not know if he has maintained the Naval College, I think he has. So far so good, that is under the Naval Act. Has he sold the Rainbow or the Niobe?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: He has kept them without doing anything at all. They are there but have no men on them. He has made no effort to recruit men; I do not think he has even made an effort to punish men who desert the service. I do not think there has been a single prosecution for desertion; I think he has rather encouraged desertion.

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: He has not made any very strong effort to prevent it. Has he ever prosecuted a man for desertion? I know that in our little army and in the Mounted Police if a man deserts his engagement he is prosecuted as a warning to the others, but my hon. friend has closed his eyes, has done nothing; but he still maintains the service. What answer has he therefore to the criticisms of my friends behind me? Why does he ask this appropriation if he does not want to have a naval service? If you do not want to have a naval service, just go back to the condition we were in in 1911. Then the Hydrographic Survey, the Fisheries Protection Service, the Wireless Telegraph Service, the Tidal Survey, the Patrol of Northern Waters in Canada were under the Department of Marine and Fisheries. All these matters have been transferred to the Naval Service, and I think very properly transferred; but my hon. friend takes the consequences, he repudiates the principle. I do not know that he can justify himself or has answered successfully the criticisms of my friends behind me.

[Mr. Hazen.]

At six o'clock the House resumed, and then took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 10, respecting Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 11, respecting the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 12, respecting The Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 13, to incorporate The Central Canada Railway Company.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

Bill No. 14, respecting The Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company, Limited, and to change its name to The Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

Bill No. 15, respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 16, respecting The Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill No. 17, respecting The Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 18, respecting The Tillsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 19, respecting The West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill No. 20, respecting The Canadian

Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

Bill No. 22, respecting Brazilian Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

Bill No. 23, respecting British America Nickel Corporation, Limited.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill No. 24, respecting The Canadian Railway Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to The Globe Indemnity Company.—Mr. Baker.

Bill No. 25, respecting The Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 26, to incorporate Pacific, Peace River and Athabaska Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 27, respecting The South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Smith.

Bill No. 33, respecting The Acadia Loan Corporation, and to change its name to The Mortgage Corporation of Nova Scotia.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

Bill No. 34, respecting The Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Jameson.

Bill No. 35, to incorporate The Bank of Edmonton.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 37, respecting the Ottawa and Ungava Railway Company.—Mr. Chabot.

Bill No. 38, respecting the Sterling Trusts Corporation.—Mr. Gerald V. White.

Bill No. 39, respecting The Thessalon and Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Smyth.

Bill No. 40, respecting La Compagnie des Pouvoirs d'eau de Valleyfield, limitée.—Mr. Sevigny.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply.

Civil Government—Department of Naval Service, $107,300.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Is it the intention of the department to order the Canadian cadets, now on board the Berwick stationed at Bermuda, back to the Naval College at Halifax for a new course of one year? They are under examination at the present time. I am told that when their examinations are over they will be sent back for a new course at the Naval College at Halifax for one year. Is that the intention of the department?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, the candidates who are now on the Berwick passing their examination will be sent back to the Naval College at Halifax for a one year's supplementary course.

Mr. PROULX: Assuming that the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Lesperance) passes, what will become of the Naval College?

Mr. HAZEN: I have been taught that it is time enough to bid the devil good morning when you meet him. Perhaps the hon. gentleman might ask that question when the Bill passes.

Mr. OLIVER: This is a somewhat serious question. A certain number of young men of Canada have been induced, we might almost say, to enter upon a presumably naval career, and they did that in the first place believing that the Government intended to carry out a certain policy that had been laid down. These young men have sacrificed their time, they have sacrificed the prospects of their life in many cases, and I think it is reasonable to ask what is the prospect for them now? It is really a very serious matter to the young men themselves and to their families, if they are not to have the advantage of a career after they have trained for it.

Mr. HAZEN: I may say that an arrangement has been made under which those who have attained the rank of sub-lieutenant are serving now upon the British ships. The Naval College at Halifax is being continued, the course there is being carried on, and as the young men graduate from there we hope that there will be an arrangement made by which we shall be able to place them in the Hydrographic Survey. One or two have been placed at their own request on the Hydrographic Survey, where practically we require men who have a knowledge of seamanship, which is very essential for hydrographic survey work. We propose to look after these young men and to see that no injustice is done to them.

Mr. OLIVER: Everybody will be glad to know that the Government is going to make arrangements that will be measurably satisfactory to these young men, but if the Government is going to maintain the Naval College at Halifax, it will mean the continuance of existing conditions. Is it intended to maintain that college with a view of furnishing a supply of Canadian officers to the British navy?

Mr. HAZEN: That matter is being taken up at the present time, but it is hoped that the Naval College will serve not only as a training college for men who want to follow the naval career, but also as a training

school for men who want to follow other callings, such as the work in connection with the Hydrographic Survey and other work of that sort, just as the Military College at Kingston turns out men who follow other than military careers. Only a comparatively few of the graduates of the Military College embark on a military career, but the training that they get there fits them for other walks in life. Many become engineers and engage in other professions, and it is expected that the Naval College at Halifax will serve that purpose as well, so that the men will not only become naval officers and pursue a naval career but will be able to follow other lines of work with the education that they get there.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I do not think there will be a disposition to urge the Government too strongly upon this question. It will take a little time to wean them from the contribution policy in order that they may devote themselves to the development of Canada. They have been running in company with Mr. Churchill, and he is a pretty active man in getting around from one place to another. I see that the Canadian Naval Annual for this year says in so many words that the German scare was a thing that the people had to be weaned from, that it was all nonsense. It is the organ of the people who were making a great deal of the German scare just twelve months ago. Personally I feel that we should be sympathetic to the Government in this matter. It will take a little time for them to wean themselves from the false line of policy they embarked in, but I hope they will become good Canadians and follow the example of New Zealand and Australia, without feeling they are very disloyal in being in such excellent company. I am perfectly sure they will come around to the idea of Canada being a good country within the empire, like the others. This hydrographic survey will no doubt work out very nicely; the country does not want the Government to go too fast with it, and if the hydrographic survey means an easy transition from the contribution policy, to the old policy they never should have abandoned, we should be patient with them. I would appeal to my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) to take my point of view and allow the minister to get these Estimates, on this kind of provisional understanding.

Mr. HAZEN: I am glad that what the Government is doing in this direction has such a valiant defender in the person of my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark).

[Mr. Hazen.]

Mr. GAUVREAU: I am not an expert in this matter, but I am quite interested in it because my son has the honour to be in the navy, studying the best way to defend his country and the empire if need be. Am I to understand that he will have to go back to the naval college? The expense to me has been quite heavy for the past two years, and I would like to know from the minister if I shall have to pay my son's expenses for another year.

Mr. HAZEN: On the contrary, I do not think the son of my hon. friend will have any expense at all. If he becomes an officer he will receive a salary.

Mr. GAUVREAU: That is satisfactory.

Mr. SINCLAIR: To-night, my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) referred to the fact that the Niobe had been tied up to a wharf at Halifax during the whole season, and for aught we know the Rainbow may have been similarly tied up to some wharf on the Pacific coast. I would like to know how many men are on the Niobe and Rainbow and what these ships are really supposed to be doing? It would seem, from what the minister has said to-night that the Government does not intend to go any further with the Canadian Naval Service, for he told us that the cadets were to find places in the British navy when their period of study was over. If the Government has abandoned the idea of a Canadian navy, it is difficult for me to understand why we should vote this money at all. What necessity is there for keeping up a staff of officers and voting $30,000 or $40,000 to pay their salaries, if these officers are to have nothing to do? The minister should give us some information as to that.

Mr. HAZEN: More than two-thirds of this vote is for fishery protection, hydrographic survey, and other services which come under the Naval Department. We have to take care of the dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt, under the arrangement entered into with the British Government when these dockyards were handed over to Canada. There is a staff in each of these dockyards, and the vessels of the fishery protection fleet and other Government vessels are repaired there. Then we are continuing the Naval Service at Halifax, and that involves certain clerical aid at headquarters and elsewhere, and there is certain work to do in connection with the Niobe and Rainbow. There are about 150 men on the Niobe and a lesser number on the Rainbow, and they having been

engaged for a certain number of years we have to keep faith with them. In reply to the contention that there is no need for a naval service department under certain conditions, I may say that if the Naval Service were abolished altogether there would be no saving as far as Civil Government Estimates are concerned, because there are not now enough employees in the Marine and Fisheries Department to take over the work in connection with the naval college, the dockyards, the hydrographic survey, fisheries protection and other similar services. The only thing that possibly might be saved would be the salary of a deputy minister, but I would ask hon. members to bear in mind that the Marine and Fisheries Department deals with a greater variety of subjects than perhaps any other department of Government. While there are other departments of Government that are responsible for the expenditure of a larger sum of money during the year, still the Department of Marine, including the Naval Service, has a greater variety of subjects to deal with than any other. It is very doubtful if, in view of the large increase in work in that department of late years, it would be possible to get along as one department, and my experience is that it would be necessary under any circumstances to have a division of the department with two deputy heads. Years ago when the work of the department was very much less than it is to-day, there was a deputy minister of marine and a deputy minister of fisheries. That system was abolished, but since then there have been added to the department a great many services that were unthought of years ago. Even if the Naval Service Department were abolished, it is doubtful if all the work of the department could be carried on with one deputy head.

Mr. OLIVER: While the explanation of the minister is very full and lucid, he will, I think, admit that from the viewpoint of the Opposition a naval service department without a navy is fairly and reasonably a subject of question. The hon. gentleman drew a parallel between the conditions of naval education and the conditions of military education, both of which are given by the Government. There is a vast difference. In the case of military education we have a permanent military force, and besides we have a very large volunteer force.

Mr. HAZEN: I think comparatively few of our graduates at Kingston go into the permanent service.

Mr. OLIVER: Possibly. But at least we have the field for their abilities when they have secured the education they seek. But much the larger field, no doubt, is in connection with the volunteer force. There is a vast field of usefulness for the young men who have gone through the Kingston Military College in the line of life for which that education specially fits them. They know, before they enter the college, what the conditions are in regard to employment in that line of life for which they are educating themselves. But in the case of the naval cadets they entered upon their course of instruction in the full belief that there was for them a Canadian Naval career; now, as my hon. friend has explained, we have everything in connection with the service except a navy, and the young men who have been prepared to sarcifice their time and talents in the interests of the Naval Service are left in a position that is unfortunate for them and not creditable to the Government. I think that we are fairly entitled to know what is the Government's intention in regard to the two vessels they have on their hands. Are they going to keep them in commission, or are they going to put them out of commission? Are these vessels to be tied up to the wharf, one in Halifax and the other in Esquimalt, with a partial complement of men, and neither fit for one thing nor fit for another? If that is the intention of the Government I think we are entitled to know it, and to know it now on this vote. We are voting $30,000 for the Civil Government expenses of the Canadian Navy. Now, if there is not going to be a navy, their ought not to be this vote. My hon. friend has explained, as he best of all men can explain, that we will need the money anyway, and that we have work to be done in other lines. That does not answer the question. We have this Naval Service, we have these two vessels; they are either fit for service or not fit for service. Is the Government keeping them fit for service, does it intend to keep them fit for service, does it intend to carry out the policy that was the reason for the establishment of the Naval College and for the purchase of these two vessels, namely, to carry out the policy of fitting young Canadians to take positions of responsibility in a navy owned, controlled and manned by Canada? I think that on this vote we are entitled to get a definite statement from

the minister as to the intentions of the Government.

Mr. HAZEN: The Niobe and the Rainbow have both been kept in a good state of repair, they have not been allowed to deteriorate; they are in quite as good a condition, if not better, than they were at the time they were acquired by the Government of Canada. As to what disposition will be made of these vessels, that matter is under consideration at this time. It is doubtful whether the Rainbow could be disposed of at any price, if it were thought desirable to sell her, either to the British naval authorities or to any other such a body, for such a vessel would not be required in connection with a modern navy. It is doubtful also if anything could be obtained for the Niobe. It may be that the British Government would allow us to hand them back and take them off our hands, but whether we could sell them is a matter of some doubt, and it is receiving attention at the present time. The hon. gentleman asks me to state what the policy of the Government is to be in relation to naval affairs. He knows that the Prime Minister of Canada, who is the one, in circumstances of this sort, to enunciate the policy of the Government, has told this House on several occasions that before the country embarks upon a naval policy, that policy will be stated to the House and the people will be asked whether they approve or disapprove. In view of that statement made by the Prime Minister on several occasions, I think the hon. gentleman will admit that it is not altogether right or proper to suggest that I should state to-night what the naval policy of the Government is to be, and no one more than the hon. gentleman would recognize the impropriety of my making such a statement.

Mr. MURPHY: I do not see that there can be any question as to the propriety of the inquiry made by my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver). That hon. gentleman probably had in mind the answers given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a series of questions asked two years ago with respect to the appeal of the Naval Service Act. In those replies the minister stated that the Naval Service Act would be repealed. He further stated that after consulting the Admiralty this Government would announce its permanent naval policy and would appeal to the people upon it. Now, this Government did consult the Admiralty, but it did not announce its naval policy to the country, and it has taken no steps, so far, to consult the people about it. So, in view of the replies given to the questions by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I think it was quite natural for my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) to ask these questions to-night. And the minister, if he were to look round him, would see that there is a great interest taken in this question by his friends and supporters from the province of Quebec. In fact the new member for Chateauguay (Mr. Morris) has moved several seats nearer to the minister to hear what is going on—no doubt with a view to enlightening the electors to whom he is alleged to have made some statements on this subject.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The minister has stated that there are over one hundred men on the Niobe in Halifax. These men, I suppose, are undergoing some kind of naval training. But what kind of naval training do these men get aboard a ship tied to a wharf? Would not an essential part of their naval training be the efficient management of the ship and other matters which could only be learned at sea? These men are kept there at considerable expense to the country, and I doubt very much their obtaining any training that will be of any advantage to the country, or possibly to themselves. If it is the intention of the Government to repeal the Naval Service Act, could not some arrangement be made with these men whereby they could go into other walks of life and obtain a training that would be of some use to them? It seems to me that the keeping of a large body of men under these circumstances, at very great expense to the country, is a useless waste. If these men must be kept there comparatively speaking in idleness, and it may be under conditions that may be disadvantageous, the whole thing appears to be a most peculiar arrangement.

Mr. HAZEN: The men who are now on these ships enlisted in Great Britain at the time the ships came out here. In war vessels of this nature there is a large amount of machinery of the most complicated character. Some of these men are ablebodied seamen, but a great many of them possess qualifications for taking care of that complicated machinery. These men were enlisted for a certain period of time which has not yet expired, and we are bound to retain them until that term expires. In any case it is necessary that they should be retained in the ship for the purpose of taking care of it, seeing that it does not deteriorate and that the

machinery is kept in proper order. A large number of the men on the ships are doing that work at the present time.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What did it cost last year to maintain the Niobe and the Rainbow?

Mr. HAZEN: I have not that information at hand, because I did not anticipate questions of that nature coming up on the Civil Government Estimates.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I should like to reiterate the hope that the Government will not be rushed in this matter. We were somewhat put out to hear that the Rainbow is in such a very bad condition, because it is a serious thing to lose money on account of the armaments business. I read an assertion made by Sir Herbert Lyon in London the other day that the British Admiralty, without the consent of Parliament, had used a boat called the Empress of India, which could have been sold for £45,000, as a target. It occurs to me that that fact is worth bringing to the attention of this committee, and I would like to draw the minister's attention to it, by way of impressing upon him the view which I have already expressed: that the Government should go slowly in this matter, because I am perfectly certain that the majority of the people of this country, especially in these hard times, do not want to spend too much money on naval targets. It occurs to me that the fact is worth mentioning for a second reason. If the Rainbow is no good where she is, perhaps it would be possible to sell her back to the British Government to be used as a target. I should think that almost any ship is good enough to be blown to pieces, and being a man of an economic turn of mind, and anxious to do my duty by the people of this country, looking after their money as well as one member of Parliament can do, I suggest in all seriousness that the minister should ascertain what kind of targets they are using in the British navy, and whether he could not get something for the Rainbow on that ground.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. gentleman's suggestion will have every consideration, I can assure him.

Mr. CARROLL: I must confess that there are a few things about the Niobe and the Rainbow that I do not quite understand. The minister tells us that it would be quite impossible at the present time either to give away these ships or to get anything for them. That means that the ships are no good for anything, and if they are no good for anything, it is impossible for them to deteriorate. Why, therefore, should we spend our good money in keeping one hundred men on board the Niobe at Halifax if the ship is good for nothing, and if the Government find it impossible to obtain one cent for it? Why should we pay one hundred men, out of the revenues of this country, to keep this worthless piece of machinery from deteriorating? It does not sound to me like good business. I think that what the minister had in view in saying that we could not get rid of these ships was to show that the Laurier Administration had made a mistake, and had bought these ships when they were no good. They were certainly no good as instruments of war when they were taken over to this country. That was not the intention. The intention was that they should be used as training ships; that on these ships our young Canadians should learn something about the running of a cruiser, its machinery, and the processes of navigating it. I am in the very same position as the hon. member for Red Deer. If the ships are not worth a cent, why spend $20,000 to keep worthless articles from deteriorating? It is bad business.

Mr. OLIVER: I think I may justify the question I asked the minister by the remarks made by the hon. member for Cape Breton. I did not intend to ask for a declaration of the Government's naval policy; I did intend to ask what the intentions of the Government were in regard to the Niobe and the Rainbow. As the hon. member for Cape Breton has said, these vessels were bought to be used for the education of the young men who wished to enter upon a naval career; to give them an opportunity of being instructed in practical seamanship and the practical working of a man-of-war. The minister has informed us to-night that the young men who have enlisted are to be given positions, some in the British navy, and some in the hydrographic survey, and the inference is that there is to be no naval career for Canadians. We are asked to vote money for clerical assistance to carry on the Naval Service, when we have no navy, and so far as we can judge, no intention on the part of the Government to have one. We have two vessels which are an enormous bill of expense to the country, serving no purpose, so far as I can see. If the Government were making a large expenditure of any other kind every year for

absolutely no purpose, certainly their action would be called into question. I am sure my hon. friend the minister must be prepared to make a statement in the matter.

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm) (Translation) : Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the country should go on expending money on the navy, why the committee should pass this item.

I would have been pleased to hear from the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Nantel) and from the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Sevigny) two former members of the Nationalist party; I would like to know their opinion on the question.

On this side of the House, we speak freely on the naval policy, but our hon. friends opposite, are dumb. The hon. minister of Marine and Fisheries is the only one who dares answer our questions.

What are the sentiments of Mr. Lespérance, concerning this vote?

Would you be surprised, Mr. Speaker, to hear what the hon. member for Dorchester had to say during the last by-election, in Chateauguay, in October last? He was saying that the Niobe and the Rainbow were two old tubs, that they were good for nothing.

And now, the Government is asking the Committee to vote money for the maintenance of those old tubs. That is not fair.

The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Lespérance) wants the repeal of the Naval service Act. I will support his Bill with both hands. What is the use of voting this money, just now? Let us wait till after the Bill asking the repeal of the naval service Act is passed, and then the Niobe and the Rainbow can be sent back to England and be disposed of as scrap iron.

For my part, I strongly and formally oppose this expenditure. If the boats are nothing but old tubs, let them go to pieces.

Mr. H. BOULAY: (Translation). Mr. Speaker, one might have supposed that the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) had said enough when he spoke for four hours or five hours on that question, last year, to dispense with the remarks he has just made.

I am surprised at the stand he now takes after having voted in 1910 for the Naval Service Act, at the bidding of the Laurier government—a law authorizing the construction of a navy which comprised twelve or fifteen boats.

If it happened to be the intention of the present government to continue the policy introduced by the Administration of which my honorable friend was a supporter, he should exhibit to-day the same courage as in 1910, instead of going back on what he did and said at that time. The hon. member should at least wait till the Government dispose of these two boats which they have inherited from their predecessors.

Last summer I had the occasion to pay a visit to Halifax and to have a look at the now famous Niobe. The hon member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) wanted to know from the hon. minister of Marine and Fisheries why this boat has been kept in idleness, tied up to the wharf, in the port of Halifax. The Niobe has been kept in idleness for the simple reason that there was nothing for her to do, and that is the best proof that Canada does not want a single battleship, and much less a dozen of them.

If the naval policy of the Liberal Government had gone through, we would have, by now, twelve or fifteen boats tied up at wharfs and the situation would be much worst than it is.

All that goes to show that Canada has no use for a navy and that if we are bound to do something, the policy of the present Government, the policy of a substantial contribution, is the wisest of the two.

Mr. OLIVER: Will the Government say if the hon. gentleman has correctly expressed the policy of the Government, that they will do nothing?

9 p.m.

Mr. HAZEN: Will my hon. friend translate what was said?

Mr. OLIVER: The purport of it was that he approved of the policy of the Government in doing nothing.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Nothing has been said in answer to the remarks of hon. gentlemen on this side as to the question of the repeal of the Naval Service Act. Two years ago a question was asked by the hon. member for Dorchester and after a long period of deliberation the Government replied that they would repeal the Naval Service Act. There is a Bill now before the House standing for its second reading to that effect and if the Government intends to adopt that Bill, introduced by one of its prominent supporters, it seems to me that we should not pass this item until we know whether they have made up their minds in regard to that matter. If this Bill should pass I

think it will involve a reorganization of the whole question and will dispense with the employment of some of the officers for whom we are providing by this vote. The minister has not given any light on that question. I think we ought to have an answer as to whether the Government really intend to support the measure before the House or repeal the Naval Service Act.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think my hon. friend or any other hon. member would seriously suggest that the Government should say what its policy is going to be on a certain Bill introduced by a private member before the Bill comes up for consideration. I cannot believe that my hon. friend is serious in asking that question. When the Bill comes down for consideration at the proper time, the policy of the Government will undoubtedly be stated by the First Minister or some other minister on behalf of the Government. For me to state now what the policy of the Government would be would be not only improper but not a course that any hon. member would approve.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I would not have ventured to ask this question had it not been that the policy of the Government was announced two years ago. I presume the Government are prepared to carry out the promise they then made to repeal the Naval Service Act. If the Government have changed their policy in that matter, of course I am out of order in asking the question. Is the policy of the Government the same to-day as when a reply was given in Parliament a couple of years ago that the Naval Service Act was to be repealed?

Mr. McCRANEY: The Government has stated that the men who are engaged on the Niobe and Rainbow have been engaged in the old country for a term of years. How much longer are they to remain in the employ of Canada?

Mr. HAZEN: The Deputy Minister tells me that these men were engaged for different periods, the longest period would be for five years beginning three years ago.

Mr. McCRANEY: If I understand the situation it is that the Niobe and the Rainbow are tied up at wharfs.

Mr. HAZEN: They are in the harbours.

Mr. McCRANEY: They are not cruising they are not being used for the purpose for which they were originally intended. The reason that they are kept in commission at all is to provide a place of employment for some men, the balance of whose term of employment is two or three years and whose present occupation is looking after the delicate instruments which are used on these vessels. I would suggest to the minister that these men who are so employed are at the very best time in their lives, the time when they ought not only to be in the best kind of employment but when they should be doing the best service for themselves or for Canada or for Britain or for somebody and that they must be in a condition, if not of idleness at least of useless employment in keeping instruments in repair. The instruments must be kept in repair, but there is surely no reason why those instruments should be kept on the Niobe or Rainbow if the only purpose is to keep them in repair. If those ships are not to be used for their original purpose, they had better be dismantled and the men paid off.

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend, I think, must to some extent have misunderstood me. I did not say that we were keeping instruments on board the boat, but the machinery which could not be removed. The men, the Deputy Minister informs me, are kept busy. The great bulk of them are Englishmen who have been in the English navy, and the Deputy Minister says they are kept employed. We are responsible for carrying out our contract with the men and if we dismiss them at an earlier date than the contract calls for some arrangement would have to be made to compensate the men.

Mr. OLIVER: Can the minister tell me what was the cost of the Niobe and the Rainbow?

Mr. HAZEN: I have not the figures here and the Deputy Minister tells me he does not remember, but perhaps some of my hon. friends who were members of the Govment at the time those ships were bought, have some recollection.

Mr. OLIVER: The point I wanted to establish is this: a very large amount of the country's money is tied up in these vessels, their maintenance is costing a large amount of money, and the purpose for which the money was voted is not being carried out. And so far as we can learn from the minister, it is not the intention of the Government to carry it out. The country, meanwhile, is burdened with that expense, capital and current, without any reason whatever. We have asked, we have almost badgered, the minister for an answer as to

what the Government intends to do in the matter. I think we have been strictly within our rights in asking these questions, and I am very much disappointed that the Government is not able or willing to give us a clear and straightforward answer. The matter is one that I think is seriously contentious, and I think that what has passed across the floor to-night is sufficient evidence on that point. I think my hon. friend will remember that when the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition spoke last night as to the business that was to be taken up to-day, it was understood that any of the Estimates that were contentious would not be proceeded with. This certainly has developed into a contentious matter and in view of the understanding between the leaders I would respectfully ask my hon. friend to allow it to stand over.

Mr. HAZEN: I hope my hon. friend did not gather from any remark of mine that I wished to imply that the Opposition were asking questions that were improper from the standpoint of an opposition. I fully realize what the rights and duties of an opposition are, and make no complaint whatever about any inquiries made of me when my Estimates are before the House. I have endeavoured to give such answers as I thought would be satisfactory to my hon. friends opposite. Having been in opposition myself in a legislature for nine years, I know it is sometimes difficult to satisfy an opposition with information, and very frequently if the Government gives information it is not considered satisfactory by those opposed to the Government. My hon. friend surely does not expect me to state what the naval policy is. That is a matter for the Prime Minister when the proper time comes. I have given my hon. friend all the information I can with regard to these vessels and the number of men employed on them, and with regard to the work these men are doing, I have also told my hon. friend that so far as the question of disposing of these vessels is concerned, no conclusion has been reached. The matter is being carefully considered by the department and will be considered by the Government when the department is in a position, after consideration with its officials, to make a report to the Government on that matter. I do not know what further information I can give my hon. friend. I would have no hesitation in allowing the item to stand, but I think my hon. friend should have asked that it stand over when the question first came up. I would have agreed to that without a moment's hesitation. But here we have been discussing for an hour, almost, every phase of the question and I have answered all questions as far as I am able except the one asking the cost of the Niobe and Rainbow. Under these circumstances I ask my hon. friend if he thinks the item ought to stand? If my hon. friend and his friends want the item to stand and say so, I am not going to insist upon its being passed to-night. I would point out, however, that when the main Naval Estimates come before the House at a later day, there will be the fullest possible opportunity for discussion of this question, and I will be delighted to give hon. gentlemen all the information possible if they desire to go on with the matter at that time.

Mr. OLIVER: I am sure my hon. friend is courteous and considerate in every respect, and I do not wish him to think I have any fault to find with his attitude on this matter. But my hon. friend the member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) before he went away this evening, asked that the item should stand and in view of the fact that it has developed into a contentious item and in view of the arrangements which I understand existed between the two leaders last night, I would ask that the item stand for the present, and in making that request I do not want the minister to understand that I am making any criticism whatever of him or of the way in which he has dealt with this matter.

Mr. HAZEN: I think I understand the attitude of the hon. member for Edmonton, and if it is his desire that the item should stand, I will at once agree; but if we are to go over all this again on some future occasion, I think it is unfortunate that the matter did not develop as contentious before dinner. However, if that is the hon. gentleman's request I will bow to it.

Civil Government—Department of Militia and Defence—Salaries and contingencies, $186,900.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Will the hon. minister explain?

Hon. SAM. HUGHES (Minister of Militia and Defence): There are no increases except the statutory increases.

Mr. PROULX: What is included in that item of sundries, $11,000? Is that another trip to England?

Mr. HUGHES: No trip to England. When the main Estimates come up, I shall

be delighted to give my hon. friend the particulars about that trip to England, and I am sure he will regret that he was not along and that he had not become a soldier earlier in life.

Mr. PARDEE: What are the sundries for?

Mr. HUGHES: They are for general odds and ends and for travelling expenses.

Mr. PARDEE: What are some of the items?

Mr. HUGHES: The travelling expenses of civil officers of the Department come out of that.

Mr. PARDEE: I do not want to be persistent at all, but it seems to me the Minister's explanations are rather vague—odds and ends.

Mr. HUGHES: These are travelling expenses.

Mr. PARDEE: Is that $11,000 made up of small items?

Mr. HUGHES: All small items—the expenses of officers travelling to Toronto, Quebec or anywhere. These are civil officers, not the military department.

Mr. MURPHY: It was explained by the hon. Minister's colleague, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), in connection with an item for sundries under the head of contingencies, that the item of travelling expenses which used to be voted in connection with a special appropriation had been transferred to this item of sundries under the head of contingencies, and that his Estimates were thereby increased by that amount. The estimates of the hon. Minister of Militia, under the head of sundries, apparently remain the same as they were last year. The Minister of Militia is not following in his department the custom as explained by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. HUGHES: I presume my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is following our custom.

Mr. MURPHY: No.

Mr. HUGHES: We have always had our expenses for travel under this head. I do not know what the Naval Service is doing at all. I am not running that show; I am running this show.

Mr. NEELY: I would like to ask the minister if this item of sundries would cover, for instance, the travelling and other incidental expenses of entertaining the visiting officers, say, from England, whom the Minister of Militia might see fit to entertain as properly he should. Would it also cover the expense of a visiting officer if the minister takes him to a political picnic, for instance, wearing a badge 'Britain and the Empire,' where a visiting British officer would hardly be expected to feel particularly at home in a country where all classes of the people are supposed to be loyal to the empire to which we are all so proud to belong. I would like to know if that is the case.

Mr. HUGHES: If the Minister of Militia entertains an officer, he entertains him himself. He does not charge him up to the public expense. If the Minister of Militia takes a gentleman to any party—Queenston Heights I presume my hon. friend refers to—he does so at his own expense and assumes the full responsibility for it. If he wears a badge, the Minister of Militia and Defence is responsible for the wearing of his badge. He asks no person what badge he shall wear on such an occasion.

Mr. NEELY: I am not worried about what badge the minister wears; we all know the badge he wears. That is not a matter of any particular concern. I am asking whether this $11,000 for sundries would cover such an occasion as where the minister takes a foreign officer, or an officer from the old country, or any other country, to a picnic. Does the minister mean to tell us that the minister pays the expenses of the visitors, because I have no fault to find with that proposition; but, in connection with the particular incident that he referred to, did the minister actually pay out of his own pocket the expenses of this visiting officer, and does he pay the expenses of visiting officers while travelling through the country?

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. gentleman referred to an incident that occurred at a picnic at Queenston Heights. I take the responsibility of everything that occurred on that occasion. When General Ian Hamilton travelled through this country as Inspector General, all his expenses were paid out of the general vote, but that has nothing to do with Civil Government, nor had the incident to which my hon. friend refers anything to do with this item.

Mr. NEELY: If this incident does not come under this item, that is all I want from the minister. But the minister will understand, of course, that when we do

come to the point we hope the matter may be properly discussed.

Mr. HUGHES: I shall be glad to give my hon. friend the opportunity.

Mr. NEELY: We would like to have a little information about that particular trip to Queenston Heights.

Mr. PARDEE: The Minister's explanation is that this $11,000 would simply cover the travelling expenses of officers of the department?

Mr. HUGHES: The civil officers.

Mr. PARDEE: The civil officers; that is the only explanation of the expenditure of this $11,000?

Mr. HUGHES: That is the great bulk of it.

Mr. PARDEE: Would $9,000 be a fair estimate of the travelling expenses?

Mr. HUGHES: I think it would be more than that.

Mr. OLIVER: I am sorry that my military experience is not very large, but it would appear to me as a rank outsider that the amount of $11,000 for the travelling expenses of the civil staff of the department is too large. I do not appreciate how the civil end of the military department has to do so much travelling. I understand that the travelling was generally done by the military officers, not by the civil officers.

Mr. HUGHES: If that question had been asked by some hon. gentleman on the other side who had never sat within the sacred precincts of the Privy Council, we would not have wondered at it; but the item is the same item that the hon. gentleman passed himself whilst he was a minister sitting with his colleagues around the Council Board. I do not think that it has been increased at all from the time that he passed it himself. It is the same item that has been passed for years.

Mr. OLIVER: The minister compliments the Government too much.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In looking at the Auditor General's Report I find that the contingencies under the Civil Government item for the Department of Militia and Defence last year amounted to $22,028. I do not know whether this represents the same expenditure or not, but the amount is more than twice as much as the item we are discussing.

[Mr. Neely.]

Mr. HUGHES: If the hon. gentleman looks at the Estimates he will see that the vote includes contingencies, clerical assistance, printing and stationery and sundries.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is it the same expenditure that we are discussing now?

Mr. HUGHES: We are discussing one of the three items which go to make up the whole of the contingencies. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 13 of his Estimates he will see that the vote includes these three items.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the Minister of Militia intend shortly to make provision for the payment of the Fenian bounty claims? I, and others, have had numerous inquiries with regard to this matter. A great many have put in their claims, and the statement having gone abroad that the Act expired on the 31st December, the claimants are uneasy as to whether or not their claims will be paid.

Mr. HUGHES: It is the intention of the Government to taken any legislation that may be necessary to continue the right of any claimant who may have presented his claim. There are a number of questions on the Order Paper with reference to this matter, and they will be answered in due course. I may say now that every claim that has been allowed will be paid. The Militia Department has nothing to do with paying the claims; it merely issues a warrant and the Finance Department pays.

Civil Government—Department of the Interior—Salaries and contingencies, $1,258,255.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior): The statutory increases amount to $33,357, and the other increases, caused by increased clerkships, to $83,700, being a total of $116,957. There have been decreases through the filling of vacancies occasioned by promotion, resignations, &c. In all cases, the new clerks came in at the minimum of the salary of the division to which they were promoted.

Mr. CARROLL: There seems to be a large increase in the contingencies for travelling expenses?

Mr. ROCHE: That is occasioned by the fact that the travelling expenses, which formerly were paid out of the votes for the different services, will in future be paid out of this vote.

Mr. OLIVER: Does the total represent any actual increase over last year?

Mr. ROCHE: These Estimates are based on the Estimates of last year.

Mr. OLIVER: Apparently, there is an increase of about 88 officials.

Mr. ROCHE: The hon. gentleman, who was formerly minister of this department, will appreciate the explanation of that. The department has over 800 employees, and during the course of the year there have been employed from 70 to 145 temporary clerks at different periods. Under the present practice, temporary employees are only allowed to remain in the department for six months. Formerly, when they were in a department for six months and did not pass the examination they were transferred to another department in which they remained for the next six months, and so on. That practice has been abolished, and now, unless they have passed their examination within the first six months they are compelled to leave the service, and usually just at the time when they are becoming proficient in their work. I consulted the heads of the different branches, and in order to avoid the employment of so many temporary employees, it was considered it would be very much better in the interests of the service and in the interests of economy, that we should have a larger number of permanent employees. Of course we must continue to take some vote for temporary clerical assistance, but it will be materially reduced.

Mr. OLIVER: This is really only an apparent increase ?

Mr. ROCHE: That is all.

Mr. OLIVER: I took objection a short time ago to the passing of the Estimates for the Naval Department, but in order to facilitate business it may be well to withdraw the objection and let the item go through.

Mr. HAZEN: Thank you.

Mr. OLIVER: On the understanding that discussion may be had when the other naval Estimates come up.

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Civil Government—Department of Labour—Salaries, $52,412.50; contingencies, $15,000.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): Hon. members will notice that there is an increase of one in the staff of the department, and of $700 in the amount devoted to salaries. The new appointee is a messenger. This appointment and the statutory increases explain the increase of $700. The contingencies are the same as last year.

Mr. CARROLL: I have received communications to the effect that a statement appears in our papers that a new Bill is being introduced to extend the Industrial Disputes Act so as to cover all classes of employment. I have a question on the Order Paper for Monday on that subject, but I should be glad if the minister could give me the information now.

Mr. CROTHERS: There will be an item later on for the administration of the Industrial Disputes Act, and perhaps my hon. friend will wait until that time. It would be more in order to discuss such a matter then.

Mr. CARROLL: Will that be reached this evening?

Mr. CROTHERS: I suppose not; we are only taking up Civil Government now.

Civil Government—Department of Inland Revenue—Salaries, $182,087.50; contingencies, $10,000.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the Minister of Inland Revenue be good enough to explain the increase of size in the membership of the staff?

Hon. W. B. NANTEL (Minister of Inland Revenue): We have an Assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. J. U. Vincent at a salary of $3,350. Then, in the branch of Dr. McGill, Chief Analyst, we have two analysts employed, Mr. Dawson and Mr. Papineau Couture.

Mr. MURPHY: What is the increase in the Weights and Measures branch?

Mr. NANTEL: We have a chief inspector, Mr. Way, who last year was assistant chief and has now been promoted. His salary is $2,800.

Mr. MURPHY: Who is the present deputy minister?

Mr. NANTEL: Mr. W. Himsworth.

Mr. MURPHY: Is he retiring?

Mr. NANTEL: He will retire soon, but is still in office.

Mr. MURPHY: When does he retire?

Mr. NANTEL: Probably next spring.

Mr. MURPHY: About what date?

Mr. NANTEL: About April, I suppose.

Mr. MURPHY: Who is to succeed him?

Mr. NANTEL: That is not decided yet, but there is the assistant deputy minister, Mr. Vincent, who has been appointed cum futura successione.

Mr. NESBITT: Under 'Sundries' there is an increase of $1,000. What is that for?

Mr. NANTEL: 'Sundries' covers unforseen expenditure, such as subscriptions to newspapers, telephones, telegrams, etc.

Mr. NESBITT: Subscriptions to newspapers?

Mr. NANTEL: Yes, there are many in my department.

Mr. NESBITT: I know that people subscribe to newspapers that they do not want, but I did not know that the departments did.

Mr. NANTEL: They always have. It was so when I took office.

Mr. ROBB: Would the minister mind telling us if he intends to introduce legislation to govern the manufacture, sale and use of explosives?

Mr. NANTEL: That is not in my department.

Mr. ROBB: It was in the minister's department last session.

Mr. NANTEL: It belongs to the Mines Department.

Mr. CARROLL: May I ask if the revenue cutters that were referred to this afternoon are in this department?

Mr. NANTEL: No, they are in the Customs Department.

Mr. CARROLL: I wanted to find that out because I have had some difficulty in locating them.

Mr. NANTEL: I have nothing to do with them.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How many inspectors of weights and measures are there in the province of Nova Scotia, and what are their names and salaries?

Mr. NANTEL: That is in the outside service, and I have not the notes on that subject with me. But I am informed that there are three inspectors in Nova Scotia.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I think the question will be in order now: Some of the retail merchants are complaining of inspection of their weights and measures being made oftener than is necessary, and the inspectors compel them to pay a fee for this inspection. There is a certain amount of trouble and friction about it, and I desired to ask the minister whether he proposes to change the law so as to relieve the retail men of the charge now made upon them for inspection of weights and measures.

Mr. NANTEL: I have received no complaint as to that.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: These inspectors of weights and measures are paid by the Government, and they also exact a pretty large fee.

Mr. NANTEL: The fee is not large; it has not been changed since I took office.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Where do the fees go?

Mr. NANTEL: The fees go to the department.

Mr. CARROLL: I desire to take this opportunity of thanking the minister for giving heed to a request which I made of him last year. I made many requests of the Government for various small things, but the Minister of Inland Revenue was the only member of the Government who heeded my requests. Last year I brought to his attention the matter of an employee of his department at Halifax, Mr. Patrick Tompkins, who had been in the employ of the department for twenty years, and was getting a very small salary. I wish to thank the Minister of Inland Revenue very kindly for having granted this gentleman the increase of pay which he so well deserved.

Mr. NEELY: I understand that the Deputy Minister of the Department is leaving some time in the spring, and that another gentleman, Mr. Vincent, is taking his place. How long has this gentleman been in the service of the department, and what qualifications has he for the office?

Mr. NANTEL: Mr. Vincent has been in the department since last October. He has been recognized by Mr. Shortt, of the Civil Service Commission, as being capable of filling the position; I consider he is well qualified for the office. Probably he will be appointed deputy minister.

Mr. NEELY: What was his occupation before he entered the service of the department?

Mr. NANTEL: He was a lawyer in Ottawa. A lawyer should make a good deputy minister for the Department of Inland Revenue.

Civil Government—Department of Agriculture—Salaries and contingencies, $509,637.50.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the hon. minister explain the increase in the staff and the increase in the salaries?

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture): There will be two vacancies created by promotion of two officers into the first division. The four patent examiners in that division, who have practically reached the maximum of $2,100 in the second division, are going up from the $2,100 to $2,800 class. Two men have been brought in from the outside service and appointed field husbandman and seed analyst respectively. In the next division the four vacancies are created by promotions, and four of the patent office who have been in the $1,200 to $1,600 class will be promoted to the $1,600 and $2,100 class. Most of these patent examiners come in on probation at $1,200, on the stipulation that they shall go up to $1,600 after the first year, if their services are satisfactory. In addition to that we are providing for an assistant Dominion botanist, a horticulturist, another clerk in the copyrights branch, an assistant editor in the publications branch, and an assistant Dominion entomologist. In subdivision B we have a number of vacancies and are providing for the appointment of an assistant to the Dominion botanist, to the Dominion field husbandman, the transfer to the inside service of an outside officer, an additional clerk in the minister's office, an assistant to the Dominion chemist, a filing clerk in the publications office. In the third division some clerks who have reached their maximum in the $500 to $800 class are going up to the $900 to $1,200 class. The changes are simply the result of the natural expansion of departmental work, with the addition of the officers I have just mentioned.

Mr. MURPHY: Are the two positions at $5,000 new?

Mr. BURRELL: No. These are Dr. Montizambert and Dr. Torrance.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Why are the travelling expenses so large this year?

Mr. BURRELL: Hitherto we have paid all our expenses from the votes apportioned to the different branches. It has been suggested that we should do away with that practice, and put these expenses into a general travelling expense fund for all branches. Many of the officers of the inside service of the department are travelling a good deal of the time, particularly those in the experimental farm, dairy and cold storage and live stock branches. This change was suggested by the Auditor General. Last year the amount was, I think, between $45,000 and $50,000.

Mr. MURPHY: Have all the positions in subdivision 'A' of the first division been filled?

Mr. BURRELL: No. This will provide for two promotions and a possible new appointment.

Mr. MURPHY: Are the vacancies in this subdivision to be filled by promotion?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes, some of them. I have spoken of the four in the patent examiners' branch. Four patent senior examiners who have reached their maximum of $2,100 will go into the $2,100 to $2,800 class.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the explanation of the doubling of the vote for clerical and other assistance?

Mr. BURRELL: Last year we had a great deal of trouble because we
10 p. m. could not get permanent clerks from the Civil Service Commission to fill a lot of appointments, and we had to put on a number of temporary employees. We ran much behind our vote last year for temporary employees. If we had had permanent appointments for this, much of the vote would have lapsed. We had to increase our temporary vote, and we are providing enough so that if we do not get the permanent clerks we shall have enough to pay for temporary assistance.

Civil Government—Post Office Deaprtment—Salaries and contingencies, $867,810.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General): The number of officers is the same, and the increase is due to statutory increases.

Mr. MURPHY: What is the increase in contingencies?

Mr. PELLETIER: To a large extent it is due to the same reason given by other departments.

Mr. CARROLL: I notice an item for provisional allowances in the Northwest. What is the explanation of that?

Mr. PELLETIER: That is a special allowance that we give in Western Canada, which existed before my time. The explanation is, and I do not hesitate to say this, that the law does not permit us to pay sufficient

salaries to get good men in the West We get men and they leave the service because we are not allowed by law to pay them sufficient salary. The late Government provided for this to a certain extent by making what they called a living allowance to the employees in the West, that is from Winnipeg to the Coast. In a general way the allowance is $180, but it varies according to salary.

Mr. OLIVER: What class of employees get the benefit of that allowance?

Mr. PELLETIER: For officers receiving $1,600 and under, $15 a month, that is $180 a year. In the case of salaries over $1,600 and under $1,780, the allowance is the amount required to make up a total of $1,780, this being the amount that would be received by a clerk whose salary is $1,600.

Mr. OLIVER: The dead letter office employees of the West are part of the Inside Service?

Mr. PELLETIER: Yes.

Civil Government—Public Works—Salaries and contingencies, $628,547.50.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of Public Works): I might say, in a general way, that there are no increases except the ordinary statutory increases, as far as I know, and a few promotions. The total amount asked this year is $543,000 as against $527,000, or a difference of $16,000 for the general increase incident to the expansion of the department made up entirely of the natural increase and statutory increases.

Mr. OLIVER: In the second division, subdivision 'A,' I see two more have been appointed, and in the second division, subdivision 'B' five more.

Mr. ROGERS: These are the increases incident to the development and extra work of the department.

Mr. MURPHY: What is the meaning of that item in the second division subdivision 'A' where it says 'remainder of salary in Estimates of Railways and Canals'?

Mr. ROGERS: That refers to D. A. McLaughlin, the photographer. He gets part of his salary from my department, and the rest from the Railway Department.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Travelling expenses have increased by $46,000.

Mr. ROGERS: The same answer applies to that as was given by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture. Heretofore, if we sent out an inspector, an engineer or purchasing agent his expenses were chargeable to the particular work on which he was engaged, but for some reason or other on the recommendation of the Auditor General or Treasury Board, that has been changed and all travelling expenses are charged to a contingency account. That accounts for the increase over last year.

Mr. CARROLL: How would the various items compare with this year?

Mr. ROGERS: About the same I think.

Mr. OLIVER: There is a considerable increase in the printing and stationery. Is there any explanation of that?

Mr. ROGERS: Printing and stationery last year was $12,500 and this year $17,000. The increase is due to books, publications and so on.

Mr. OLIVER: Has it anything to do with newspaper advertising?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not think so.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Where is the printing being done?

Mr. ROGERS: In the Printing Bureau.

Mr. CARROLL: Have many new clerks been appointed by the department during the last year?

Mr. ROGERS: Very few; about four or five additional ones in the different offices.

Civil Government—Department of Justice—Salaries, including legal officer at $4,500, and assistant legal adviser at $4,000, $135,773.75.

Mr. PROULX: Has any new officer been appointed?

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): No. One officer has been dropped. Moreover, the officer who last year combined the duties of secretary and assistant deputy minister was paid $5,000. This year we are paying the gentleman who replaces him only $4,000. We have diminished, not increased, the number of officers.

Mr. CARROLL: I understand some new appointments have been made in the legal department. Was Mr. Bill of Truro not appointed?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. Mr. Gisborne was appointed parliamentary counsel, and we appointed the gentleman next in order to the position of secretary. Mr. Gisborne's transference naturally created a vacancy that we had to fill by promotion, and Mr. Bill was appointed to the position rendered vacant by such promotions.

Mr. CARROLL: At what salary?

Mr. DOHERTY: $3,300.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

Monday, February 2, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Commissioners of Internal Economy for the year ended March 31, 1913.—The Honourable the Speaker.

Report of Department of Marine and Fisheries, Marine branch, for the year ended March 31, 1913.—Hon. J. D. Hazen.

Report of Geographic Board of Canada for year ended March 31, 1913.—Hon. William J. Roche.

Report of the Veterinary Director-General for the year ended March 31, 1913. —Hon. Martin Burrell.

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 45, to amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act. He said: The Bill has a special reference to the tidal waters of the Pacific coast. If a boom of logs breaks loose, there is no provision made in the present Act whereby anybody may pick up and save the logs. The large concerns say that it does not pay to pick them up, but in the interest of navigation and for the protection of life it is necessary that these logs should be taken care of.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVILEGE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. B. B. LAW (Yarmouth): Mr. Speaker, I desire to rise to a question of privilege. I call your attention to an article which appeared in the Ottawa Journal on Friday, January 30, 1914, and which reads as follows:

> It is current gossip on Parliament Hill to-day that Hon. W. S. Fielding, who resigned the editorship of the Montreal Herald-Telegraph yesterday, intends to re-enter the House of Commons at an early day. It is said that Mr. B. B. Law, of Yarmouth, N.S., will resign his seat in his favour. Yarmouth is regarded as a safe Liberal constituency, and there is no doubt that the former Finance Minister would be an immense help to the Opposition, which is none too effective at present.

I think it is due to my constituents, who have on four different occasions elected me to a seat in this House, and by handsome majorities, to say, in the first place, that there is absolutely no truth in this statement in so far as it refers to myself. I have never been asked to resign my seat, nor have I any intention of doing so. I propose to stay here and oppose bad legislation whenever it is introduced.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is scarcely to be regarded as a question of privilege, because it does not refer to the hon. gentleman's conduct, nor to his rights and privileges in the House.

THE STEAMER ALERT.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): The hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) on Friday last asked for certain information with regard to the steamer Alert. This information I have obtained from the responsible officer:

The steamer Alert is employed in the Customs Preventive Service on the Cape Breton coast, and does the work formerly carried on by the steamer Gladiator. The Alert is under the command of Captain Voutier, subject to the general orders of the Chief Preventive Officer of Customs. No instructions were given by the minister, commissioner, or the chief preventive officer regarding the conveyance of Messrs. McLeod and Hayes, as stated in the newspaper clipping read by the member for South Cape Breton. On inquiry I find it has been the practice to carry travellers occasionally on the Gladiator and the Alert going to remote points where other conveyance was not available, and when not interfering with the regular cruise of the vessel. In order to ascertain the facts regarding the statement read by the member for South Cape Breton, I instructed the chief preventive officer to telegraph to North Sydney. The chief preventive officer informs me he received a reply stating that the Alert recently on a trip to Neil's Harbour, took on board as travellers, Joseph McNeill, Phillip McLeod and Dr. Hayes. The member for South Cape Breton is aware that certain parts of the coast are inaccessible except by boat, and if on the occasion in question the Alert was not interfering with her regular cruise, I, personally do not see any reason why any one, even the member for

South Cape Breton himself, should not go on board, and proceed to their destination, should the vessel be going in that direction.

PRIVATE BILL.

SECOND READING.

Bill No. 36, respecting the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—Mr. Guilbault.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

MAGDALEN ISLANDS MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Has the mail contract between Bryan and Leslie, Magdalen Islands, been cancelled? If so, for what reasons?

Mr. PELLETIER: No.

LOBSTER FISHING.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Have the lobster fishing regulations been changed as regards Magdalen Islands?
2. Why has the month of September been withdrawn from the lobster fishing season?
3. Was not that month fixed after an investigation?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. In the interest of preserving the lobster fishery. Fishing could be carried on only on a limited portion of the coast in September; it interfered with the mackerel and cod fishery, and it made it much more difficult to prevent illegal fishing during the summer.
3. Yes.

NEW TELESCOPE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the contract been let by the Government to the Warner and Swasey Company, of Cleveland, Ohio, in connection with the building of a telescope?
2. Have any tenders been asked for same? If so, in what papers?
3. How many tenders were received, and from whom?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.
2. Tenders were invited by correspondence from the following firms or individuals: Sir Howard Grubb, Dublin, Ireland; the John A. Brashear Company, Pittsburgh, Pa.; the Warner & Swasey Company, Clveland, Ohio; the Alvan Clark Sons Corporation, Cambridge, Mass.; T. Cooke & Sons, York, England; O. L. Petitdidier, Chicago, Ill.; Professor G. W. Ritchie, Passadena, Cal.; Carl Zeiss, Jena, Germany. Tenders were not advertised for in the newspapers.
3. Tenders were received as follows: For the construction of the mechanical parts from the Warner & Swasey Company and Sir Howard Grubb; for the construction of the optical parts from the John A. Brashear Company, the Alvan Clark Sons Corporation and Sir Howard Grubb.

MARLINE TWINE DUTY.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Is the Government aware that unbarked marline used in the lobster fishing industry is subject in the general tariff column to a duty of 25 per cent?
2. Does the Government intend to place this twine on the free list?

Mr. REID:

1. The Government is aware that under the general tariff of 1907, as introduced by the Government of that day and enacted, unbarked marline is dutiable at 25 per cent.
2. The intentions of the Government regarding the tariff will be known when the Budget Speech is made.

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Is it the intention of the Government to readjust the Provincial subsidies during the present session of Parliament?

Mr. BORDEN: The matter is under consideration.

ELECTORAL CORRUPTION.

*Mr. SINCLAIR:

Is it the intention of the Government to make provision during the present session of Parliament for the appointment of a public prosecutor to act in case of electoral corruption.

Mr. BORDEN: The matter is under consideration.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

Is it the intention of the Government to make more effective provisions to punish bribery and fraud at elections; to expedite the hearing of election petitions and to prevent collusive arrangements for the withdrawal or compromise thereof; to provide for a thorough investigation of corrupt practices, and if necessary, to appoint an independent prosecuting officer charged with that duty; to simplify the procedure thereof and to enforce the laws so amended?

Mr. BORDEN: The subject has been and is now under the consideration of the hon. Minister of Justice. There is a motion,

moreover, on the Order Paper, No. 123, covering the same subject, standing under the name of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean).

VANCOUVER ISLAND COLLIERY STRIKE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Referring to the investigation conducted by the Minister of Labour in connection with the strike of colliery workers on Vancouver Island, British Columbia, what was the total number of underground workmen employed in the Canadian Collieries by the Dunsmuir Limited in May, 1913?
2. How many of the said underground employees of said company were Orientals?
3. Are mining licenses granted to Orientals employed in the British Columbia collieries? If so, under what authority?
4. What is the total number of Orientals employed in the British Columbia collieries?
5. Does the Government intend to take any steps to prohibit the employment of oriental labour in British Columbia, or elsewhere in Canada? If so, what is proposed?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. 690.
2. 432.
3. It is understood that under provincial regulations certificates of fitness are issued by a board of examiners.
4. No information.
5. The Government is informed that this question has in certain aspects been the subject of legislative action in British Columbia. So far as it may in any case be properly the subject of federal legislation, the intention of the Government will be announced in due course.

ANNAPOLIS COUNTY MAILS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Were tenders asked for in 1912 for the carriage of mails between Bridgetown and Port Lorne, Hampton and Parker's Cove, Annapolis County, N.S.?
2. If so, to whom was the contract awarded?
3. From whom were tenders received and for what amounts?
4. Was the contract awarded to the lowest bidder? If not, for what reason?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. The contract was awarded to Jeremiah Hawkins, subject to the usual inquiries as to his fitness for the position and the insufficiency of his security. The inspector found that Mr. Hawkins was unable to read ordinary writing or to write anything except his own name. It was also reported that he was intemperate. In these circumstances the department withdrew the award to Hawkins, and accepted the offer of the next lowest tenderer, Daly Saulnier.
3. Jeremiah Hawkins, Hampton, $320; Daly Saulnier, Hampton, $400, (reduced to $375); Norman Grant, West Arlington, $425; Jos. E. Marshall, Hampton, $532; S. S. Brinton, St. Croix Cove, $499; G. K. O'Neal, Hampton, $400; Elijah Ristern, Hampton, $400; G. K. O'Neal, Hampton, (late), $379.
4. Answered by No. 2.

HALIFAX FORTIFICATIONS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Is it the practice of the Department of Militia and Defence to require from applicants for labour upon fortification work, at Ferguson's Cove, or near Halifax harbour, a recommendation from any Patronage Committee, or any person or persons not an officer or permanent employee of the department?
2. If not, by whom is such labour procured on behalf of the Department of Militia and Defence?

Mr. HUGHES: It is the practice of the Department of Militia and Defence to require from the applicants for labour upon fortification works at Ferguson's Cove, near Halifax, or elsewhere, under this department, evidence that each is a competent and desirable man.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY LAND VALUATOR.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Who is the land valuator in connection with lands expropriated for the Dartmouth to Dean's Settlement Branch of the Intercolonial railway of Canada now under construction?
2. What is the remuneration paid for such services?
3. What amount has been paid to date?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Thomas E. Stewart.
2. $5 per day, with an allowance of $2 per day for expenses while he is actually engaged in the work.
3. $3,255.

HALIFAX POST OFFICE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Has any property been purchased or agreed to be purchased on Gottingen street, Halifax, Nova Scotia, as a site for a proposed post office building?
2. If so, from whom was it purchased, or agreed to be purchased; what is the exact location and area of the same and the price therefor?

Mr. PELLETIER: No purchase nor agreement to purchase has yet been made, but the matter is under consideration by the department.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY—PAYMENTS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

What amounts have been paid, with the dates thereof, to the Canadian Northern Ontario

railway, and the Canadian Northern Alberta railway, by the Government of Canada, under the provisions of Chapter 10 of the Statutes of Canada, 1913?

Mr. COCHRANE: $1,363,122.39 to Canadian Northern Ontario railway; $242,424 to Canadian Northern Alberta railway.

CANADIAN NAVAL SERVICE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. How many officers and men respectively are now enlisted under the Canadian Naval Service Act?

2. How many officers and men respectively are at present enlisted on H.M.C.S. Niobe?

3. What was the total expenditure of all kinds in connection with H.M.C.S. Niobe, during the calendar year 1913?

4. What was the total cost of administration of the Naval Service Department at Ottawa for the calendar year 1913?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. On December 15, 1913: 45 officers and 19 midshipmen, 246 petty officers and men.

2. On December 15, 1913: 14 officers, 153 petty officers and men.

3. $317,881.55.

4. The total expenditure from the Votes of the Department of the Naval Service for the calendar year 1913 was $2,364,322.98.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. What is the number of men forming the crew of the Niobe?

2. What is the number of Canadians now on this vessel?

3. How many soldiers have deserted or abandoned the service since her arrival in Canadian waters?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. On 15th January, 1914, officers 14, petty officers and men 155.

2. Number of persons entered in Canada, serving in Niobe on 15th January, 1914:—Officers, 8; petty officers and men, 75.

3. Number of seamen who have left service up to 15th January, 1914:—

Dead, 9; run, 241; services no longer required, 57; own request, 102; invalided, 21; time expired, 100; by purchase, 18; total, 548.

HUDSON BAY TERMINALS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. What steamers were chartered by any department of the Government of Canada for service in connection with the construction of the Hudson bay railway terminals at Port Nelson during the year 1913?

2. What was the tonnage of each, from whom were they chartered, and at what cost?

3. What was the nature of the work each was engaged in during the season?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The following steamers were chartered by the Department of Railways and Canals: Cearense, Alcazar, Bonaventure, Bellaventure, Sindbad, Alette.

2. Cearense: tonnage, 1,790, net register; chartered from John F. O'Meara, New York; cost: $20 per M. Ft. B.M. lumber, $10 per gross ton, coal.

Alcazar: tonnage: 2,020, net register; chartered from Inter-American Steamship Co., Ltd., Toronto; cost: $25 per M. Ft. B.M. lumber, $15 per gross ton, coal.

Bonaventure: tonnage: 467, net register; chartered from Bonaventure Steamship Co., Ltd., St. Johns, Newfoundland; cost: $5,500 per month.

Bellaventure: tonnage: 467, net register; chartered from Bellaventure Steamship Co., Ltd., St. Johns, Newfoundland; cost: $5,500 per month.

Sindbad: tonnage: 539 net register; chartered from Franklin E. Hall, Montreal; cost: $4,500 per month.

Alette: tonnage: 1,937, net register; chartered from Timber Transport, Ltd. (O. W. Mordin, Managing Director); cost: $25 per M. Ft. B.M., for lumber.

3. Cearense's cargo was largely bituminous coal from North Sydney, lumber and general goods from Halifax.

Alcazar's cargo was all hard pine from Port Arthur, Texas.

Bonaventure's cargo, on her first trip, was a general and men.

Bellaventure's cargo, on her first trip, was a general and men.

Sindbad's cargo, general.

Alette's cargo, hard pine from Port Arthur, Texas, lumber and timber from Halifax; as well as two steel sectional scows from Halifax.

Bonaventure's second trip was general cargo from Halifax and men.

Bellaventure's second trip from North Sydney, coal and towing of dredge Port Nelson to Nelson.

The Beothic chartered by the Department of Naval Service also had as cargo a quantity of general merchandise for this department, and men for Nelson.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. From whom did the Deaprtment of Railways and Canals purchase the steamer Kathleen for service in connection with Hudson bay railway construction?

2. What amount was paid to the owner for the said steamer and were negotiations for the purchase made with the owner? If not, with whom?

3. What is her age, tonnage, and horse power?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The steamer Kathleen was purchased from William M. P. Webster.

2. $10,000 being the price established by tender received as result of newspaper advertisement. Tender was made by Webster, Smith & Co., W. M. P. Webster. The bill of sale was signed by W. M. P. Webster.

3. Age: registered December 7, 1907, at Liverpool, N.S. Tonnage: gross, 62·50; registered, 38·49. Horse-power: nominal h.p., 16·66; indicated h.p., 120.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Were any scows purchased by the Department of Railways and Canals for use in connection with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway or Port Nelson terminals?

2. If so, from whom, what was the cost and were tenders solicited for the construction of the same?

3. Of what and how are the same constructed?

4. Were the scows used for any purpose during the season of 1913? If not, why not?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.

2. The contract was for one steel tow barge and two sectional scows. The lowest tender, that of the Thor Ironworks, of Toronto, was accepted, a total cost of $19,142.26. The estimated cost of each scow is about $6,000.

3. Steel, each scow being composed of five pontoon sections.

4. No. Scows formed part of cargo of steamship Alette which left harbour before being unloaded.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. From whom was the lighter or barge Neophyte for use in the construction of the Port Nelson terminals during 1913, purchased, and at what price?

2. Of what construction, age and tonnage is the Neophyte?

3. What was the total amount of service or work performed during 1913 by the lighter or barge Neophyte?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Motor schooner Neophyte was purchased from the Navigation Syndicate, Limited, of Nordin, N.B., for £4,000 sterling.

2. Steel construction throughout, built to the German Lloyd requirements, 1910, registered tonnage 96.72; capacity 188 tons on a 7-foot draft.

3. From her arrival at Port Nelson, August 14, 1913, until the departure of the last steamer out, on October 13, the Neophyte made 43 round trips with cargo from ship's anchorage to temporary wharf at Root creek.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. From whom did the Government of Canada purchase the dredge Port Nelson, and what was her cost?

2. Of what description, size and capacity is the dredge Port Nelson?

3. What was the cost of delivering the same from the point of purchase or construction to Port Nelson?

4. Was the same built or purchased by tender and contract?

Mr. COCHRANE:

(a) Polson Ironworks, Limited.

(b) $272,184.02, which includes spare parts and some special equipment for towing to Port Nelson.

2. 24-in. suction dredge, steel hull, 180 feet long, 44 feet beam, depth at side 11 feet; main engines, 14-in., 22-in., 36-in. x 21-in.; main boilers (2), 13-in. x 11 ft. 9 in.; discharge pipes and necessary pontoon 3,000 feet long. Dredge equipped with machine shops, wrecking pumps, etc., for general service at Port Nelson.

3. The steamers which towed the dredge to Port Nelson also carried coal, of which 206 tons were unloaded at Port Nelson, also some supplies utilized in the towing, such as timber in bulkheads, cables, etc., were purchased with a view to their subsequent use in connection with the terminal work and left at Nelson. Further, the hull of the stern wheel tug and some plant were loaded on the dredge, thus saving the freight charges otherwise necessitated by their transportation.

In view of the above circumstances it is not possible to give a precise answer; it is estimated that the cost of towing the dredge from Montreal to Port Nelson and placing her in winter quarters was $29,457.79.

4. By tender and contract.

HUDSON BAY FISHERIES.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Was any person employed by the Government of Canada during the year 1913 to make a survey or report of the fishery resources of Hudson bay? If so, whom and what is his occupation?

2. Did such person have any experience in, or qualification for, such work? If so, what experience or qualification?

3. By whom was he recommended to the Government, what remuneration did he receive and what were his exact duties?

4. Did he perform any service whatever for such remuneration? If so, what?

5. Did he make any report to the Government upon the fisheries of Hudson bay? If so, is the same available to the House?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes, to make a preliminary survey. Professor J. B. McCarthy, M.A., MSc., of University of King's College. Professor of Science.

2. He was well qualified on account of his scientific training.

3. The department being aware of his scientific qualifications, asked him if he would undertake the investigation. $200 per month. To procure sufficient preliminary information regarding the fishes, and food of fishes in the bay to enable an intelligent decision to be reached as to the desirability of this year sending a vessel to the bay to make a thorough fisheries survey thereof.

4. Yes. He went on the Beothic to Hudson bay, and gained such information as the conditions permitted.

5. He did not make a report regarding the fisheries of Hudson bay itself, as the conditions were such that he could not carry on investigations when sailing across it.

BATHURST HARBOUR DREDGING.

Mr. TURGEON:

1. What was the quantity by cubic yards of dredging done by dredge Saint Lawrence in Bathurst harbour, both on the outside bar and inside bar during the months of July, August, September and October, 1913?

Mr. ROGERS:

July, 17,400 cubic yards; August, 21,200 cubic yards; September, 13,200 cubic yards; October, 11,200 cubic yards.

Mr. TURGEON:

1. What is the quantity in cubic yards of dredging done in Bathurst harbour by the contractors during the season of 1913?

Mr. ROGERS:

226,080 cubic yards.

Mr. TURGEON:

1. Why was the dredge Restigouche taken away from Bathurst harbour last July and August?

2. Where was said dredge operating during those months?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Material at Bathurst proved to be difficult for this dredge, and she was replaced by the bucket ladder dredge St. Lawrence.

2. On urgent work on The Horseshoe and The Lump, Miramichi Bay, July 18 to August 27, and on Restigouche river August 29 to November 4.

BATHURST PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. TURGEON:

1. Who is the local foreman in charge of public Works at breakwater of Shippegan Gully, Gloucester county, N.B.?

Mr. ROGERS:

Sam. G. Robichaud.

[Mr. Hazen.]

CUSTOMS OFFICERS, GLOUCESTER. N. B.

Mr. TURGEON:

Did the sub-collectors of customs at Lameque (Shippegan) and Tracadie, Gloucester county, N. B., obtain permission from the Minister of Customs to offer as candidates in the municipal election in Gloucester county in October, 1913?

Mr. REID: No.

FISHERIES ADVISORY BOARD.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

What amount has been paid to date to Gideon A. Hemeon as a member of the Fisheries Advisory Board, for allowance and for expenses, respectively?

Mr. HAZEN: Allowance, $220; expenses, $202.80.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

What amount has been paid to date to W. C. Smith of Lunenburg, N.S., as a member of the Fisheries Advisory Board, for allowances and for expenses, respectively?

Mr. HAZEN: Allowance, $210; expenses, $185.70.

Mr. W. A. CHISHOLM:

1. Who are the members of the Fisheries Advisory Board, and what are their home addresses.

2. What salaries do they receive, respectively, if any?

3. What amounts have been paid to each member of the board, for travelling and other expenses?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. C. H. B. Longworth, Charlottetown, P.E.I.; H. B. Short, Digby, N.S.; Gideon Hemeon, Arnold, N.S.; W. C. Smith, Lunenburg, N.S.; Andrew King, Halifax, N.S.; F. T. B. Young, Caraquet, N.B.; Andrew B. Carson, Rexton, N.B.; P. P. Russell, St. Andrews, N.B.; Azade Arseneault, Grindstone, M.I.; D. R. Reid, Selkirk, Manitoba; John E. Sinclair, Prince Albert, Sask.; C. D. Melvill, Edmonton, Alta.; D. M. McIntyre, Victoria, B.C.; F. H. Cunningham, Chief Inspector of Fisheries, New Westminster, B.C.; the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, chairman, Ottawa; the Deputy Minister of Naval Service, Ottawa; the Superintendent of Fisheries, Ottawa, the Commissioner of Fisheries, Ottawa; the Assistant to the Superintendent of Fisheries, Ottawa; the Expert in the Curing and Handling of Fish, Ottawa.

2. No salary, but the outside members receive an allowance of $10 per day, and travelling expenses when attending the meetings of the board, or the committees thereof.

3. C. H. Longworth, $224.56; H. B. Short, $225.90; Gideon Hemeon, $202.80;

Captain W. C. Smith, $185.70; F. T. B. Young, $191.21; A. B. Carson, $129.80; P. P. Russell, $154.10; Azade Arseneault, $151.85; D. F. Reid, $199.50; J. E. Sinclair, $288.75; C. D. Melvill, $359.40; D. M. McIntyre, $475.

SHELBURNE COUNTY FISHERIES.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

What amount was paid to George T. Walls, fishery overseer, Shelburne county, N. S., in the years 1912 and 1913 respectively, for salary or allowances, travelling fees or mileage, and other disbursements?

Mr. HAZEN: 1912, wages, $50; expenses, $150. 1913, wages, $150; expenses, $1,502.83.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

What amount was paid during the years 1912 and 1913 respectively, to the following fishery guardians in the county of Shelburne, N.S.; George Loughwest, Lockport; Bertram O. Bower, Upper Ohio; Sydney Smith, Jordan Falls; Fred Poole, East Jordan, and H. C. Dash, Louis Head, for salary and allowances, travelling fees or mileage, and other disbursements?

Mr. HAZEN: George Loughwest, nil; B. O. Bower, nil. Sydney Smith, 1912, wages, $30; 1913, wages, $30. Fred. Poole, 1912, nil; 1913, wages, $16.67. H. C. Dash, 1912, wages, $59; 1913, wages, $119.55.

FENIAN RAID BOUNTIES.

*Mr. SINCLAIR:

Prior to December 31, 1913, how many veterans applied to the Department of Militia and Defence for a bounty under the provisions of the Fenian Raid Volunteer Bounty Act, and how many of said veterans were paid such bounty prior to said date?

Mr. HUGHES:

1. Prior to December 31, 1913, 34,050 veterans applied to the Department of Militia and Defence for a bounty under the provisions of The Fenian Raid Volunteer Bounty Act.

2. To be answered by Department of Finance.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. How many Fenian Raid Veterans have received the Government Grant of $100 provided for by law?
2. How many requests have been refused?
3. How many requests are still under consideration?

Mr. HUGHES:

1. I would ask that the first question stand, inasmuch as the answer is not ready and belongs to another department.

2. 3,405.

3. 14,337.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Has the Government considered the advisability of amending the Fenian Raid Volunteer Bounty Act, so as to make provision for the payment of the bounty to the widows of veterans who departed this life prior to April, 1912?

Mr. HUGHES: The Act will be amended, if necessary, to meet every case not settled yet.

POULSEN WIRELESS STATIONS.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. What progress has been made in connection with the proposed establishment of the Poulsen wireless?
2. Have any stations been built in Canada? If so, where?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. The whole thing is well under way.
2. A station is being built in Newcastle, N.B.

GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a commission to investigate the conditions of lake navigation?

Mr. HAZEN: Soon after the disaster which occurred on the Great Lakes in the month of November last, steps were taken to ascertain if it was the intention of the United States, whose shipping had sustained greater loss and damage than Canada's, to appoint any commission of investigation and inquiry, and it was learned that there was no such intention. The Department of Marine believed that any inquiry, to be effective, should be international in its character; and in view of this, and of the further fact that it was informed that it was the intention of a member of the House at the present session to move for a parliamentary committee of inquiry, it was not decided that the appointment of a commission was desirable or necessary.

The following Canadian vessels, which were stranded during the storm on the Great Lakes during the month of November, were the subject of investigation by the Wreck Commissioner:

SS. Turret Chief, owned by the Canadian Lake and Ocean Navigation Co., Ltd., of Montreal; stranded on Keweenaw Point, U.S.A., in lake Superior, at 4 a.m., 8th November, 1913, and still remains there. Crew all saved. Formal investigation held November 21 at Kingston. Master censured by court.

SS. Acadian, owned by the Canadian Interlake Line, Limited, Toronto; stranded on shoals near Sulphur island, Thunder bay, U.S.A., in lake Huron, at 4.20 p.m., November 9, 1913. Crew all saved. Towed off November 19, and is now undergoing repairs. Formal investigation held in Toronto, January 30, 1914. Finding not yet rendered.

These two appear to be the only Canadian vessels whose crews were saved, and direct evidence as to casualty obtainable.

PARCEL POST.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. What progress has been made towards the establishment of parcel post?
2. Have the rates been fixed? If so, what are they?
3. What additional compensation, if any, is to be paid to the railway companies?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. The progress made is such that parcel post will be an accomplished fact on February 10.

2. The rates have been fixed and are contained in the regulations of which they form a part. The Postmaster General laid these regulations on the table of the House a few days ago.

3. The department at the same time has succeeded in settling the question of the transportation of parcel post with the railway companies, and the other long outstanding and difficult question of the general increase, over which the railway companies have been so keen and insistent for a number of years. The demand of the railway companies in this respect was for an increase of about $4,000,000, and moreover, for compensation in connection with parcel post, but the whole matter has been settled by the adoption of a car mile instead of a track mile basis, and the Accounting branch of the Post Office Departpartment estimates that this increase will be about $786,000 for 1914-15. No special or additional compensation will be paid to the railway companies on account of parcel post.

ROYAL SOCIETY OF CANADA.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

Is it the intention of the Government to erect a public building for the Royal Society of Canada?

Mr. ROGERS: A petition was presented by the Royal Society to the Minister of Public Works asking that accommodation should be provided for it in the new departmental buildings on Wellington street. The matter is under consideration.

KITSILANO INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Has the Kitsilano Indian Reserve in British Columbia been acquired by the Dominion Government?
2. If so, at what price and on what terms has it been acquired?
3. To whom has the price, if any, been paid?
4. What disposition does the Government intend to make of the land in the reserve, if it has acquired such land?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No.

2, 3 and 4 answered by No. 1.

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION.

Mr. OLIVER:

Is the order in prohibiting the entry of skilled or unskilled labourers at certain British Columbia ports so administered as to prevent the entry of Chinese and Japanese labourers?

Mr. ROCHE:

The regulation contained in P. C. 2642 was made under the authority of subsection 3, of section 38, of the Immigration Act, 9-10 Edward VII, and applies to Chinese immigration only in so far as it is not inconsistent with the provisions of Chapter 95, R.S.C., 1906, as amended by Chapter 14, 7-8 Edward VII. In view of the existing agreement with Japan, and in order to give the Japanese authorities an opportunity to advise their subjects of the change in regulations, immigration officials at Vancouver and Victoria were notified not to enforce provisions against Japanese sailing before December 27, 1913.

Mr. OLIVER:

Why were certain Hindus recently admitted to Canada on an order of Chief Justice Hunter, instead of being excluded under the authority vested in the Minister of the Interior by section 23, of the Immigration Act?

Mr. ROCHE:

The Hindus referred to were not admitted by order of Chief Justice Hunter, but the proceedings taken to exclude them failed, because, upon a writ of Habeas Corpus, the Honourable Chief Justice held that Orders in Council 920 and 926, under which it was sought to exclude such Hindus, were not authorized by the Immigration Act, and consequently that the provisions of section 23 of said Act did not apply to proceedings under said Orders in Council, the same not being proceedings under the authority and in accordance with

the provisions of said Act. In view of this decision, new Orders in Council have been passed to overcome the objections.

IMMIGRATION REGULATIONS.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. At what date of the year 1913, were the provisions of Order in Council No. 924, dated May 9, 1910, and requiring immigrants to have in their actual or personal possession on their arrival in Canada the sum of twenty-five dollars ($25.00) suspended or relaxed?

2. For what period was such suspension or relaxation continued?

3. In what terms was notice of such suspension or relaxation conveyed to the officers of the department?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Between the first day of April and the last day of September, 1913.

2. The concession was withdrawn on the 3rd of May, 1913, so far as it concerned railroad and general labourers going to the province of British Columbia. It was also withdrawn on the 28th of May, as touching all labour going to Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, and on the 6th of June the relaxation of P. C. 924 was entirely withdrawn as touching immigrants arriving on and after the 30th of that month.

3. In two circular letters, dated the 12th of March, 1913, reading:

(a) The Superintendent of Immigration hereby gives notice that the money qualification will be waived this year, between the 1st April and last day of September, in favour of persons coming from Great Britain or Ireland, to assured permanent employment in Canada, who have in their possession a card of consent signed by any of the regular Departmental Agents in Great Britain or Ireland, and who pass the medical examination and have the means of reaching their employment.

This concession will be construed strictly by port agents as applying exclusively to natives or citizens of Great Britain and Ireland.

(b) The Superintendent of Immigration hereby gives notice to all concerned that between the 1st of April, proximo, and the last day of September, this year, railroad and general labourers will be admitted to Canada without money qualification, if coming to assured permanent employment, provided they are natives or citizens of Great Britain, or Ireland, or if natives or citizens of some other European country, provided they come by a continuous journey from that country, and provided also:

(1) They pass the usual medical examination at port of landing.

(2) Have documentary or other sufficient evidence of definite employment to go to.

(3) Have the means of reaching place of employment in Canada, and,

(4) They are not persons of Asiatic origin.

The above concessions will cease without further notice on the last day of September, 1913.

IMMIGRATION STATISTICS.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. What number of immigrants from the British Isles arrived during each of the calendar years 1911, 1912, 1913?

2. What number of immigrants from the continent of Europe arrived in Canada during each of the calendar years 1911, 1912 and 1913?

3. What number of immigrants from the United States arrived in Canada during each of the calendar years 1911, 1912 and 1913?

4. What number of people left Canada as immigrants to the United States during the calendar years 1911, 1912 and 1913?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. 1911, 144,076; 1912, 145,859; 1913, 156,984.

2. 1911, 75,184; 1912, 109,802; 1913, 146,135.

3. 1911, 131,114; 1912, 140,143; 1913, 115,751.

4. No figures available.

Mr. OLIVER:

How many Chinese immigrants arrived in Canada during each of the calendar years 1911, 1912 and 1913?

Mr. ROCHE:

1911	6,817
1912	7,146
11 months of 1913	5,988

Complete returns for December, 1913, not yet available.

Mr. OLIVER:

How many Japanese immigrants arrived in Canada during each of the calendar years 1911, 1912 and 1913?

Mr. ROCHE:

1911	727
1912	675
1913	886

Mr. OLIVER:

How many Hindu immigrants arrived in Canada during each of the calendar years 1911, 1912 and 1913?

Mr. ROCHE:

1911	14
1912	5
1913	88

EMPLOYMENT OF JOSHUA FLETCHER.

Mr. OLIVER:

Is Joshua Fletcher in the employ of the Department of the Interior in the Grand Prairie Land Agency.

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

CANADIAN OFFICE IN LONDON.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

Has the Government leased or purchased any site in London, England, with a view to transfer the Canadian office from its present site at 17 Victoria street?

Mr. BORDEN: The Government have not purchased or leased any such site in London.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

Has the Government received a copy of the following resolution passed on Friday, December 26, 1913, at 8 p.m., by the Executive Board of the Chambre de Commerce, of Montreal?

Your commission has apprised itself of all that has been said, written and made since twenty years by the Chamber and outside of it on the Georgian Bay canal question, since fifty years, that this question has been before the public, and, after deliberation, it recommends the adoption of the following resolution. It also recommends that copies of this resolution be forwarded to all public bodies, commercial and municipal, in order to obtain their help and adherence, and, thereby, assume the success of energetical, powerful and decisive pressure on the Government.

Whereas, the necessity of the construction of Georgian Bay canal is now so well acknowledged by all, that further arguments in its favour are now useless.

2. Whereas, the federal Government has already obtained all the necessary information as regards its possibility, its cost and the results which would be brought by the fulfilling of this great national enterprise.

3. Whereas, the leaders of the different governments at Ottawa have declared themselves in favour of the project.

4. Whereas, at its last session, the Government announced that the canal would not be built until a new commission be appointed to ascertain the commercial results of the scheme, which commission was to make a report at the next session of Parliament

Whereas, the session is now at hand, and this commission has not yet been appointed;

Be it resolved, that the Chambre de Commerce du district de Montreal reiterates with energy its demand on the federal Government for the construction of the Georgian Bay canal within the shortest delay, and assurances of its building at the impending session.

6. That the Chambre de Commerce du district de Montreal protests with all its might against all measures which would entail delay in the realization of this great national project.

Humbly submitted,
A. P. Frigon,
President of Special Commission.

Mr. BORDEN: Yes.

THE STEFANSSON EXPEDITION.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. When was the steamer Karaluk last heard from?
2. Where was she at that time?
3. What was her condition then?
4. When was Mr. V. Stefansson last heard from?
5. Where was he then?
6. What was his condition at that time?
7. What were his intentions then?
8. What steps were taken to satisfy the Government that the reports of unfitness of the Karaluk for the work of the expedition, circulated before her departure for the Arctic, were unfounded?

Mr. HAZEN:

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. The last report from Mr. V. Stefansson was dated from Point Barrow, October 30. He stated that the Karaluk which had been supposed to be frozen in for the winter, had drifted out with the ice pack on September 23. The ship was then in good condition. Mr. Stefansson intended to proceed east and explore the MacKenzie delta, Banks land and possibly Prince Patrick island.

8. Before recommending the purchase of this vessel, Mr. Stefansson had her inspected by Captain Pedersen, a whaling captain of experience, and by shipping inspectors, and stated that she was the best vessel available for the expedition.

On leaving Victoria Mr. Stefansson stated that the vessel had been extremely well repaired and outfitted, and that in the opinion of Captain Bartlett, who was familiar with Peary's equipment, and of Mr. Murray, who was familiar with Shackleton's, the expedition was equipped in more detail than either of the above. Mr. Stefansson's opinion was that the expedition was extremely well equipped for the work before it.

HOMESTEAD AND PRE-EMPTION ENTRIES.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. How many homestead entries were granted during each of the calendar years 1911, 1912, and 1913 in the three prairie provinces?
2. How many pre-emption entries were granted during each of the calendar years 1911, 1912 and 1913?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. 1911, 38,585; 1912, 35,226; 1913, 29,640. The returns from Peace river and Grand Prairie for the week ending December 31, 1913, have not yet been received.
2. 1911, 10,583; 1912, 8,947; 1913, 6,483.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CAR CHARGES.

Mr. REID (Restigouche):

1. What are the rental and other charges on cars and equipment of the Canadian Pacific railwaf in the service of the Intercolonial railway or handled by the latter railway?
2. What are the rates or rental charges on passenger, baggage, dining, sleeping and express cars, and on freight and refrigerator cars and other cars, if any?

3. What amount was paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by the Intercolonial railway for the handling of Canadian Pacific railway passenger, dining, sleeping, express and baggage car service over the Intercolonial railway line between St. John and Halifax, during the period between April 1, 1913, and January 1, 1914?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. On cars moved on the regular trains and steamship specials between St. John and Halifax, by an agreement entered into in 1890 between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Intercolonial railway, the Intercolonial railway hauls the passenger trains of the Canadian Pacific railway between St. John and Halifax, and collects the whole of the passenger earnings of such trains between those points, allowing the Canadian Pacific railway the following rates: Sleeping cars, no charge; dining cars, 60 per cent of 3c.; first-class cars, 60 per cent of 3c.; second-class cars, 60 per cent of 2c.; baggage cars, 60 per cent of 2c.; mail and express cars, 60 per cent of 2c.

2. On cars hired by the Intercolonial for its use and in the earnings from which the Canadian Pacific railway does not participate, the rate is: First-class cars, according to seating capacity, $5, $7 or $8 per day; second-class, $5 per day; express and all mail cars, according to length, $3, $4 or $5 per day; the rate on all freight, box, refrigerator, flat, stock or tank cars is 45c. per day.

3. The amount paid the Canadian Pacific railway during period from April 1, 1913, to January 1, 1914, is $18,516.55.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY BRANCH LINES.

*Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation during the present session relating to the acquisition of branch lines connecting with the Intercolonial railway?

2. Does the Government, or the Department of Railways and Canals, propose to take any action, now or in the near future, with a view to securing by purchase or lease any one, or any of the branch lines connecting with the Intercolonial railway? If so, which of said branch lines?

3. Are any negotiations now pending in that direction? If so, in relation to which particular railway or railways?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. In view of the action of the Senate at the last session, it is not considered that the introduction of such legislation during the present session would be of any use.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Does the Government intend to provide for the construction of a branch line of the Intercolonial railway into Guysborough County, Nova Scotia, during the present session?

Mr. COCHRANE: The matter is under consideration.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has any progress been made since last session towards the acquisition by the Government of the Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic, Quebec and Lake Superior railways, as feeders and branch lines of the Intercolonial railway? If so, what is it?

2. If not, can any explanation be given, and what is it?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.

2. On account of the measure for the acquiring of such lines having been defeated by the Senate at the last session.

LETTER BOXES IN SOUTH BRUCE.

Mr. KYTE:

1. What is the population of the village of Chesley, South Riding of Bruce?

2. Have letter boxes been placed on the streets of Chesley by the Post Office Department? If so, how many and on what date were they placed there?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. When the last census was taken, the population was 1,734.

2. Six street letter boxes were erected in Chesley on the 17th October, 1913.

Mr. KYTE:

1. What is the population of the town of Walkerton, South Riding of Bruce?

2. Have letter boxes been placed on the streets? If so, how many and on what date were they so placed?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. The last census gives the population of Walkerton, in the South Riding of Bruce, as 2,601.

2. On the 30th April, 1913, seventeen street letter boxes were erected in Walkerton.

EGANVILLE POST OFFICE.

*Mr. GRAHAM:

Has the Government fully decided to erect the Eganville post office on the north side of the river in that village?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

H. P. DUCHEMIN.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Why has the order of the House passed on the 29th day of January, 1913, calling for

papers relating to H. P. Duchemin, not been complied with?

Mr. PERLEY: The papers in answer to this order were brought down in the House of Commons by the Secretary of State, on the 22nd January, 1914.

ST. PETER'S RESERVE.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Have patents been issued by the Indian Department to all the purchasers of lands on the St. Peter's Indian reserve. Manitoba?
2. If any have not been issued, who are the several purchasers affected?
3. If patents have not been issued, what is the reason?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No.
2. H. Kolurznick, J. A. Dyma, The Selkirk and Northern Land Company, John Swerthen, The Western Trust Co., W. Kosack, A. B. Funk, W. McCorrister, F. W. Kooker, Wm. Bird, Chas. Bird and J. Cessford, H. Sable, L. J. Schalme, Peter Bear, H. Moortignowich, O. S. Jones.
3. It is not at present considered advisable to issue patents to lands on the St. Peter's reserve.

DRILL HALL AT EDMONTON.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. (a) Has a contract been let for the construction of a drill hall at Edmonton? (b) If so, what is the amount of the contract, and (c) who is the contractor?
2. When is the building to be commenced, and when completed?
3. Has the city of Edmonton donated a suitable site?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. (a) Yes; (b) $286,000, and for additional concrete, if required, $15 a cubic yard; (c) P. Lyall & Sons, Construction Company.
2. Contractor may start operations immediately; building to be completed by 8th January, 1916.
3. Yes.

ATHABASKA LANDING-FORT McMURRAY TELEGRAPH.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. To what distance and to what point has the proposed telegraph line between Athabaska Landing and Fort McMurray been completed?
2. Between what points is the line in operation?
3. When was construction commenced?
4. What amount has been expended on construction to date?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Line completed to Duncan's Creek, 57 miles, beyond which point the right-of-way has been cleared for a further distance of 42 miles to a point 20 miles south of Pelican Rapids.
2. No offices yet established on the line.
3. June 5, 1912.
4. $27,004.43.

MAIL BAG LOCK.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has any mail lock been patented since the 19th of March, 1913?
2. If so, under what number?
3. Who are the patentees?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.
2. No. 151,043.
3. Mr. F. W. Carling.

BREAKWATER, LITTLE RIVER EAST.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to build a breakwater at Little River East, county of Gaspé?
2. Have any tenders been received for same?
3. If so, from whom and what is the amount of the tender in each case?
4. Has any contract been awarded? If so, to whom?

Mr. ROGERS:

1 and 2. Tenders have been received for the construction of this breakwater, and are now under consideration.

3 and 4. As the contract has not yet been awarded, it is not customary to give this information.

QUEBEC QUARANTINE INSPECTORS.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many medical inspectors have been appointed in connection with the quarantine immigration offices at the port of Quebec since the 1st of October, 1911?
2. What are the names and salaries respectively?
3. How many were employed during the year 1910?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Eleven medical immigration inspectors.
2. Dr. Jos Dobbin, $600 per annum; Dr. Arthur Leclerc, $500 per annum; Dr. J. P. DeBlois, $500 per annum; Dr. Albert Jobin, $500 per annum; Dr. Albert Drouin, $500 per annum; Dr. V. Martin, $500 per annum; Dr. W. Verge, $500 per annum; Dr. Emile Dupont, $600 per annum; Dr. J. L. Gilbert, $600 per annum; Dr. Pierre Lagueux, $600 per annum; Dr. J. E. Grondin, $600 per annum.
3. Five.

MARGAREE HARBOUR.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM:

1. What amounts have been spent by the Government of Canada on harbour improve-

ments at Margaree harbour, Inverness county, N.S., since 1872?

2. What amounts have been spent on repairs to piers and wharfs at this harbour?

Mr. ROGERS: Dredging, $6,805.93; construction and improvements, $54,101.79; repairs, $7,857.79; total, $68,765.51.

PORT HOOD PUBLIC WHARF.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM:

What amounts have been spent by the Federal Government in building and repairing the public wharf at Port Hood, Inverness county, N.S.?

Mr. ROGERS: Construction, $52,695.07; repairs, $17,477.14; total, $70,172.21.

GUYSBOROUGH PUBLIC WHARFS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

What is the gross amount expended by the Government on public wharfs of all kinds in the county of Guysborough, N.S., since October 11, 1911, excluding all expenditures provided for in estimates submitted to Parliament prior to October, 1911?

Mr. ROGERS: $10,733.84, as follows: Burying island, $50; Cole harbour, $1.31; Cunningham's point, $508.42; Drum Head, $492.94; Ecum Secum, $687.65; Melford, $7,702.38; Middle Country Harbour, $21; Milford Haven, $315.05; Port Beckerton, $450.44; St. Mary's river, $504.65; total, $10,733.84.

AID TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What is the gross amount of railway subsidies authorized by Parliament since the present Administration came into power?

2. Since October, 1911, what amount has been loaned or advanced by the Government to railway companies?

3. Since October, 1911, what is the gross amount of liability assumed by the Government in guaranteeing the bonds or securities of railway companies?

4. What is the amount paid by the Government up to December 31, 1913, in connection with survey or construction of the Hudson Bay railway and terminals?

Mr. COCHRANE: Subsidies authorized by chapter 48, the Railway Subsidies Act, 1912, sections 2 and 3; and chapter 9, 1912, section 2. (Copies of acts attached.)

WOODEN RAILWAY CARS.

*Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Does the Government or the Department of Railways and Canals contemplate discontinuing the construction or purchase of freight or passenger cars constructed of wood, and to substitute therefor cars constructed of steel?

2. Is the matter under consideration?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The department has not decided to discontinue the building or buying of cars constructed of wood.

2. Answered by No. 1.

NEW WESTMINSTER POSTMASTERSHIP.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has Postmaster J. W. McDonald of New Westminster, B.C., been removed from office?

2. If so, was an investigation held?

3. If no investigation was held, what were the reasons for the postmaster's dismissal?

4. Who has been appointed to succeed him?

Mr. PELLETIER: The New Westminster post office was lately made a city office, and, consequently, new appointments had to be made by Order in Council. On recommendation of the member representing the constituency, Mr. D. J. McQuarrie was appointed postmaster.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to give effect to the recommendations contained in the report of the Technical Education Commission?

2. If so, will action to that end be taken at the present session of Parliament?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. The latter parts of the report were delivered to the printer about the 12th day of January, 1914, and assurances have been received that printed copies of the complete report will be available about the 10th of February, 1914.

2. The intention of the Government will be announced in due course.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—LEGAL ADVISER.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has a legal adviser been appointed by the Government for the Department of External Affairs?

2. If so, what was the date of his appointment, and what are the duties and salary attaching to the position?

3. Under what section of the Civil Service Act was the appointment made?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. Yes.

2. Date, April 15, 1913; duties, considering and reporting upon the legal aspects of questions coming before the department; salary, $3,000.

3. Under sections 21 and 33 of the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Would my right hon. friend object to stating who the appointee is, though that question is not included in the notice?

Mr. BORDEN: Mr. L. C. Christie.

Mr. MURPHY: Of Ottawa?

Mr. BORDEN: He is a native of Nova Scotia. He had a university education at one of the universities in Nova Scotia—Acadia, I think. He is a graduate in law of the University of Harvard. He had some experience in a law office in the United States, and, I think, about three years in the Department of Justice of the United States.

COST OF LIVING COMMISSION.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the attention of the Government been directed to the published reports of a speech alleged to have been delivered by the Hon. Geo. E. Foster, Minister of Trade and Commerce, at Smith's Falls, Ontario, on December 9, 1913, in which the honourable gentleman is reported to have said.—

'The Lord knows we have had enough commissions. They are as plentiful as blackberries. Commissions are wandering around the country wasting good ink and paper preparing reports which are laid on shelves and nothing done with them.'

2. How many commissions have been appointed since December 9, 1913, and what duties have been assigned to each?

3. Who are the members of the respective commissions appointed since the said date?

Mr. BORDEN:

1 and 2. On the 20th December, 1913, John McDougald, Commissioner of Customs, Charles C. James, Agricultural Commissioner, and Robert H. Coats, Chief Statistician Department of Labour, were directed to make an inquiry into the increase in the cost of living in Canada and into the causes which occasion or contribute to such result. On the 22nd day January, 1914, Mr. J. U. Vincent, Assistant Deputy Minister Inland Revenue, was appointed a member of the Board so constituted.

3. With the exception of the said Board no Commissions have been appointed since the 9th December, 1913. Copies of the Orders in Council above mentioned and of a letter written by the Prime Minister to the Chairman of the said Board, together with his reply, are as follows:—

'Upon a memorandum from the Prime Minister setting forth that representations have been made to the Government by the governing bodies of several of the cities of Canada and by other representative bodies and persons asking that an investigation be made into the increase in the cost of living in Canada and into the causes which have occasioned or contributed to such result;

'The Prime Minister reports that having conferred with the Minister of Customs, the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Labour, he has been informed by them that such an investigation in the first instance might be made by permanent officials of the Government, and that they recommend that John McDougald, Esquire, Commissioner of Customs, Charles C. James, Esquire, Agricultural Commissioner, and Robert H. Coats, Chief Statistician of the Department of Labour, should conduct such inquiry and report thereon as soon as possible.

'The Prime Minister, therefore, recommends that such an investigation be made forthwith and that the Minister of Customs, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Labour be authorized to instruct the said officials to enter upon such investigation and to co-operate for that purpose, employing and utilizing all information which may be available in the several departments of the Government and obtaining such further data and information as may be necessary or useful for the purposes aforesaid, and that the said officials report upon the matters aforesaid with the least possible delay.

'The Prime Minister further recommends that John McDougald, Esquire, act as convener and Chairman of the Board so constituted.

'The committee concur in the foregoing and submit the same for approval.

Rodolphe Boudreau,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

'The Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, advise that Joseph Ulric Vincent, Assistant Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, be appointed a member of the board authorized to be constituted by the Order in Council of the 20th December, 1913, for the purpose of inquiring into and reporting upon the increase in the cost of living in Canada and the causes which have contributed to or caused the increase.

Rodolphe Boudreau,
Clerk of the Privy Council.'

Ottawa, January 8, 1914.

Sir,—In connection with the investigation which is being carried on by yourself and by Messrs. C. C. James, C.M.G., and R. H. Coats, I desire to inform you that in case you and your colleagues in the inquiry should find it desirable or convenient to be invested with power to subpœna witnesses to examine them on oath or affirmation and to send for persons, papers and records, the necessary Order in Council for that purpose will be passed and submitted for the approval of His Royal Highness the Governor General. If, in addition to the powers alluded to, you should find it convenient or desirable to be invested with any other powers within the scope and meaning of the Enquiries Act and the amendments thereto, the Government will be glad to have your suggestions and will give immediate consideration and attention thereto.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) R. L. Borden.

John McDougald, Esq., C.M.G.,
Chairman of Commisison to
Investigate the High Cost of Living,
Ottawa.

Board of Inquiry into Cost of Living,
Regal Building, Ottawa, Canada,
January 12, 1914.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 8th instant regarding additional powers in connection with the

investigation into the cost of living if found desirable or convenient by the Board of Inquiry.

In reply I am to state that your letter has been placed before the members of the Board for their information.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) John McDougald.

Right Hon. R. L. Borden, P.C., K.C.,
Prime Minister,
Ottawa, Ont.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—IMPORTATION OF LABOUR.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Has the Government passed an Order in Council to the effect of preventing or prohibiting labourers or artisans from being imported or from entering British Columbia?

2. If so, at whose request was the Order in Council passed and for how long?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to pass a similar Order in Council to apply to all the other provinces? If not, why not?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. At certain ports yes.

2. Recommended by the Minister of the Interior.

3. The policy of the Government will be announced in due course.

WAGES ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Is the Government aware that contractors doing work for the Department of Public Works in Montreal are not paying the wages specified in the fair wages clauses?

2. Has any representations been made in that respect? If so, by whom and when?

3. Has the question been settled? If so, when?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. Complaint has been made to the Department of Labour regarding rates of wages paid on two contracts of the Department of Public Works in the city of Montreal, as follows:—(1) structural steel workers employed on the customs examining warehouse building; and (2) carpenters employed on postal station 'F.'

2. Both of the foregoing complaints were made through the Montreal Building Trades Council, the former in November and the latter on December 29.

3. Both complaints have been investigated by the Department of Labour, and are now in process of adjustment.

ALBERTA PRE-EMPTIONS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has the Minister of Interior been requested to cancel the payments due on pre-emptions in Alberta?

2. If so, what action has the minister taken or does he intend to take on the matter?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.

2. This matter is under consideration at the present time.

BLOOD RESERVE GRAZING LEASE.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has any lease been made of the Blood Indian reserve in Alberta for grazing purposes? If so, to whom?

2. Was a request made on behalf of any farmers for the privilege of leasing this reserve for grazing purposes? If so, what action has been taken on this request?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. The former lease to the Donald McEwan Company has been extended temporarily.

2. Yes. No definite action has been decided upon with reference to grazing privileges for this reserve.

ALBERTA NATURAL GAS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Is the Government aware that it is proposed to pipe natural gas out of the province of Alberta into the province of Saskatchewan?

2. Is the control of the natural gas resources of Alberta possessed by the Dominion Government?

3. Has the Government been asked to prevent the piping of natural gas out of Alberta, in order to conserve the supply?

4. What action does the Government purpose taking to meet the requests from Alberta?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Representations have been made to the department that such action is proposed.

2. Yes, under vacant lands of the Crown and under lands which have been disposed of but in connection with which the mines, minerals and mining rights have been reserved to the Crown.

3. Yes.

4. There is nothing in the Dominion Lands Act or in the regulations which have been framed thereunder which would appear to empower the Minister of the Interior to prohibit the piping of natural gas from Alberta to Saskatchewan.

BONAVENTURE EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has any action been taken by the Minister of Agriculture towards the establishment of an experimental farm or station or stations in Bonaventure county?

2. If so, what has been that action? If not, why not?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. No.

2. The work of experimental farms is continually being expanded, and though it is

impossible to meet all the requests that are brought before him, the minister is giving these matters his best consideration.

BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY CLAIMS.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Does the Government intend paying the claims against the Baie des Chaleurs railway, the Atlantic and Lake Superior railway and the Quebec Oriental railway, reported on favourable by the commissioner, Arthur Plante, Esq.?
2. When may such payments be expected, and what will they amount to?
3. If any such payments are not to be made, why not?

Mr. COCHRANE: The matter is under consideration.

FRASERVILLE HARBOUR.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has the Department of Railways entered into a final understanding with the Public Works as to the improvements needed at Fraserville harbour?
2. If so, when are the works to be started?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.

2. Plans and specifications are being completed after which tenders will be invited.

SAFETY AT SEA.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Who are the representatives of Canada at the International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea?
2. What is the date of the Order in Council appointing them?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Alexander Johnston, Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

2. Order in Council is dated October 11, 1913.

WRECK OF THE COBEQUID.

Mr. LAW:

1. Did the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries receive a message of congratulation from His Royal Highness, the Governor General, relating to the rescue of passengers and crew of the wrecked steamship Cobequid?
2. If so, was this message telegraphed to the Press by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or by any one acting for the department.
3. What are the names of the newspapers, if any, to which this congratulatory message was transmitted?
4. Was the light on the buoy that marks Trinity Lodge, where the Royal mail steamer was wrecked, in commission at the time of the disaster?
5. If not, for how many days had this light been out of commission prior to the date of the disaster?
6. Where was the Dominion Government Str. Lansdowne at the time the light was out?
7. Were any changes made in the personnel of the officers or crew of the Lansdowne about the time of the wreck of the Cobequid? If so, what changes were made, and what are the names of the officers or crew so changed?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. Yes, by the minister's private secretary, who handed a copy of the same to a representative of the Press Gallery, who understood that it would be given to the newspapers generally.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. No.

5. The agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries at St. John was advised on the 7th January, and on the 8th January, it was advertised in St. John, Halifax, Yarmouth and Digby newspapers. Shipping Federation, of Montreal, was also notified and immediate action taken to restore the light.

6. At St. John.

7. Yes. Mr. N. A. Withers, second officer of Lansdowne was promoted to chief officer of Aberdeen. Mr. Brickley, third officer of Aberdeen, promoted to second officer of Lansdowne.

AGRICULTURAL AID ACT.

Mr. BOULAY:

What amounts have been paid to the Quebec Government during the years 1912 and 1913 in virtue of the Bill for aid to agriculture, passed by the federal Government?

Mr. BURRELL: 1912, $69,741.20; 1913, $69,741.20; total, $139,482.40.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. Has the Government appointed officers with instructions to supervise the distribution and management of the federal subsidy intended for the provinces for agriculture?
2. If so, what are the names of these officers and the provinces for which they have been appointed?
3. Prior to granting to the provinces of a special subsidy for agriculture purposes, has the Government ordered an investigation or study, or caused information to be taken by one of their officers as to the situation and the agricultural wants in each of the provinces?
4. If so, has such officer sent in a report?
5. What parties have been consulted in each of the provinces?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.

2. Dr. C. C. James generally, assisted by Mr. Chapais for the province of Quebec.

3. Dr. C. C. James was appointed for the purpose.

4. He reported to the Minister of Agriculture.

5. The provincial departments of agriculture and the various agricultural educational authorities.

EXPENDITURES ON INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITIONS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. What amount of money has been spent by the Federal Government since 1896 for the universal or international exhibitions which have been held the world over?
2. What amount has the federal Government decided to spend for the San Francisco Exhibition?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. $2,129,132.05.

2. This Government has decided to spend in connection with the Panama-Pacific International Exposition to be held in San Francisco a sum sufficiently large to insure a creditable representation of the resources and products of the Dominion and to that end Parliament will be asked during the present session to vote a substantial sum to be spent during the fiscal year 1914-15. The total amount to be spent cannot be decided until further information can be obtained as to the conditions to be met at San Francisco.

INTERNATIONAL PURITY CONGRESS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Who was the representative of the Government of Canada at the Seventh International Purity Congress at Minneapolis, 7th to 12th November, 1913?
2. Has he made a report to the Government?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. The Reverend William McDonald, David Allison, Esquire, and Lt.-Col. A. P. Sherwood, C.M.G.

2. No formal report has been received, but a letter was received from one of the Commissioners and another of the Commissioners made an oral report to myself. It is expected that a formal report will be made later.

BRITISH COLUMBIA BETTER TERMS COMMISSION.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Who are the members of the British Columbia Better Terms Commission, and when were they appointed?
2. Who is the Secretary?
3. Has the Commission had any sittings? If so, when and where?
4. Are the sittings of the Commission public or private?
5. Have they made any report?
6. What is the detailed expenditure to date?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. The members of the Commission are Zebulon Aytoun Lash, of the city of Toronto, one of His Majesty's Counsel learned in the law, on behalf of the Government of British Columbia; Ernest Victor Bodwell, of the city of Victoria, one of His Majesty's Counsel, learned in the law. The Order in Council which established the Commission was passed on the 1st of February, 1913. The Order in Council which appointed the two gentlemen above mentioned was passed on the 26th March, 1913.

2. Fred Cook, of the city of Ottawa, has been appointed secretary.

3. The two members of the Commission so appointed had a meeting for the purpose of determining upon the third commissioner, but they were unable to agree and a statement to that effect has been sent to the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

4. No instructions have been given to the Commission with regard to this matter. It is assumed that the meetings at which evidence is given and arguments are made would be open to the public, but that matter will be left to the determination of the Commissioners themselves.

5. No.

6. An advance of $1,500 for salary and incidental expenses has been made to the secretary, but there have been no other disbursements up to the present time.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Has the commission created to investigate the matter of the claims of the province of British Columbia for increased or additional provincial subsidies yet begun its work?
2. If so, is its report or findings available, and when will it be submitted to Parliament?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. The first question has already been answered by the reply given to question 107.

2. The commission has not yet made any findings or report except the report that the two commissioners already appointed had been unable to agree upon the third commissioner. Therefore, no findings and no report are available.

STE. PERPETUE FOOD INSPECTOR.

*Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. Has Alphonse Pelletier, food inspector, at Ste. Perpetue, made any report since his appointment? If so, when?
2. What is his salary?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. No reports have been made, but he has done duty in connection with the collection of food samples in December, 1912, July, 1913, November, 1913, January, 1914, which are the duties of his office.

2. $300 per annum.

ST. ROCH DES AULNAIES EXCISE OFFICER.

*Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. Has Joseph Dupont, excise officer at St. Roch des Aulnaies, made any report since his appointment? If so, when?
2. What is his salary?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. Yes. Three, May 28, 1913, October 28, 1913, November 28, 1913. No seizures. He is a preventive officer.
2. $200 per annum.

ST. ANNE EXPERIMENTAL STATION.

*Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. Has the Government secured new grounds for the extension of the Experimental Station at Ste Anne de la Pocatière?
2. If so, what is the area of those grounds, from whom have they been bought and what is the purchase price?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.
2. Area of grounds between 125 and 135 arpents. Land bought from Messrs. Prudent Martin, Alphonse Sirois and Emile Hudon dit Beaulieu. Purchase price $10,800.

CROSSINGS PROTECTION.

*Mr. GRAHAM:

1. What amount has been paid out by the Government to assist in removing level crossings, or eliminating the danger therefrom?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to amend the statute relating thereto?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Amount paid out to January 1, 1914, $60,991.22.
2. No.

ST. CASIMIR POST OFFICE.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. What amount was placed in the Estimates of 1911-1912 for the erection of a post office at St. Casimir, Portneuf, Que.?
2. Is it the intention of the Government, or of the Minister of Public Works, to grant the petition of the citizens of St. Casimir towards the construction of said post office?

Mr. REID:

1. $5,000.
2. This question will be answered when the Estimates are laid before Parliament.

L'ISLE VERTE WHARF.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Was Joseph Collin employed as superintendent of the works on the wharf at L'Isle Verte, Temiscouata, in 1912 and 1913? If so, for how many days in each of these years?
2. What was his salary or wages per day?
3. What total amount did he receive in 1912 and 1913?
4. Has he supplied the Department of Public Works with lumber or other material?
5. If so, for what amounts during 1912 and 1913 respectively?

[Mr. Nantel.]

Mr. REID:

1. Yes. In season of 1912, 77⅜ days. In 1913, 79 days.
2. In 1912, $2.75 per diem; in 1913, $3.
3. In 1912, $212.24; in 1913, $237.
4. No.
5. Answered by No. 4.

FRASERVILLE DRILL HALL.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

Is it the intention of the Minister of Militia, together with the Public Works Department, to erect a drill hall at Fraserville, Temiscouata, Que., now that the 20th Battery has been organized in that place?

Mr. REID: Under consideration.

ST. MALO RAILWAY SHOPS.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Who is the contractor for the Transcontinental Railway shops at St. Malo, Que.?
2. On what date was the Order in Council passed?
3. On what date was the work commenced?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Mr. Joseph Gosselin, of Lévis, Que.
2. October 8, 1913.
3. September 17, 1913.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC ARBITRATION.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Was Sir William White appointed sole arbitrator to adjust certain differences between the Government, or the Transcontinental Railway Commission, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company?
2. If so, what was the date of his appointment?
3. What were the matters submitted to the arbitration and award of Sir William White?
4. On what date did he make the award, and what were its terms?
5. Have the terms of the award been carried out?
6. If not, in what respect and for what reason have they not been carried out?

Mr. COCHRANE: The following information was supplied by the Transcontinental Railway Commission:

1. Yes.
2. December 11, 1912.
3. (Par. 1). What is a fair rental for the use of that portion of the eastern division between Winnipeg and Lake Superior Junction, exclusive of the shops hereinafter mentioned, until the eastern division is completed sufficient for operation, within the intent and meaning of the Agreement and Acts hereinafter mentioned, with a ferry at Quebec? (Par. 2). Are the shops at Transcona and repair shops at

divisional points, or any of them, to be regarded as a portion of the eastern division, within the intent and meaning of the Agreements of July 29, 1903, and of February 18, 1904, and Acts confirming same? (Par. 3). If not, what is the proper rental for the use of such shops, or any of them, by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for any railway purposes they may desire, until the eastern division is completed sufficient for operation. (Par. 4). Or, if the arbitrator determines that the said shops, or any of them, are to be regarded as a portion of the said eastern division under said Acts, what is a fair rental for the use of that portion of the said railway between Winnipeg and Lake Superior Junction, inclusive of the said shops, or such of them as he finds are a portion the eastern division and inclusive of the right to the said company to use such shops for the purposes of the said eastern and western divisions of the said railway.

4. (a). February 28, 1913—date of award. Terms are as follows: (b) Par. 1. Keeping in view the advantage that will accrue to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in acquiring business for its line of railway from Lake Superior Junction to Fort William and for its system west of Winnipeg from the use of the line between Winnipeg and Lake Superior Junction until the completion of the eastern division, and the advantages that will accrue to the said company in handling its construction material by that channel, and also keeping in view the amount of lake and rail business as compared to all rail business, I award, order and determine that a fair rental for the use of that portion of the eastern division between Winnipeg and Lake Superior Junction, exclusive of the shops at Transcona and repair shops at divisional points until the said eastern division is completed, sufficient for operation within the intent and meaning of the agreements of July 29, 1903, and February 18, 1904, and Acts confirming them which are referred to in the said memorandum of agreement of December 20, 1912, with a ferry at Quebec, is a sum equal to two per cent per annum upon the cost of construction of said portion of the eastern division; the said cost to be ascertained in the manner defined in paragraphs 15 and 16 of said agreement of July 29, 1903, and to include the cost of the items referred to in said paragraphs, but excluding and excepting the cost of construction in like manner of the said shops at Transcona and repair shops at divisional points and of the lands required or used for said shops. In addition to the said two per cent, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company until the said eastern division is completed as aforesaid, will at its own expense maintain and operate said portion of the eastern division and pay all charges for working expenditure as defined by paragraph 14 of the said agreement of July 29, 1903. Par. 2. With respect to the shops at Transcona, considering their location and the circumstances under which they were produced and furnished, and the specifications and interpreting the said agreements and Acts, in the light of modern railway practice, and considering the contemplated use of the said eastern division by other railways, I award, order and determine that the said shops are to be regarded as and are a portion of the said eastern division within the intent and meaning of the said agreements of July 29, 1903, and February 18, 1904, and Acts confirming the same. I further award, order and determine that all repair shops at divisional points are to be regarded as and are a portion of said eastern division within the intent and meaning of said agreements of July 29, 1903, and February 18, 1904, of the Acts confirming the same. I consider these are a material part of the railway and necessary for its proper and efficient operation. (Par. 3). In view of my award upon the second question submitted, the third question does not require a finding. (Par. 4.) The capacity and appointment of the Transcona shops are much beyond the needs of the line from Winnipeg to Lake Superior Junction, and no doubt in the interval before completion of the eastern division, and it may be for some time thereafter, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will avail itself for economic reasons of the use of these shops and outworks to take care of its power, rolling stock, tools and other equipment and materials used upon the line from Lake Superior Junction to Fort William and upon the western division, and upon such other lines or branches as it may construct from the eastern division. I award, order and determine that a fair rental for the use of that portion of the said railway between Winnipeg and Lake Superior Junction, inclusive of the shops at Transcona and repair shops at divisional points, and inclusive of the right of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to use such shops for the purposes of said eastern and western divisions of said railway, is a sum

equal to two per centum per annum upon the cost of construction of said portion of the said eastern division, to be ascertained in the manner defined in said paragraphs 15 and 16, including therein such cost of construction of the repair shops at divisional points on said portion, and excluding therefrom such cost of construction of the shops at Transcona, and in addition to the said two per cent, a sum equivalent to ten per cent of the actual cost of all work done at said Transcona shops upon locomotives, cars, rolling stock supplied for the operation of the said eastern division, and upon the plant, tools and materials entering into or used in the operation or maintenance of the said eastern division, and a further sum equivalent to twelve and one-half per cent of the actual cost of the total work done at or of the output of the said Transcona shops, other than for said eastern division. Such cost of work is to include the cost of all labour and service, the wages of the shops' superintendent, and all the staff supervising the Transcona shops and its outworks, and also of all material and supplies used in said shops. In addition to the said percentages, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, until the said eastern division is completed as aforesaid, will, at its own expense, maintain and operate said portion of the eastern division, including said shops at Transcona and at divisional points, and pay all charges for working expenditure, as defined by paragraph 14 of the said agreement of the 29th of July, 1903.

5 and 6.—The terms of the award as being carried out, but lease to be entered into has not yet been executed.

VANCOUVER DRILL HALL SITE.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Has the Department of Public Works acquired all the land in the city of Vancouver required for a Drill Hall site?

2. What portion of block 43 in D. L. 264 A of the said city of Vancouver has been acquired and what are the names of the different parties from whom the properties in this block were purchased, and what was the price paid to each party?

3. How many lots in the said block are not yet acquired, and what steps have been taken by the Department to expropriate the same?

Mr. REID:

1. Yes.

2. Lots 9, 10, 11 and 12, Mrs. Campbell, $16,500; part lot 19, Mrs. Bennest, $5,100; lot 17, James McKay, $6,500; part lots 13, 14, 15 and 16, C. Grossman, $6,787; part lots 19 and 20, Mrs. Ireland, $4,200; part lot 20, Mrs. Bellamy, $6,787; part lots 13, 14, 15 and 16, John McLeod, $7,150; lot 18, James Kerr, $7,000; lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 21, 22, 23 and 24, Mrs. McSpadden, $122,700.

3. One property to be expropriated.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—FRENCH RIVER BRIDGE.

*Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Did the Intercolonial Railway management, or the Department of Railways and Canals, engage a diver to examine the foundations of the French River bridge on the Short Line, so called, in Nova Scotia? If so, what was the necessity of such engagement, and what was his name and residence?

2. If the services of a diver were secured in connection with that bridge, what salary was paid, what was the amount of expenses incident to his engagement, and what was the total cost of such examination?

3. Is not the foundation of one of the piers of said bridge dry at low water, and is not the top of the old coffer dam of the other out of water?

4. Did the diver have to wait for high water in order to get under and at the bottom of foundations?

5. Was it not possible and more feasible, to have an examination made by an engineer at low tide?

6. Was the matter under the control and supervision of the new bridge engineer; what is the name of the bridge engineer now in the employment of the Intercolonial railway; when was he engaged, and at what salary; was he in the employment of any particular railway corporation when his services were engaged by the Intercolonial Railway management? If so, what railway; what was his last employment in the services of a railway corporation, what particular railway corporation, and what was his citizenship at the time of his employment?

7. Has any one been employed as a general consulting engineer of the Intercolonial railway engineering staff? If so, when, whom, at what salary and what was his age at the time of his employment?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes. The necessity of engaging a diver was to make sure that the piers below water were sufficiently good to support new piers from low water up. Thomas Anderson, St. John, N.B.

2. Salary paid was $20 per day for a diver and one assistant, which includes diving apparatus. The amount of expense incident to his engagement was $33, and the total cost of the examination was $153.10.

3. No, the foundation of one of the piers is not out of water at low water, the foundation of both piers being about 12 feet below water. The top of the old coffer dam of the other is out of water at low water.

4. No.

5. The resident engineer did make an examination at low tide and recommended employing a diver to find out the condition

of the piers below low water. It was not possible for the resident engineer to make an examination of the piers below low water without the assistance of a diver.

6. The matter was under the control and supervision of the new bridge engineer, whose name is W. A. Duff, and he was engaged in June, 1913, at a salary of $250 per month. He was in the employment of the National Transcontinental railway when his services were engaged by the Intercolonial railway management. He was in the employ of the National Transcontinental railway as assistant bridge engineer. His citizenship at the time of his employment was Canadian.

7. No.

DISEASED CATTLE IN EASTERN TOWNSHIPS.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. Is the Government aware that tuberculosis is reported to exist in many herds of dairy cattle throughout the country, and especially in the Eastern Townships?
2. Has the Government appointed any veterinary inspectors for the purpose of ascertaining the existence of the said disease?
3. Does the Government pay an indemnity to the owners of cattle destroyed, owing to their being affected with tuberculosis?
4. If so, what is the amount of said indemnity?
5. Is the Government authorized by law to do so?
6. If not, does the Government intend to introduce legislation for that purpose during the present session?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes, but not especially in the Eastern Townships.

2. The Government has appointed veterinary inspectors for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and the regulations thereunder, respecting infectious or contagious diseases generally affecting animals.

3. No.

4. Answered by 3.

5. The Government has discretionary powers in the premises.

6. Answered by 5.

SHEFFORD COUNTY RURAL MAIL.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. How many rural mail delivery routes have been established in the county of Shefford?
2. From what post offices do these routes originate?
3. How many post offices, if any, have been closed owing to the establishment of the said rural mail delivery routes?
4. What are the names of the said offices?
5. What provision has been made by the Government to supply the needs of the former patrons of the offices who do not reside upon or near the new rural mail delivery routes?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Four.

2. Granby. South Stukely (two routes). Foster (portion of route No. 3 from that point being in Shefford).

3. Two.

4. South Granby. Granboro.

5. The patrons of these former offices are now given all the accommodation needed by rural mail.

GRANBY LETTER BOXES.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. Has the Government received a request from the Granby Board of Trade for the installation of street letter boxes for the collection of mail on the streets of Granby, Quebec?
2. If so, does the Government intend to grant the said request?
3. When will the boxes be installed?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. The matter is still under inquiry by the officers of the department.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. Is Mr. Edward Doonan, of Montreal, in the employ of the Department of Agriculture?
2. If not, when was he dismissed?
3. At whose request was he dismissed?
4. What salary did he receive?
5. By whom was he replaced?
6. What salary is paid to his successor?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. No.

2. His term of engagement as a cargo inspector being for the season of navigation only, expired on November 30, 1911, and he has not been employed since that date.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. $100 per month.

5. Mr. Doonan has not been replaced by any one in particular. He was one of several employed as cargo inspectors at Montreal.

6. The salaries paid to cargo inspectors at Montreal in 1912 was $90 per month. In 1913 the salary was increased to $110 per month.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. Is Mr. Robert Blackwood, of West Shefford, Quebec, in the employment of the Department of Agriculture?
2. If not, when was he dismissed?
3. At whose request was he dismissed?
4. What salary did he receive?

5. By whom was he replaced?
6. What salary is paid to his successor?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. No.
2. Resigned 15th June, 1912.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. $1,000 per annum.
5. Mr. S. Riendeau.
6. $1,000 per annum.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. Is Mr. L. P. Bernard, of Granby, Quebec, in the employ of the Government?
2. If so, in what capacity?
3. What are his duties?
4. What salary does he receive?
5. Has he been authorized or requested to do organization work for the Conservative party?

Mr. BURRELL: So far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned:

1. Yes.
2. Inspector of dairy products and lecturer at agricultural meetings.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. $100 per month.
5. No.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY ICE SUPPLIES.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Have recent tenders been opened for supplying ice for the Intercolonial railway at Mulgrave, N.S.?
2. If so, has the contract been awarded, and to whom?
3. What are the names of all parties who tendered and the amount of each tender?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.
2. Yes. To S. W. Hagerty, Mulgrave, N.S.
3. S. W. Hagerty, Mulgrave, N.S., 84 cents per ton, delivered and packed in the ice-house at Mulgrave.

J. A. Cesale, Mulgrave, N.S., $1 per ton, delivered at Mulgrave.

E. L. Hadley, Mulgrave, N.S., $1.25 per ton, delivered at ice-house, Mulgrave.

J. W. Taggart, Piedmont, N.S., 42 cents per ton, delivered on cars, Piedmont and Dewers Mills. Cost to the railway for hauling and storing in ice-house at Mulgrave 55 cents, total 97 cents.

James Dunlop, Leitches Creek, C.B., 65 cents per ton, on cars, Dunlop Siding, C B. Cost to the railway for hauling to and storing in ice-house at Mulgrave 60 cents, total $1.25.

C. H. McIntyre, McIntyre's Lake, C.B., 50 cents, on cars at McIntyre Lake, C.B.; cost to the railway for hauling to and storing in ice-house at Mulgrave 42 cents, total 92 cents.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Have tenders been recently called for the supplying of ice to the Intercolonial railway at Rivière du Loup, Ouelle and Rimouski?
2. If so, has the contract been awarded, and to whom?
3. What are the names of all the tenderers and what is the amount of each tender?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes, for Rivière du Loup and Rivière Ouelle wharf, but not for Rimouski, as there is no ice-house there now.
2. Yes, for Rivière du Loup and Rivière Quelle wharf, to Frs. Meunier, of Rivière du Loup.
3. For 1,170 tons more or less at Rivière du Loup:

J. A. Boulay, Sayabec, P.Q., $1.05, delivery not stated.

Frs. Meunier, Rivière du Loup, 60 cents, delivered and stored in ice-house.

J. A. Pelletier, Rivière du Loup, P.Q., 64½ cents, delivered and stored in ice-house.

Eighty tons, more or less, at Rivière Ouelle wharf.

Frs. Meunier, Rivière du Loup, P.Q., 60 cents, stored in ice-house; the railway to carry ice free, also necessary men for storing from Rivière du Loup to Rivière Ouelle wharf.

J. A. Pelletier, Rivière du Loup, P.Q., 69½ cents, on cars at Rivière du Loup.

Alfred Dionne, J. P. Hudon, Rivière Ouelle, P.Q., $2.10, delivered and stored in ice-house, or $1.50 stored in ice-house. Railway to carry ice free of charge from Letellier station to Rivière Ouelle wharf.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY MILEAGE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What is the length of the proposed Hudson bay railway from Le Pas to Port Nelson?
2. How many miles have been contracted for?
3. How many miles have been completed between Le Pas and Port Nelson?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. 418½ miles.
2. Le Pas to Thicket Portage, 185·5 miles; Thicket Portage to Split Lake Junction, 68 miles; Split Lake Junction to Port Nelson, 165 miles; total, 418·5 miles.

3. 86 miles of steel laid; 56 miles surfaced; 137 miles of grading fairly completed, with the exception of a few cuts at miles 110, 121 and 133, and some cross-laying.

PAS MISSION BRIDGE.

Mr. GRAHAM:

Is the bridge across the Saskatchewan at Pas Mission completed? If so, at what date was it so completed?

Mr. COCHRANE: The bridge at Pas Mission has been in operation since the middle of July, 1913, but the swing span has not been adjusted to the satisfaction of the engineer.

NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Will the Government make provision during the present session for the extension of the breakwater at New Harbour, Guysborough county, N.S.?

Mr. ROGERS: It is not customary to give such information until the Estimates are laid before Parliament.

GRAND FALLS-ST. JOHN RAILWAY.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Did the Subsidy Act of 1910 provide a subsidy for a line of railway from Grand Falls, N.B., to St. John?
2. In the Subsidy Act of 1913, was that portion of the line from Andover to Grand Falls omitted?
3. If so, what was the reason for dropping the subsidy to this portion of the line?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Subsidy Act of 1910 did provide for a subsidy from Grand Falls to St. John, N.B.

2. Subsidy Act of 1913 provided for a subsidy from Andover to St. John, N.B., only.

3. There is no settled policy that the railway will not be extended to Grand Falls.

EMPLOYMENT OF PETER FIELDING.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. What position does Mr. Peter Fielding of Windsor, N.S., hold in the service of the Government?
2. What salary is he paid therefor?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Dominion Government immigration agent.

2. $1,800 per annum.

CROWN COAL LANDS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. By whom are the coal lands in 28-19, 27-17 and 28-18 West of the Fourth Meridian held?
2. Have they been opened for entry? If so, when?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. The Crown, the Rosedale Coal and Clay Products Co., Ltd., Noble William Clarke, John N. Murray and William Murray, and as far as the Department of the Interior is aware, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Hudson Bay Company.

2. The available lands in these townships were opened for entry in 1904.

NOVA SCOTIA COAL.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Is the Government aware that at Confederation Nova Scotia was promised an Ontario market for her coal?
2. Has Nova Scotia ever had such market?
3. If not, was it due to lack of transportation facilities?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. There is no official record on the subject.

2 and 3. The Government is informed that a certain amount of Nova Scotia coal is sold in Ontario, the character and value of the market thus afforded being limited by conditions which vary to a certain extent from year to year.

TRAFFIC ON CANADIAN CANALS.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. What was the total traffic of the Canadian Canal System for the years 1911, 1912 and 1913?
2. How was the traffic divided?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. 1911, 38,030,353; 1912, 47,587,245; 1913, 52,053,913.

1911.	United States.	Canadian.	Total.
	$	$	$
2.—Sault Ste. Marie	27,774,128	3,177,581	30,951,709
Welland	1,241,149	1,296,480	2,537,629
St. Lawrence	1,041.847	2,063,861	3,105,708
Chambly	155,983	443,846	599,829
St. Peters	.....	75,298	75,298
Murray	4,048	159,409	163,457
Ottawa River Canals	7,802	312,269	320,071
Rideau	12,489	159,738	172,227
Trent Valley	.....	57,290	57,290
St. Andrews	.....	47,135	47,135
	30,237,446	7,792,907	38,030,353
1912.			
Sault Ste. Marie	35,579,293	4,090,362	38,669,655
Welland	1,298,799	1,553,116	2,851,915
St. Lawrence	1,137,045	2,340,143	3,477,188
Chambly	170,713	447,702	618,415
St. Peters	300	74,509	74,809
Murray	2,561	167,520	170,081
Ottawa River Canals	8,835	383,515	392,350
Rideau	13,170	146,963	160,133
Trent Valley	.....	77,150	77,150
St Andrews	.....	95,449	95,449
	38,210,716	9,376,529	47,587,245
1913.			
Sault Ste. Marie	37,744,590	4,954,734	42,699,324
Welland	1,477,308	2,093,406	3,570,714
St. Lawrence	1,465,408	2,837,019	4,302,427
Chambly	196,801	358,801	555,602
St. Peters	.....	71,514	71,514
Murray	18,481	162,095	180,576
Ottawa River Canals	6,973	358,465	365,438
Rideau	13,477	157,746	171,223
Trent Valley	.....	55,800	55,800
St. Andrews	.....	81,295	81,295
	40,923,038	11,130,875	52,053,913

ST. JOHNS AND IBERVILLE RURAL MAIL.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Has the rural mail delivery been established in the parish of Ste. Brigide, County of St. Johns and Iberville?

2. Have tenders been advertised for the conveyance of that mail, or for part thereof?

3. Has a tender been sent in for such conveyance by Mr. Israel or Mr. Isaie Deslauriers?

4. Has this gentleman been recommended by any one for the awarding of the said conveyance?

5. If so, what is the name of the recommending party?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Three rural mail routes have been established in Ste. Brigide parish.

2. Tenders were invited for three routes.

3. Israel Deslaurier tendered for the Ste. Brigide Rural Route No. 3.

4 and 5. Mr. Deslaurier was recommended by Dr. Pickel and Mr. F. H. A. Giroux of Sweetsburg, by Dr. Sabourin of St. Jean and Mr. J. E. Lareau of Village Richelieu, but as a lower offer than his was received, the department was obliged to accept it.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Has the contract for the conveyance of mail in the town of St. Johns, secured by Joseph Barsalou, been cancelled?

2. Did anybody ask for such cancellation?

3. If so, what is the name of the petitioners?

4. Has a subsequent contract been awarded for that conveyance? If so, to whom?

5. Does he pursue the fulfilment of his contract? If not, why not, and who is the actual contractor?

Mr. PELLETIER: Joseph Barsalou asked to be released from his contract because he was an invalid and unable to do the work. Tenders were invited and a contract awarded to Auguste Hebert who replaced Barsalou as the actual contractor on the 1st October, 1913.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Has the rural mail delivery been established at St. Alexandre, County of St. Johns and Iberville?

2. Who sent in the petition of the citizens of St. Alexandre, asking for the establishment of rural post in the above mentioned parish?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2. The question of establishing rural mail delivery routes from St. Alexandre was taken up at the personal request of Mr. J. E. Lareau. Petitions for this service were subsequently received at the department through Mr. Joseph Demers, M.P.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. What expenses have been incurred by the establishing of the rural postal delivery routes in St. Johns and Iberville?

2. Have any persons outside of the regular officers of the Post Office Department been employed in that county for that purpose?

3. If so, what are the names of those persons and the amounts paid to each of them for their services?

4. What is the amount of travelling expenses incurred by those persons, by railway, cab or otherwise?

5. Has the Government paid any accounts for cab expenses in connection with the establishing of said routes?

6. If so, to whom were those payments made?

7. Were these accounts sent in in detail?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. The ordinary living and moving expenses incurred by the Departmental Field Officers engaged in laying out the routes.

2. No.

3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Answered by No. 2.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. How many Post Offices, if any, have been closed owing to the establishment of the rural mail delivery routes, in the County of St. John and Iberville?

2. What are the names of those offices?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. 16.

2. Belle Vallee, Dieppe, Grand Bois, Henrysburg, Henrysburg Centre, Honoreville, Lacroix, McCarthy, Menard Corner, Menardville, Odelltown, Rang des Dusseau, Roxham, St. Bernard Sud, Ste. Brigide Station, Versailles.

FRENCH CANADIAN SENATOR FOR ONTARIO.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has the Government taken cognizance of an article published in L'Action Sociale of Quebec, on the 19th instant, which reads as follows:

'The French Canadians of the province of Ontario have strong hopes that the urgent appointment of Senator Cox's successor will give to the Government the opportunity of living up to the express promise made just a few months ago, that of appointing to the first vacant seat in the Upper House a second representative of their race, to which they are entitled by right.'

2. Has the Government or any of its members, as herein stated, promised to appoint a second senator of French Canadian race for province of Ontario?

Mr. BORDEN: The answer to both questions is in the negative.

MANITOBA SCHOOLS.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has the attention of the Government been called to an extract in Les Cloches de Saint Boniface, the organ of His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface, Manitoba, in its last issue, headed 'The last word of the School Commission of Winnipeg,' of which the following is an extract:—

'We said in our edition of November last, that the letter addressed on the 14th of October last, by the Winnipeg School Board to Dr. McKenty, chairman of the committee entrusted with the interests of the Catholics of the city, was nothing but a means of palliating a refusal. Such was the case. When the question came up of stating precisely the principal points of the litigation, the chairman of the committee appointed by the Catholics gave, on the 5th of December, the following answer:

"To the chairman and members of the School Board of Winnipeg.

"Gentlemen:

"The committee representing the petitioners acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th of October, which was carefully examined. In our petition, we said that 'Your petitioners are in the same position as to incompetency as they were during several years, in conditions similar to those existing in Winnipeg, their co-religionists of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, but, a few years past, the Public School Commissions of both these provinces did, what your petitioners are anxious should be done by you here, and that since twenty years such arrangement has given satisfaction to both sides.

"That quotation is the principal part of our petition. It is equivalent to a demand of having our schools rented and administered in the same way as public schools for our Catholic children are conducted, and of having for those schools, Catholic professors, bearing diplomas, without paying attention to their costume.

"Yours truly,

"James McKenty.'"

"On the 29th, the School Board, through the secretary answered as follows, and this was to be the last word:

"'I received your letter of the 5th inst., and submitted it to the board. In answer to your communication I was instructed to thank you, in the name of the board, about your plain and explicit statement re the petition of the Roman Catholic taxpayers and to bring to your knowledge the decision of said board, which acting as a public body entrusted with the administration of the schools, according to the law governing the public schools, and in conformity of its legal adviser, to the effect that it cannot agree with the requests contained in the petition as interpreted by you, as your actual confirmation proves it.'"

'As it can be seen, such refusal, indefinitely allowing of a crying injustice, which has lasted since 1890, to continue, was not justified. The

board hides itself behind the law, as its legal adviser, Mr. J. H. Munson, thought fit to understand it, when it does not even allude to a contrary interpretation made by a no less eminent lawyer, Mr. A. J. Andrews, at the request of the Minister of Education, interpretation which was the very basis of the new step entered into by the Catholic committee.'
(Les Cloches, 15th September, P. 403.)

The School Board will, as in the past, and what we say about Winnipeg applies to all mixed centres where the Protestants are masters of the school boards, to collect the regular taxes from the Catholics and even the tax established for their school houses intended for the instruction of the children of the majority. What would the same men say, should the Catholic majority try to oppress the minority of the province of Quebec? Would they not be the first in denouncing such an injustice? Why two different weights and measures? It has besides to be noticed that the Catholics of Winnipeg were only asking a minimum of their rights. They were ready to facilitate an agreement, to accept the general management of the Public School Board, its inspection, its programme and books, provided the Catholic pupils were educated together by Catholic schoolmasters, either belonging to the clergy or not, bearing due diplomas, and that their schools were only rented, in view of the future. Everything is refused, even such minimum.'

2. Are the facts alleged in said article true, to the knowledge of the Government?

3. If so, does the Government intend taking any action, or has any action been taken by it or by any of its members, towards obtaining remedy for such state of affairs, by conference, conciliation, concession, or otherwise, with the Manitoba Government, or any of its members? If so, what has been such action and what has been the result?

4. If no action has been taken, why not?

5. If there is any correspondence in the matter, will the Government lay it on the table of the House if it is moved for?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. No.

2. The Government has no knowledge as to the truth of the alleged article.

3 and 4. The action of the Government in such matters is limited by the provisions of the Constitutional Act.

5. There is no correspondence on the subject.

CHEVRIER ET FRERES, RIGAUD.

*Mr. BOYER:

1. What are the amounts of money paid by the Departments of Militia and Public Works to Messrs. Chevrier et Frères, general merchants, of Rigaud, since 1911?

2. What is the nature of such bills?

Mr. HUGHES:

1. April 24, 1913, $6.75.

2. Repairs to heating system Rigaud armoury; account dated March 13, 1913. (This payment made to E. Chevrier, Rigaud.)

[Mr. Marcil.]

REVENUE FROM WHARFS.

*Mr. BOYER:

What was the revenue from each of the wharfs at Rigaud, Hudson, Vaudreuil and Ste. Anne de Bellevue for the years 1911, 1912, 1913.

Mr. HAZEN:

	1911-12	1912-13	1913-14
	$	$	$
Hudson	61.80	71.64	46.23
Rigaud	50.00	61.89	45.99
Ste. Anne de Bellevue.	207.80	256.05	132.35
Vaudreuil	76.42	73.08	41.88

PAYMENTS TO Mr. J. C. BERGERON.

Mr. BOYER:

What was the amount of fees and travelling expenses in detail of the inquiring commissioner, J. C. Bergeron, relating to the investigations held in the cases of the postmasters of Pointe Fortune, Vaudreuil, St. Lazare, Rocque Brune, Mont Oscar, and Isle Perrot-Nord?

Mr. PELLETIER:

Name of Office.	Fees.	Travelling expenses.
	$	$
Pte. Fortune	15.00	11.60
Mont Oscar	15.00	8.60
Isle Perrot Nord	15.00	7.10
St. Lazare	15.00	5.20
Vaudreuil Station	15.00	6.80

Investigation held at Vaudreuil station, possibly the Vaudreuil mentioned in the above question.

LIGHTSHIP LURCHER.

Mr. LAW:

1. How long was the lightship Lurcher out of commission in the year 1913 for her annual overhauling?

2. Has the Government considered the advisability of providing a relief lightship for the Lurcher?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. From October 1 to November 22 (53 days).

2. Yes. When the new lightship, now under construction for Halifax, is in commission, the Anticosti lightship will be available as a relief both for the Halifax and the Lurcher lightships. The Anticosti lightship is available for service elsewhere for about five months in each year, and is

being employed during these five winter months off Halifax. It is intended to have the Halifax and Lurcher lightships repaired each year when the Anticosti is available to replace them.

EDSON-GRAND PRAIRIE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. What is the frequency of the mail service between Edson and Grand Prairie?
2. What is the cost per year?
3. What is the name of the company or person holding the contract?
4. When was it awarded?
5. When did the service under the present contract begin?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Two trips each way every week.

2. The service is paid for by the trip. For each trip from Edson to Grand Prairie and return the department pays $299.50 in summer and $274.50 in winter.

3, 4, 5. The former contractors having asked to be released and an offer at a lower price than the department was paying having been received, a temporary agreement was entered into with Messrs. Caywood and Robb dating from 5th December, 1913, at the prices given in answer No. 2.

LEVIS COUNTY RURAL MAIL.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1 How many rural mail delivery routes have been established in the county of Lévis?
2. In what parishes of Lévis county have those rural delivery routes been established?
3. From what post offices do these routes originate?
4. How many post offices, if any, have been closed owing to the establishment of the said rural mail delivery routes?
5. What are the names of the said offices?
6. What provision has been made by the Government to supply the needs of the former patrons of the said offices who do not reside upon or near the new rural mail delivery routes?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Two.

2. (a) St. Nicholas; (b) St. Etienne de Lauzon.

3. (a) St. Nicholas Station No. 1; (b) Craig Road Station No. 1.

4. None.

5 and 6. Answered by No. 4.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN LEVIS COUNTY.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Has the Minister of Agriculture taken any means of establishing an experimental farm in the county of Lévis?
2. If so, what means has he taken, and in what parish of Lévis county does the Government intend to establish such experimental farm?
3. If no means has been taken why not?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. The work of experimental farms is continually being expanded, and though it is impossible to meet all the requests that are brought before him, the minister is giving these matters his best consideration.

DISTRIBUTION OF SEED GRAIN.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Will the Government distribute, this year, seed grains to the farmers who will ask for them?
2. If so, what is the proper way to get them?
3. Has the Department of Agriculture published a notice to that effect? If so, in what papers?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. A distribution of samples of superior sorts of seed grain, including spring wheat, oats and barley, is now being made to applicants who have written for the same in good time in accordance with a notice sent to the newspapers of the country early in November last.

2. Those desiring a sample have been expected to apply to the Dominion Cerealist, Experimental Farm, Ottawa, in accordance with the regulations, not later than January 31.

3. A circular letter from the Director of Experimental Farms announcing this seed distribution and the regulations governing it, was mailed to every journal on a list believed to contain the names of all the newspapers published in Canada.

PAYMENT TO AMBROSE POTTS.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Did the Department of Militia and Defence issue a warrant to the Department of Finance for the payment of $100 to Ambrose Potts of the township of west Hawkesbury in the county of Prescott, one of the Fenian Raid veterans? If so, when will the sum be paid to him?
2. If the said warrant has not been issued is it the intention of the Department of Militia and Defence to issue one? If not, why not?

Mr. HUGHES: A warrant was issued to the Department of Finance for the payment of $100 to Ambrose Potts, Hawkesbury, Ont., on January 22, 1913.

DISMISSALS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has Wm. C. Leslie, of Grindstone, Magdalen Islands, been dismissed as postmaster?
2. If so, at whose request and for what cause?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2. For political partisanship, by direction of the Postmaster General.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. When was Mr. Larivière appointed as land agent at Grouard?
2. When was he dismissed?
3. What was the cause of his dismissal?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. March 1, 1912.
2. November 1, 1913.
3. For not carrying out instructions from Head Office.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

How many employees in the various fish hatcheries throughout the Dominion have been discharged or dismissed since the present administration came into power?

Mr. HAZEN: Sixteen.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is the Minister of Railways aware that twenty-three employees on the Intercolonial railway at Rivière du Loup have been dismissed at the beginning of this month, without any notice whatever, as alleged, prior to such dismissal?
2. If so, why have those employees been dismissed, after having started to work, as reported?
3. Are such dismissals only temporary? If so, when does the department intend taking them back?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The minister is aware that a number of employees on the Intercolonial railway, at Rivière du Loup, were laid off owing to slackness of work.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. These employees were laid off on account of the slackness of work, and should they be required they will be given employment.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has J. R. Laing, postmaster at Liscombe, been dismissed?
2. If so, on whose complaint was such dismissal made, and what was the complaint first laid against this postmaster?
3. Was the usual form or affidavit denying partisanship conduct sent him to be signed?
4. If so, did he sign and return same?
5. Was an investigation ordered?
6. Was any investigation held?
7. What was the expense of the investigation?
8. Who was acting as assistant of the said postmaster at the date of his dismissal?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. By direction of the Postmaster General, it having been reported by the Post Office Inspector that the postmaster was absent from the place nine months in each year, and could not, therefore, perform the duties of the office.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.
6. Yes.
7. $65.20.
8. The postmaster's wife.

[Mr. Pelletier.]

UNDISCUSSED and UNOPPOSED MOTIONS.

Mr. Turgeon.—For a copy of all tenders received for the construction of a lighthouse at Grand Anse, Gloucester county, N.B., and of the contract awarded.

Mr. Turgeon.—For a copy of all tenders received for the construction of a salmon hatchery on Nipissiguit river, Gloucester county, N.B., and of the contract awarded.

Mr. Turgeon.—For a copy of all tenders received for the dredging in Bathurst harbour and of the contract awarded.

Mr. Turgeon.—For a comparative statement of the quentity by cubic yards of dredging done by the Restigouche, or dredge No. 3, on the outside bar of Bathurst harbour, during the seasons of 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913.

Mr. Turgeon.—For a copy of all correspondence, letters and telegrams relating to the deposit of sand and mud dumped into the southwestern channel by the contractors of dredging in Bathurst harbour.

Mr. Turgeon.—For a copy of all tenders received in 1912 for the construction of a breakwater at Green Point, Gloucester county, N.B., and of all correspondence, letters and telegrams showing why the contract was not awarded to lowest tenderer.

Mr. Emmerson.—For a copy of all rules and regulations made and passed by the board, with the approval of the minister, under the provisions of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act, pursuant to section eight of said Act.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a copy of all decisions of the Board of Railway Commissioners made on or after the 10th of October, 1911 on which appeals have been taken to the Governor in Council, and of all decisions given by the Governor in Council on such appeals.

Mr. Turgeon.—For a copy of all correspondence, letters and telegrams relating to the to the passage of an Act in Great Britain and the different dominions, providing for uniformity of the Naturalization Law.

Mr. Emmerson.—For a return showing the amount of receipts and expenditure on the Intercolonial railway during the months of April, May and June, of 1913, respectively, giving separately the revenue from passenger trains, freight traffic, mails and express and miscellaneous revenue, respectively, with the total thereof during that period; also the same information respecting the corresponding months of 1912, with the total thereof for that period. Also a statement showing the working expenses or expenditure during months of April, May and June of 1913 respectively, giving separately the working expenses or expenditure on maintenance of way and structures, maintenance of equipment, traffic expenses, transportation expenses and general expenses; with the total thereof during that period; and

also the same information respecting the corresponding months of 1912, with the total thereof for the same period; also a statement showing the cost of transporting freight per ton mile during the period named in the years 1912 and 1913.

Mr. McCraney.—For a copy of all papers, documents, telegrams, correspondence, etc., in reference to the purchase of a site in Saskatoon for a post office building.

Mr. Emmerson.—For a return showing in detail the number of dismissals from office of postmasters in the county of Albert, N.B., from the 10th day of October, 1911, not already brought down, together with the names of the dismissed postmasters, the reason of their dismissal, and a copy of the charges or complaints against such officials respectively, also a copy of all correspondence, recommendations, petitions, protests and other documents, and of all notes of evidence and of the reports of investigations, where such were held with respect to the same or relating thereto, or to the appointment of successors to fill such offices respectively. And also the names of all persons appointed to fill the vacancies cause by such dismissals, and the names of the persons by whom the same were respectively recommended for appointment.

Mr. Emmerson.—For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, reports and all other papers relating to the dismissal of Martin Lanigan, postmaster at Sexton, county of Kent, N.B., and of the minutes of evidence of any investigation or inquiry held relating to the said dismissal, and of all and any charges and recommendations connected therewith; also a copy of all letters written to the Postmaster General or to any official of the Post Office Department, by F. J. Robidoux, M.P., or by any other person relating to the said dismissal.

Mr. Emmerson.—For a return showing in detail the number of dismissals or removal from office, of postmasters in the county of Westmorland, N.B., from the 1st day of February, 1913; together with the names of the dismissed postmasters, or postmistresses, the reason of their dismissal, and a copy of the charges or complaints against such officials respectively, and of all correspondence with respect to the same; and of all correspondence, recommendations, petitions, protests and other documents, and of all notes of evidence and of the reports of investigations, where such were held, relating thereto, or to the appointment of successors to fill such offices respectively; and also the names of all persons appointed to fill the vacancies caused by such dismissals, and of the persons by whom the same respectively were recommended for appointment.

Mr. Verville.—For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and reports that have been exchanged between the Government and the strikers and operators of coal mines in British Columbia since the beginning of the strike until the present; also a copy of all Orders in Council in connection with said strike.

Mr. Marcil.—For a copy of the report of operations at the fish hatchery at Port Daniel West, for the year 1913.

Mr. Marcil.—For a copy of the reports made by the proprietors of the steamer Canada, on which the subsidy was paid to them for the season of 1913, for the service between Campbellton, N.B., and Gaspé, Que.; together with a copy of all complaints regarding the said service and of the correspondence, reports and documents in the possession of the Department of Trade and Commerce in that connection in the said year.

Mr. Marcil.—For a return showing the number, location, and mileage of rural mail routes established in Bonaventure county from October, 1911, to date, if any; together with a copy of all applications, memorials, reports and correspondence generally on this matter.

Mr. Marcil.—For a return showing the names of officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in Bonaventure county who have been dismissed from the service since January 1, 1913, to date; together with the reasons for such dismissal, and a copy of all reports and correspondence; with the names of new appointees, their salaries respectively, pointing out the increase in each case, if any, said copies to be produced in the original language in which they were drafted.

Mr. Marcil.—For a copy of all documents bearing upon dismissals and appointments of officials of the Inland Revenue Department in Bonaventure county since January 1, 1913, to date; together with a statement showing the salaries, emoluments and amounts paid to the new appointees since appointment, compared with amounts paid officials for corresponding periods in 1911 and 1912.

Mr. Marcil.—For a return showing the number of engineers, assistant engineers, draftsmen, clerks, divers, and students in engineering or surveying, or other parties employed by the Department of Public Works in the constituency of Bonaventure, from October 11, 1911, to date, with their names, residences, salaries, nature of their work, time employed and on whose recommendation; together bearing with a copy of all correspondence, and reports on such employment, and of reports made to the said Department of Public Works in that constituency from January, 1913, to date.

Mr. Marcil.—For a copy of all correspondence, reports and documents exchanged by and with the Department of Public Works from October, 1911, to date, regarding the non-erection of the public building authorized to be erected at New Carlisle, the county seat of Bonaventure county, in the Estimates of 1911-12.

Mr. Marcil.—For a return of all reports, memorials, correspondence and documents generally, bearing on the dismissal of customs officials in Bonaventure county from January 1, 1913, to date, together with a statement of salaries paid to old and new officials, and a copy of recommendations on which new officials were appointed.

Mr. Marcil.—For a return showing the nature and cost of works carried on in the county of Bonaventure by the Department of Public Works since October 10, 1911, to date, together with a copy of all reports, estimates, pay-lists, and correspondence in connection therewith.

Mr. Marcil.—For a return showing the dredging operations carried on in Bonaventure county in 1913, together with a copy of estimates, reports and correspondence.

Mr. Marcil.—For a copy of all correspondence, memorials, petitions, engineer's reports and other documents exchanged by or on behalf of the proprietors of the Quebec Oriental railway and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western railway, and the Department of Railways and Canals, since last session, with the view of

the acquisition by the Government of these roads as branch lines or feeders of the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. Marcil.—For a copy of the Order in Council appointing Arthur Plante, Esq., a commissioner to receive claims against the Atlantic and Lake Superior railway, the Baie des Chaleurs railway and the Quebec Oriental railway, and of the report of said commissioner and of the statement of claims accepted and those rejected by him, with the reasons therefor, as well as of all correspondence, memorials, documents, petitions and documents generally bearing on said subject.

Mr. Marcil.—For a return showing the changes in postmasterships in Bonaventure county from January 1, 1913, to date, with a list of dismissals, and reasons therefor, and of new appointments; also a copy of all reports, correspondence, petitions and documents generally bearing on this subject; together with a list of post office contracts cancelled in said constituency, with reasons therefor, if any, and of new contracts awarded, with the old rate and the new, and whether tenders were called for, in each case, and whether contracts were awarded to lowest tenderer or not.

Mr. Carroll.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams and correspondence of all kinds relating in any way to the applications for Fenian raid bounty in South Cape Breton, or relating to or touching in any way the claims of such applications.

Mr. Carroll.—For a return showing the names and Post Office addresses of all persons in South Cape Breton, N.S., who made application for Fenian raid bounty, of all persons who made two or more applications, of all persons who have been paid the said bounty, and of all persons whose claims have been disallowed, with the reasons therefor.

Mr. Carroll.—For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, etc., touching in any way the work done on Lingan Beach, South Cape Breton, under superintendent H. D. McLean.

Mr. Carroll.—For a return showing the names of all persons who worked on Lingan Bar, South Cape Breton, under superintendent H. D. McLean, the wages paid to each per diem, the amount paid each or payable to each, and showing generally how the amount voted for such work was expended, and the amount received by H. D. McLean in connection with said work.

Mr. E. Lapointe.—For a return showing the receipts and expenses of the post office at St. Philippe East, and of the post office at St. Philippe West, in the parish of St. Philippe de Néri, since the first of June, 1912, to date.

Mr. E. Lapointe.—For a return showing the names of all parties who have been employed at the Experimental Farm of Ste. Anne de la Pocatière during the years 1912 and 1913, and the salary and fees paid to each of them.

Mr. Emmerson.—For a return showing the names and Post Office addresses of all persons from the county of Westmorland, N.B., who have applied to the Department of Militia and Defence for a bounty under the Fenian Raid Volunteer Bounty Act, indicating the date on which each application was received, the names and addresses of the parties to whom such bounty has been paid; also the names and addresses of the parties to whom the bounty has not been paid, with the reason, if any, for non-payment thereof.

[M. Marcil.]

Mr. Boivin.—For a return showing in detail the number of dismissals from public offices by the present Government in the electoral district of Shefford from the 1st of October, 1911, to the present date; together with the names of the dismissed officers, the reasons for their dismissal, the complaints against such officials, names of the complainant in each case, and the names of their successors in office not already brought down.

Mr. Boivin.—For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Mr. A. Goyette, Postmaster at St. Valerien de Milton, Shefford County, Quebec, and of the evidence taken, and of the reports of investigation held by Dr. W. L. Shurtleff in regard to the same.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all papers, correspondence, telegrams, letters, pay rolls, accounts and vouchers in any way referring to the expenditure of money by this Government for harbour improvements at Margaree Harbour since Confederation.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all papers, correspondence, telegrams, letters, pay rolls, accounts and vouchers in any way referring to the expenditure of money by this Government for the harbour improvements at Inverness harbour.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all papers, correspondence, telegrams, letters, pay rolls, accounts and vouchers in any way referring to the expenditure of money by this Government for the public wharf at Whycocomagh.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all papers, correspondence, telegrams, letters, pay rolls, accounts and vouchers in any way referring to the expenditure of money by this Government for the building and repair of the public wharf at Port Hood.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all papers, correspondence, telegrams, letters, pay rolls, accounts and vouchers in any way referring to the expenditure of money by this Government for the closing of the northern entrance of Port Hood Harbour.

Mr. Lemieux.—For a copy of all documents concerning the latest changes in the Lobster fishing regulations at Magdalen Islands.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a return showing: 1. The names of all persons from whom land or property has been expropriated for right of way and station purposes in connection with the Dartmouth to Dean settlement branch of the Intercolonial railway of Canada.

2. The quantity of land or property so expropriated.

3. The amount paid or offered to such person or persons for such land or property, in cases where payment or an offer has been made.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all papers, advertisements, tenders, contracts, papers, telegrams, correspondence, returns, reports, accounts, vouchers, receipts, &c., in connection with any dredging performed by the Nova Scotia Dredging Company, or any other company, corporation or individuals, at Jeddore, Halifax county, N.S., in the years 1912 and 1913.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a return showing: 1. The names of all proprietors from whom land and property have been expropriated for the purpose of the Halifax ocean terminals between Three Mile House and the proposed site of the railway and shipping terminals.

2. The price or amount of damages paid therefor, or the amount offered and accepted in the case of each proprietor.

3. The amount offered or tendered each proprietor for damages and which has not been accepted.

4. The quantity of land and nature of property so expropriated from each proprietor.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all advertisements, tenders, papers, documents, letters and correspondence relating to the construction of the railway from Three Mile House at Bedford Basin to Halifax Harbour, and also to the piers or wharfs and sea walls in connection with the proposed Halifax ocean terminals.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all advertisements, tenders, accounts, vouchers, letters, documents and correspondence relating to the construction of a breakwater at the Graff, Halifax county, N.S.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a return showing the total amount of liability in the form of temporary loans on the last day of each month during the period between the 1st day of May, 1913, and December 31, 1913, together with, in each case, the rate of interest paid upon said amounts during the same periods.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all papers, advertisements, tenders, bids, contracts, telegrams, correspondence, accounts, receipts, vouchers, &c., in reference to the supply of meats, hay, oats, and all other supplies for the 1913 summer and autumn drill at Aldershot Camp, N.S.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all papers, documents, telegrams, correspondence, &c., in reference to the purchase of a property or site on Gottingen street, Halifax, for the erection of a post office building.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all papers, advertisements, tenders, bids, contracts, reports, vouchers, accounts, receipts correspondence, &c., in connection with the construction of a wharf at Feltzen south, Lunenburg county, N.S., now under construction or recently completed.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all papers, advertisements, tenders, bids, contracts, reports, vouchers, accounts, receipts, correspondence, &c., in connection with a wharf recently constructed at Gold river, Lunenburg county, N.S.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all papers, correspondence, telegrams, &c., in the years 1912 and 1913, in connection with the application of J. W. Comeau, of Comeauville, Digby county, N.S., for a license to can lobsters, including all correspondence, telegrams, &c., had by or with the fishery inspector for the southwestern counties of Nova Scotia, in connection therewith.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all papers, correspondence, telegrams, &c., between the Department of Trade and Commerce and any person or persons, companies or corporations, in the years 1912 and 1913, respecting a steamship service between St. John, N.B., and Bear river, N.S., and intermediate points, and the matters of the payment of a subsidy therefor.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all agreements, correspondence, papers and documents referring to any arrangement made between the Intercolonial railway of Canada and the Canadian Pacific railway in the year 1913, relating to the hauling of Canadian Pacific railway freight and passenger trains between St. John and Halifax, connecting with any transatlantic steamship lines at Halifax, during the winter season of 1913-14.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all correspondence, papers, documents, contracts, &c., between the Government of Canada and any company, firm or individuals from May 1, 1913 to December 1, 1913, referring to the establishment of a subsidized steamship service between Canada and the British West Indies.

Mr. Emmerson.—For a return showing in detail the transactions and proceedings of the so-called Provident Fund Board from the 1st day of January, A.D., 1912, to date, with the names of applicants and their addresses, and the nature of their employment, for retirement under the provisions of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act, and a statement of the names so retired during that period, showing the amount of their respective retiring allowances, their respective terms of service, their respective ages, and the total of the fixed yearly charges upon the said fund made thereby; together with a copy of all correspondence, letters, documents and other communications relating to such applications and retirements on file in the Railway Department either at Moncton or at Ottawa, and of all correspondence, letters, petitions or other communications addressed to and received by the Minister of Railways and Canals, the department, or any official thereof, or any member of the Government from any member of parliament, or other person charged with the responsibility of directing Government or railway patronage, or from any person or persons, club or association assuming to advise or direct with respect to any such patronage, and of all replies made to any such letters, petitions or other communications.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all letters, correspondence, papers and documents relating to the dismissal of the following persons from the below-mentioned offices in Shelburne county, N.S.:—J. V. Smith, sub-collector of customs at Lower Woods harbour; John H. Lyons, keeper of lightship, Barrington Passage; William L. Smith, lightkeeper, Baccaro; E. D. Smith, fishery overseer, Shag harbour; J. A. Orechia, harbourmaster, Woods harbour; J. C. Morrison, harbourmaster, Shelburne; and Albert Mahaney, postmaster at Churchover.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all correspondence, papers, documents, reports, &c., in connection with the proposed increase of mail service from Shelburne, N.S., to Jordan bay and Jordan ferry and return since October 1, 1911.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a return showing the names of all persons tendering, the amount of tender, and to whom awarded in 1913, for the carriage of mails covering the following mail routes in Shelburne county, N.S; Shelburne to Jordan bay and Jordan ferry and return; Clyde river to Upper Clyde and return; Lower Woods harbour to Charlesville and return; Port Le Herbert to Sable river.

Mr. Pacaud.—For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams, and other documents relating to the dismissal of Mr. Arthur Dupuis, postmaster at Pontbriand, county of Megantic, Quebec, and of the evi-

dence taken and of the reports of investigation held by Dr. W. L. Shurtleff in regard to the same.

Mr. Pacaud.—For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Mr. T. H. Préfontaine, late inspector of weights and measures at Lyster station, county of Megantic, Quebec; and of all those relating to the appointment of his successor, Mr. Pidgeon, with a copy of all recommendations, petitions and correspondence which refers in any way to the said appointment.

Mr. Buchanan.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams and papers concerning coal lands situate in 28-19, 27-18, 27-17 and 28-18 west of the fourth meridian.

Mr. Carvell.—For a return showing the quantities and values of potatoes exported monthly from each province of Canada, from September 1, 1911, to January 1, 1914, and the countries to which the same were exported.

Mr. J. J. Hughes.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, papers, and other documents connected with the removal of the post office from the store of Alexander Robertson at Red Point, P.E.I., to the store of J. E. Robertson, of the same place.

Mr. Boyer.—For a return showing the names of the employees of all kinds on the Soulanges canal in the section extending from the foot of the canal to the first bridge; with the functions of each of them, the salary thereto attached and the date of their hiring during the season of navigation.

Mr. Seguin.—For a copy of all the charges, correspondence, telegrams, reports and other documents relating to the investigation held in the case of Mr. St. Amour, superintendent of the canal, of Soulanges.

Mr. Boyer.—For a copy of all letters, correspondence, telegrams and all other documents between the Department of Railways and Canals and Archer Macdonald, E. Montpetit, C. A. Harwood, and A. Marceau, local engineer, St. Amour, superintendent of the canal, of Soulanges, L. A. Sauvé, and others, respecting the tearing down of several houses and dependencies erected on the government grounds at Pointe Cascades, the property of the said L. A. Sauvé.

Mr. Emmerson.—For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, memorials, letters, reports and telegrams, in the Department of Public Works, or in any of the departments of the Government, relating to a proposed wharf or breakwater at Little Cape, and Great Shemogue harbour, Westmorland county, N.B.; also of all correspondence, letters and telegrams exchanged between any member of the Government and M. G. Siddal, or any other persons or corporations, relating to a proposal or application to construct a wharf or breakwater at Little Cape or Great Shemogue harbour in Westmorland county, N.B., or in connection with having a survey made in connection with any such proposal.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all tenders, contracts, pay rolls, vouchers, documents, correspondence, &c., in connection with the purchase of a site for the Government wharf at Bear river, N.S., and the construction of the said wharf.

Mr. Emmerson.—For a return showing in detail the number of dismissals from public offices and positions of employment by the present Government since the first day of February, 1913, to this date, in the county of Westmorland, New Brunswick, in connection with any of the departments of the public service except the Post Office Department; together with the names of the dismissed officials or employees, the reasons for their respective dismissals, the complaints or charges against them, and by whom made; together with a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other communications with respect to each such case of dismissal, and of all minutes of evidence of investigations, where any such were held, and of all reports relating to such dismissals now in the possession of any of the departments of the Government, or of the Government Railway Managing Board, or of the Officials of the Intercolonial and the Prince Edward Island railways; also the names of all parties appointed to fill the vacancies caused by such dismissals, and the names of the persons by whom the same have been respectively recommended for appointment; together with a detailed statement of all amounts and expenses paid by any department in connection with the said dismissals and investigations or removals from office.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all telegrams, letters, engineer's reports, pay rolls and all other documents referring in any way to the work of opening up Inverness harbour.

Mr. Kay.—For a copy of the correspondence between the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Customs and C. S. Campbell, Esq., K.C., relating to the importation of pure bred animals into Canada.

Mr. Graham.—For a return showing the number of ships chartered by the Government or any department thereof since October, 1911, to go to Hudson bay or James bay; the name of each and the tonnage; the name and residence of each commanding officer; what cargo each carried, and what portion was landed, and where, what was lost and where, and what returned; with the values in each case.

Mr. Graham.—For a copy of all correspondence between the Post Office Department, or any official thereof, and any person or persons, concerning the installation of street letter boxes in the village of Chesley in the riding of South Bruce.

Mr. Lemieux.—For a copy of all papers, deeds, contracts, &c., in connection with the purchase by the Board of Harbour Commissioners of Quebec, of a stone quarry at St. Nicholas, Que.

Mr. Lemieux.—For a copy of all papers, deeds and contracts in connection with the purchase by the Department of Agriculture of a quarantine station at Lévis, Que., on or about July 29, 1913.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.—For a copy of all correspondence with the Imperial authorities, or any commercial bodies, on the subject of safety of life at sea; and of the Order in Council appointing representatives of Canada on the International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.—For a copy of the proceedings and resolutions adopted at the last Interprovincial Conference.

Mr. Ethier.—For a copy of all documents, letters, correspondence and petitions asking for the dismissal of Mr. Felix Raymond, postmaster at Ste. Scholastique village, county of Two Mountains, together with everything in connection with such dismissal.

Mr. Boulay.—For a copy of all documents whatsoever relating to the investigation of a claim of Jean Ross or Joseph Ross, of Amqui, county of Rimouski, province of Quebec, against the Intercolonial railway, following an accident to a horse, which occurred on the 10th of December, 1906.

Mr. Boulay.—For a return showing the names of the sailors who have been employed on the Eureka during the years 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a copy of all Orders in Council, correspondence, petitions, telegrams and other papers or documents bearing date between the years 1885 and 1914 in any way relating to the prohibition of the export of sockeye salmon from the province of British Columbia.

Mr Lemieux.—For a return showing the names of the promoters of the Canadian Contracting Company, and the powers asked by and given to said company by letters patent.

Mr. Lemieux.—For a return showing the names of the promoters of the National Drop Forge Company, Limited, and the powers asked and given to said company by letters patent.

Mr. E. Lapointe.—For a return showing what new post offices have been established in the county of L'Islet since 1911; the name of the officer in charge of each of them; what revenue they have brought; what expenses have been incurred by these offices, including the salary and fees of the postmaster and charges for the conveyance of the mails; whether these officers have been asked for by petitions of the interested ratepayers; if so, by whom; the quantity of letters and other postal matters that has passed through each of these offices since they have been established.

Mr. Graham.—For a return showing what changes have been made in the original scheme for terminals of the Transcontinental railway at the city of Quebec; the estimated cost of the former; the estimated cost of the said terminals under the present scheme.

Mr. Emmerson.—For a return showing when the Interconolonial railway and the Prince Edward Island railway last called for tenders for its coal supply, and when the tenders were returnable; the number of tenders received the names of the tenderers, and the tender prices respectively; the date of the last contract or contracts for coal for the Intercolonial railway, and who was the contractor or contractors respectively; the names of the successful tenderers, as the result of the last call for tenders and their prices respectively; the amount in tons of the contract made with each, and at what prices per ton respectively; whether any coal was purchased for the Government system of railway in the United States since March 31, 1913; if so, by whom from whom and through whom it was purchased, and at what price, and the cost per ton delivered, inclusive of commissions to the railway.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a return showing where the D. G. cruiser Margaret was built? Who the builders were; the contract price; the name and address of each tenderer and amount of each tender; whether the Government or any department thereof has contracted for any other vessel or vessels during the past eighteen months; if so, the number of such vessels, the names and addresses of contractors, the gross tonnage of each and the contract price, and the service for which they are intended.

Mr. Carvell.—For a return showing the amount paid out by each province in putting down the Fenian raid; the amount, if any, that has been paid out by the Dominion of Canada in each province in connection with the Fenian raid, excepting amounts paid under the Fenian Bounty Act; the total amount by provinces of the claims approved by the Department of Militia and Defence under the Act; the total amount of such claims by provinces paid to applicants under the Act; the total amount by provinces claimed and rejected under the Act; the total amount by provinces of the claims under the Act which have not been decided upon.

Mr. Kay.—For a return showing how many veterans in the county of Missisquoi have applied for the Fenian raid bounty; how many have been granted, and their names; how many have been refused, their names, and why the applications have been refused?

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all papers, correspondence, telegrams, letters, pay rolls, accounts, and vouchers in any way referring to the expenditure of money by this Government in the construction of the new telegraph or telephone line from Baddeck, Victoria county, N.S., to Northeast Margaree, Inverness county, N.S., thence to Big Intervale Inverness county, N.S., and also in connection with the lines from Southwest Margaree to Loch Ban, and from Scotsville to Whycocomagh, all in Inverness county, N.S.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams and correspondence in any way relating to the appointment of men in any way connected with the salmon fishing pond at Margaree during the year 1913.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and documents of all kinds in possession of the Government or any department thereof, in any way relating to the employment of and dismissal from the Geographical Survey of Canada of N. H. McLeod, Northeast Margaree, Inverness county, N.S.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, memoranda, Orders in Council, instructions to officers, regulations and other papers and documents relating to a change in the regulations governing the fishing of salmon in the St. John river, above tidal water.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents in the possession of the Post Office Department, relating to the dismissal of James R. Laing, postmaster at Liscombe N. S. and of the facts taken, and report of investigation in regard to the same, if any, a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation, together with a copy of all recommendations, letters, telegrams, and other papers relating to the appointment of his successor.

Mr. Lemieux.—For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and papers generally in connection with the appointment of Joseph Lemieux as postmaster at Mont Louis, county of Gaspé.

Mr. Carvell.—For a return showing the names and addresses, with rank or occupation, of all persons who accompanied the Minister of Militia and Defence to the old country and Europe during the summer of 1913, and whose expenses were paid wholly or in part by the Dominion Government, or who were paid salary or allowance during such time, with the amount paid to each person.

BRITISH MAILS VIA HALIFAX.

Mr. H. R. EMMERSON moved:

For a copy of memorandum of agreement between the Canadian Government railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, covering the transportation of freight and passengers between Halifax and St. John over the Intercolonial railway, in connection with the Canadian Pacific and Allan Line steamships, carrying British mails, making Halifax the terminal port; also of all agreements, Orders in Council, petitions, memorials, regulations or orders of the Department of Railways and Canals, or of any officer or officers of the Intercolonial railway; of letters or other correspondence, interviews with the Prime Minister and other member or members of the Government, and representations to the Prime Minister, or other member or members of the Government, in any manner relating to the said memorandum of agreement; and of all telegrams and letters received by the Government, or any member thereof, or sent by them, either in reply or otherwise; also of all letters, telegrams, representations or other documents relating to the said agreement or in any way connected therewith, received by F. P. Gutelius, the general manager of the Intercolonial railway, from the Canadian Pacific railway, or from any corporation, persons or body, or sent by him, in reply thereto or otherwise, to the said Canadian Pacific railway or to any other corporation, body or person.

Mr. BORDEN: I do not know what the hon. member means by asking for a return of the interviews.

Mr. EMMERSON: I suppose that might be designated as a hearing. There was a hearing by the Prime Minister and a committee of council given to representatives of the city of St. John, and that is what I want to get.

Mr. BORDEN: I do not think any notes were taken of any interviews. I am afraid that all my hon. friend can get as to that is what has already appeared in the press.

Mr. EMMERSON: I will have to be satisfied with what there is. I do not suppose the Prime Minister has a detectaphone in his department.

Mr. BORDEN: I am afraid we are not supplied with that instrument.

Motion agreed to.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY ROUTES.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved:

For a return showing a tabulated statement of the number of rural mail delivery routes opened since 1911, including the number of boxes used; also the new mail delivery contracts necessitated by the establishment of said routes in each county.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. PELLETIER: I would ask the hon. member to restrict the papers to those already not moved for.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Very well.

Mr. PELLETIER: We have had in the past several of these motions for different counties, and the information would be duplicated if this motion were not restricted.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Bolduc, the officer in charge, can prepare a general statement. I do not want details; I want the lump sum, the number of boxes, etc.

Mr. PELLETIER: Mr. Bolduc will be the judge as to what is required.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

TRANSPORTATION OF FISH.

Mr. SINCLAIR moved:

That in the opinion of this House, the question of improved means of transportation for fresh fish between the Maritime provinces and the United States should receive the early attention of the Government.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my purpose in moving this resolution is to interest the Government, if I can, and to induce them to take steps to improve the facilities for the transportation of fresh fish between the Maritime provinces and the markets of the United States. The part of the Maritime provinces in which I am specially interested is possibly the part that most needs those facilities at present, I refer to eastern Nova Scotia. The fishermen are not here asking for any favours. The fishermen, so far as I know, never get any favours, and they do not expect any. The fisherman is accustomed to hard work; he gets up early, he has long hours, and he is exposed to all kinds of weather. If hon. gentlemen, sitting in their cushioned seats in this comfortable Chamber, could see a fisherman in my constituency on one of these January mornings when the thermometer is hovering about zero, ten or twenty miles from land, tossed in his dory on the white caps, attending to his trawls, the spray freezing on his boat and clothing, liable at any minute to encounter a blizzard and be driven out to sea, if hon. gentlemen understood the risk the fisherman endures and the hardships he undergoes in making a living for himself and his family, they would be willing to support any reasonable proposal that would

give him a better price for his products and make his lot somewhat easier.

I need not refer to the importance of our great fishing industry; that will be conceded. By reference to the report laid on the table a few days ago by the Minister of Marine, we find that this industry last year employed 88,308 persons. Of this number, 65,081 were engaged in fishing and 23,327 were workers in canneries and other subsidiary employments connected with fishing. The vessels employed numbered 1,669. The boats engaged numbered 34,501. The market value of the catch last year amounted, according to the report, to $33,389,464. In Nova Scotia the industry has not been expanding of late years. For several years it has simply been marking time and making little or no progress. Last year it actually went back. As a matter of fact, the fishing industry in the Maritime provinces has never had a fair chance. It has been carried on under very great disadvantages, the chief of these being the distance from the market and the lack of transportation facilities. Up to a few months ago we were shut out of the market of the United States by a heavy tariff, and for many years we were practically shut out of the markets of Montreal, Toronto and the Canadian cities by the distance we were from them and the heavy express charges. Of late years this has been partly overcome. The Department of Marine and Fisheries is assisting in the transportation of fish in Canada, and doing so with excellent results. This assistance commenced under the late Administration in the year 1909, and it has been continued by the present Administration. Prior to this, the express rate from Mulgrave and Halifax to Montreal was $1.50 per hundred pounds. At the same time the rate from Portland and Boston to Montreal was about 80 cents. You can see that this was a very heavy handicap on the fishermen of the Maritime provinces. In 1909, under the Administration of the late Government, an agreement was made with the railways and the express companies that has been of immense advantage to the trade in the Maritime provinces. The terms of this agreement between the Government and the express companies were: The department arranged to have the railway place at the disposal of the shippers a cold storage car on two days each week, which car would be hauled by fast freight to Montreal. To enable this to be done, the department guaranteed that the earnings on these cars would be at least two-thirds those on a minimum carload of 20,000 pounds, at carload lot rates from the point of starting to destination, plus $4 per car for icing. The department arranged with the express companies to accept responsibility for one-third of the ordinary express rates on all shipments of fresh and mildly cured fish, including shell fish, from the Atlantic coast as far west as the eastern boundary of Manitoba, and from the Pacific coast as far east as the said boundary. This service has proved a great boon to the trade. While it cost the department a considerable amount annually for the first few years, it is now being taken advantage of to such an extent that it is practically self-sustaining. In this way we have developed a good home market for fresh fish caught in the Maritime provinces. But a new situation has arisen owing to the Wilson tariff, which has opened up to the people of the Maritime provinces the great market of the United States. We have only to look at the map of the Maritime provinces to see the proximity to the New England States, with their teeming population, and cheap water carriage and open navigation the whole year round. If our fisheries are ever to become a great industry, we must exploit this market in the United States. The Boston market, in addition to its proximity to the Maritime provinces, has the advantage of being a much larger market than anything we have in Canada. I am told by dealers who have experience in the fishing business that if two or three carloads were sent to Montreal for sale on the same day it would practically break the market, but you could put three or four times that amount on the Boston market and it would have no such effect, because Boston is such a large distributing centre. The ruling prices in Boston are also much higher than the prices in the Maritime provinces. This is shown very clearly by comparing the prices quoted from day to day on the Boston market with the prices that the fishermen are receiving on the coast of my own constituency.

Mr. BRADBURY: How do the Boston prices compare with Montreal prices?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am discussing the price the fisherman receives for his fish at the place where it is caught. The retail prices in Montreal, Ottawa and other Canadian cities, have always been a puzzle to me; they are so much higher than we should expect them to be. For instance a fisherman in the town of Canso gets one

and a half cents a pound for the haddock he catches at this season of the year, but you cannot buy the same pound of haddock in Ottawa for less than ten cents. That is a matter I am not able to explain. I am talking in the interests of the producer and am pointing out that the prices paid in Boston to the man who catches the fish are very much higher than the prices paid to the man who catches the fish in the province of Nova Scotia. If you look at the trade papers of the first of January, you will find that the price in Boston was $5.50 per 100 pounds of haddock while the price at Canso was only $1.50. I have a report before me—not a very recent one—taken from the Gloucester Daily Times of February 6, 1913, nearly a year ago, which illustrates the point I am making. At that time haddock was selling wholesale in Boston for $6 per 100 pounds and on certain days the price was higher, from $8 to $10 per 100 pounds. On the 7th February—quoting from the same paper—the fisherman got for his haddock landed at the wharf in Boston from $4 to $8 per 100 pounds, and for large cod from $8 to $9 per 100 pounds. Although the price varies very much in Boston it is as a rule very much higher than the price ruling in Nova Scotia. I have a third quotation from the same paper—which is the best authority we have on this question—dated the 18th of February, which shows that Boston dealers were paying $4 to $5.50 per 100 lbs. for haddock and $6 for large cod. During all this period the fisherman at Canso was getting $1.50 for the same class of fish. As I have pointed out, this Boston market with its higher prices is open to us and the question is: have we the enterprise and the pluck to take advantage of our opportunity? Whatever views some of our people may have held about this matter during the hysterical period of 1911, there are, to-day, very few business men in the province of Nova Scotia who do not recognize that it would be a great advantage to the fishing industry of that province to have the United States market open to us. I do not think there are two opinions about that among the business men of our province to-day. I will give you the opinion of Mr. S. Y. Wilson, a prominent fish dealer who has spent all his life in the trade, and who should know as much as anybody in the constituency of Halifax, about this matter. He is also a prominent supporter of the Prime Minister. He says:

> Clear-cut evidence of what 'free fish' is doing for the Nova Scotia fisherman is seen in the preparations taking place aboard schooners at the ports of La Havre and Lunenburg. These preparations mean that Nova Scotians are going to cut out the Gloucester men in the operation of the winter herring industry at Newfoundland. Right now even have they begun to elbow the Gloucester fleet from a fishery it has controlled for years, several craft having set out to secure cargoes.
>
> All this has been made possible by the recent enactment of the Underwood tariff schedule, abolishing the import tax on sea food irrespective of the transportating ship's nationality.

Another prominent man, Mr. A. Handfield Whitman of Halifax, in discussing this question in the New Year's issue of the Morning Chronicle, newspaper, says:

> The outstanding incident in 1913 in regard to the fishing industry was the removal of the duty by the United States Government. Free entry of fish into the United States must bring a tremendous development in Canada's fishing industry.

Everybody who has read the reciprocity agreement knows that it would have given us much greater benefits than we enjoy under the Wilson tariff. The reciprocity agreement would have given us practically a monopoly of the United States market, while the fisherman from abroad who shipped his salt mackerel to the United States from England, Ireland or Holland, would have to pay $2 a barrel, Canadian mackerel, under the reciprocity agreement, would have entered the United States market free of duty. The Wilson tariff does not give us that advantage because we have to compete with other nations in the American market.

The chief difficulty in taking advantage of the United States market is the want of transportation facilities. Our needs in Eastern Nova Scotia, and I am speaking now largely for my own constitutency, are twofold; in the first place, we require a branch railway in order to reach our home market, and our home market of course is not to be despised. At present we look upon it as the best market we have, and it will continue to develop as the population of the country increases. But in the constituency that I have the honour to represent we are not able to get into touch with the home market owing to the lack of railway facilities. Apart from my own constituency, and speaking for the southern coast of Nova Scotia generally, I am of opinion that a fast line of boats connecting our chief ports with the city of Boston would be of immense advantage to the fishing industry and would help to develop a very large trade with the United States. I have brought this question of branch lines to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister

of Railways and Canals several times. He has given me various answers and does not seem to be in any great hurry to deal with this question. At all events he cannot be charged with any indecent haste in regard to it. But he has been talking about it for several years. In 1912, when I asked him if he was prepared to go forward with the proposition which was inaugurated by the late Government, he informed me that he would require to have a survey made before he could say that. In 1913 he informed me that he would require to send a traffic expert down to see that country in order to find out whether the Government would be justified in spending any money on that branch line. To-day he tells me that the matter is under consideration. I do not know what has happened or what is going to be done, but it is always something in the future; it is like the little boy's complaint about his mother; it is jam to-morrow, jam the day after to-morrow, but it is never jam to-day. I would like to have this question brought to a head and have the minister deal with it. Any one who has followed the discussion in the House will remember that the late Government undertook to build certain branch lines in the province of Nova Scotia and one through this territory, and that a contract was let for the building of this line prior to the defeat of the late Government. A deposit of $50,000 was put up by the contractor, and the Sunnybrae branch was purchased from the Nova Scotia Steel Company at a cost of $100,000 to form part of the line. All of these things were done at the time this Government came into power. The same situation existed with regard to the branch line in the county of Halifax. The branch line in the county of Halifax went on and I am told that it will be completed next summer. But, the contract was cancelled in the county of Guysborough, the $50,000 deposit was paid back to the contractor and ever since that day we have been having evasive answers from the Government as to what they intend to do in reference to this branch line.

I pointed out to the minister last year that if he did undertake to build this branch line he would find sufficient traffic to justify the expenditure; that a large tourist traffic could be developed, and that along the proposed line there are large quantities of spruce and hardwood and also quantities of pulp and pitwood for which there is a good market in the coal mines of Cape Breton. The railway would also pass through a good agricultural country, but perhaps the greatest development would take place in connection with our fishing industry. That is what I am dealing with chiefly to-night. As a proof of the position I take in connection with the fishing industry, I would like to place before the House some statistics as to what has been done at Canso, Queensport, Half Island Cove, and places around Chedabucto bay that are now brought into connection with the railway at Port Mulgrave by a steamboat service. These places would not be able to carry on a fresh fish business at all were it not that they have a daily connection with the Intercolonial railway at Mulgrave, and the progress that has been made by these places indicates to my mind what could be done at other points in the same part of Nova Scotia if they had the facilities to ship out the fish they catch. I have before me here the results of the traffic carried by these boats to Port Mulgrave for the past ten years. The figures are:

Year.	Tons fish Shipped.	Value.	Railway and express charges paid.
		$	$
1903	1600	112,000	16,840 00
1904	1700	127,500	17,680 00
1905	2201	116,070	23,032 06
1906	3154	220,780	29,063 01
1907	3156	220,920	27,417 70
1908	3372	235,900	31,644 03
1909	2371	191,170	26,685 55
1910	3431	240,100	36,022 58
1911	4110	308,250	45,179 11
1912	4238	317,850	45,730 69
1913	5314	398,550	60,442 21

I am giving you, Mr. Speaker, these details, to show the growth of the fishing industry at Canso, and these other two points that are served by the boats that carry traffic to the railway at Mulgrave. In addition there are certain shipments of fish and fish products from Canso by water. The figures for 1913 are as follows:

		Value.	Freights.
250	tons fish oil.. ..	$ 12,000	$1,200
75	tons fish glue ..	9,000	360
350	tons fish fertilizer..	12,250	1,750
1,100	tons fish	77,000	5,500
1,775	tons.	$110,250	$8,810

This table shows the steady growth of the fresh fish business from these points. To sum up: in the year 1903, the quantity of fresh fish shipped was 1,600 tons while in 1913, the year just passed, the quantity

was 5,314 tons; in 1903 the value of the fish shipped from these three points was $112,000, in 1913 it was $398,550; in 1903 the express and freight charges paid to the Intercolonial railway at Mulgrave on this fish was $16,840 and in 1913 it was $60,442.41.

I submit that this is a splendid showing, and it has been made possible only by the traffic facilities that are afforded; it could be enormously increased if there were railway facilities given to Canso. To sum that up: the fresh fish shipped in 1913 from these points amounted to 5,314 tons; the fish products to 1,775 tons, making in all 7,089 tons. Allowing twenty tons to the carload, that gives us 354 carloads or one carload a day for every working day in the year 1913. The winter fishing, which is chiefly carried on in the months of November, December and January is the most profitable on that coast. The winter fishing is not prosecuted at very many points along the coast of Nova Scotia because there are no facilities for getting the fish to the market. I shall give the result of two weeks' work at Canso in the month of January of the present year, and the figures I shall now quote are for the week ending January 3, 1914. I want to give these facts in detail so that the Minister of Railways can send his traffic expert to Canso to check the statements I make and find out whether they are correct or not. The following table gives the landings of haddock by some of the larger boats of the Canso fleet for the week ending January 3, 1914; I give the names of the captains, the number of dories, and the number of pounds caught:

Landings of Haddock by some of the Larger Boats of the Canso Fleet, Week ending January 3, 1914.

Captain.	Dories.	Catch. Lbs.
H. Kavanagh	2	27,000
Pat. Ryan	1	15,000
Jake Manuel	2	24,000
W. Power	2	23,000
W. Ryan	1	12,000
K. Meagher	1	12,000
Sam. Hurst	1	11,000
J. Lumsden	3	26,000
F. Lohnes	4	33,000
G. Little	3	20,000
J. Kennedy	2	20,000
R. Mosher	2	16,000
C. Mosher	3	20,000
L. Feltmate	3	18,000
Ed. Kavanagh	3	25,000
J. Hearn	2	14,000
Ed. Hearn	4	18,000
Thos. Fanning	2	16,000
J. Grady	1	8,000
J. J. Berrigan	2	14,000
John Hurst	2	14,000
George Ryan	2	22,000
Matthew Munroe	3	18,000
Frank Hawes	3	22,000
John Boudrot	3	26,000
Frank Goodwin	2	15,000
D. Walsh	1	8,000
W. Shrider	2	17,000
Fred. Phynold	2	15,000
Thomas Carter	1	11,000
Sandy Meagher	2	17,000
Samuel Snow	2	17,000
Levi Ehler	1	10,000
S. Munroe	1	9,000
S. Hurst	1	8,000
John Carter	1	11,000
		612,000
Dories and other boats		300,000
		912,000

Other boats and dores caught 300,000 lbs., making a total of 912,000 lbs. of fish caught in that week. This is 456 tons or 23 carloads, representing four carloads per day of possible traffic from that one point alone in one week. The following week, the week ending on the 10th of January, owing to storms the catch was not so large, but with the same fleet it amounted to about 700,000 lbs., or 350 tons, or 17 carloads making three carloads per day for that week. This will give the Minister of Railways and the House an idea of the traffic that can be developed from the fishing industry, provided proper transportation facilities are afforded. What has been done at Canso can be done on a smaller scale at Whitehead, Country Harbour, Liscombe, and I have no doubt at many other points on the Atlantic coast of Nova Scotia. Give us transportation facilities, with an open market in the United States, and no man can set a limit to the possible extension of the fishing business. You may ask, Mr. Speaker, what I propose, and I will give you a clear-cut proposition as to what I think ought to be done. As far as my own constituency is concerned, I have already pointed out that our great need is a branch railway. That would give us direct communication with the home market, and it would also, to some extent, put us in touch with the markets of the United States. The second proposal I have I address chiefly to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I am sorry the minister is not in his seat now, but perhaps the leader of the House would be kind enough to point this matter out to him. My proposal is that the Government should offer a substantial subsidy to assist a fast line of boats, adapted to the fish trade and equipped with cold storage, to call at various points on the coast of Nova Scotia between Cape Breton and Yarmouth, and to make at least three trips a week between

the Maritime provinces and Boston. This would involve, no doubt, the expenditure of a considerable sum of money.

Mr. HAZEN: Does my hon. friend mean three trips a week between the Maritime provinces and Boston, or does he mean three trips a week between Yarmouth and Boston?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am not speaking just now for Yarmouth, because Yarmouth has pretty good facilities. I presume the hon. member for Yarmouth will tell us what is being done at that point. I am chiefly concerned now with eastern Nova Scotia.

Mr. HAZEN: I wanted to understand if my hon. friend is advocating that a direct line of steamers should be put on between Canso and the ports to which he refers, and Boston; or, that there should be a line of steamers from these ports to Yarmouth to connect with the steamers from Yarmouth to Boston.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I would have no objection to the system being combined with the present line of steamers. I am not undertaking to say how it ought to be done. If I can persuade the Government to give us steamboat communication between these ports and Boston, the Government will have to work out the details as to how it is best to do it. I do not want to duplicate the boats from Yarmouth to Boston, but I presume the Government would not do that unless they thought it absolutely necessary to do so. My own view is that a successful business can best be done by freight boats. The boats from Boston to Yarmouth are passenger boats. I would like to see a fast fish line in the business that would be devoted specially to carrying fish, and I do not know whether it would be wise that passengers should be included. As I have stated, this will involve the expenditure of a considerable sum of money, but in my judgment it would be justified. It would bring much better results than some of the expenditures we are now making. For instance, we are asked to vote the large sum of $340,666 to assist steam service between Canada and the West Indies and South America, and we are also asked to vote $146,000 for steam service with South Africa. I am not objecting to these subsidies, but I do say that if you could give us one-half of these sums to equip a fish-carrying service between our Atlantic ports and the American market, you will get far better results than you will ever get out of the South American trade or out of the South African trade. I regard this as the chance of a lifetime for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He does not need to travel like Gulliver all over the world to find this trade; it is right at his very door staring him in the face. Look at it; we have teeming millions of people across the boundary, and they are a fish-consuming people. They must get their chief supply from Canada, either from the Pacific coast or from the Atlantic coast. We have in eastern Canada five thousand miles of coast line comprising perhaps the most valuable fisheries in the world. We have the men. There are no better men on the seven seas than there are in eastern Canada. We have the harbours; we control the bait and we control the base of supplies. In addition to all this, the richest, the biggest and the best market in the world is thrown open to us. What we have not got and never have had is proper transportation facilities. That is what we are asking for.

I regard this as a real emergency. The question will arise: will this Government take advantage of the splendid opening for which the people of Nova Scotia have been waiting and looking for the last fifty years? It is quite true that by taking advantage of this opening, there will be more truck and trade with the Yankees, but we have that now on a very large scale and it is growing larger year by year. On this question of trade with the Yankees we have an extraordinary situation in this country. If we are to adopt the Tory philosophy of 1911, that it would endanger British connection, we have at the present time our Canadian patriotism flowing across the boundary line at the rate of $2,000,000 a day for every day of ten hours during the whole of 1913. That is $200,000 an hour or $3,333.33 every minute. This is an alarming state of affairs. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) however does not appear to be taking any steps to stop it. He just sits in his cozy seat, shuts one eye and winks at the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid), and both gentlemen are laughing in their sleeves at the poor deluded devils who left our party and voted Tory in 1911, for the purpose of stopping this trade with the Yankees.

I hope that no considerations of consistency will deter the Government from taking steps in regard to the matter that I am proposing. A great American philosopher once said that consistency was the hobgoblin of little minds. Speak what you think to-day in words as hard as cannon balls,

and to-morrow speak again what you think in words as hard again, although you should contradict every word that you said to-day. That is the philosophy I would commend to my hon. friends on the other side, owing to the circumstances in which they find themselves.

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) would have to turn a sharp corner in order to do this, but he turned a sharp corner not long ago on the naval question and I think he is quite capable of doing so again. I hope that he will deal with the situation promptly and vigorously, and that he will do whatever is necessary to put the project on its feet. I venture to say that it will be the greatest stroke of business that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce will ever have an opportunity of doing for the Maritime provinces. Let him do this and great results will follow. Towns will grow up all along our coasts. Our deserted shipyards will spring into life again. Thousands of our best seamen, who are now the hirelings of the nabobs of Boston and Gloucester, will return home to develop our own country; the Maritime provinces will win back their old prestige on the sea and Canada will take her rightful place as a great Maritime power. Is not that an achievement worthy of a statesman, even if he has to turn a sharp corner in order to carry it out? I hope that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce will measure up to the opportunity and that, when the Supplementary Estimates are tabled, he will be able to find a favourable solution.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.): I desire to say a word or two in support of the resolution introduced by my hon. friend the member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). The Estimates that were tabled a few days ago contained various sums by way of steamship subventions for the purpose of encouraging traffic in various parts of the world. On reading over those Estimates I find that the following sums are provided for:

Steamship service between:	
Annapolis and London	$ 5,000
Canadian Atlantic ports and Australia and New Zealand	140,000
Canada and Great Britain	1,000,000
Canada and Cuba	25,000
Canada and Newfoundland	70,000
Canada and West Indies and South America	340,666
Canada and South Africa	146,000
Halifax, St. John and Liverpool	20,000
Montreal, Quebec and Manchester; St. John, Halifax and Manchester	35,000
St. John and Dublin and Belfast	7,500
St. John and Glasgow	15,000
St. John, Halifax and London	40,000
Canada and Australia and New Zealand, Pacific Ocean	180,500
Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Island	16,000
Victoria and San Francisco	3,000

This last item appears for the first time, I think, in the Estimates of a federal Government. Whatever may have been in the past, the record of the party now in power, at all events they have taken a new departure, inasmuch as they have provided a subsidy to encourage traffic between British Columbia and United States cities on the Pacific coast. We in the province of Nova Scotia are asking that the Government shall pursue a similar course in respect to the development of trade between the province of Nova Scotia and the New England states. My hon. friend from Guysborough, in the course of his observations, laid upon the table figures showing the splendid development of the fishing industry in the port of Canso, which is situated in the county which he represents. Nine miles from the town of Canso are situated the fishing centres of Arichat and Petit du Grat, in the county of Richmond, which I have the honour to represent. Their record in the development of the fishing industry is equal to the record given to this House by my hon. friend from Guysborough.

The traffic which has been developed along the lines for which the steamship subventions, which I have just quoted, have been provided, is as follows:

Canadian trade for the eight months ending November 30, 1914:	
Australia and New Zealand	$ 6,253,431
Cuba	4,479,100
Newfoundland	4,966,928
West Indies (Br. and foreign)	7,027,436
South America	2,792,654
South Africa	2,952,612
United States	416,696,316

Therefore, no matter what may be the disposition of the hon. gentlemen who now form the Government of this country, with respect to their desire to curtail or curb traffic with the United States, that traffic is increasing enormously, as my hon. friend from Guysborough has pointed out.

The people of the Maritime provinces have already benefited very considerably by the action of the United States Government in

putting fish upon the free list. What my hon. friend from Guysborough suggests is quite within the means and power of the present Government. We have a line of steamships running between the town of Port Hawkesbury and the city of Boston which are already operated during the summer months. Unfortunately, the owners of these boats, not being in the enjoyment of any subvention from the federal Government, do not feel any special obligation to develop the business except that which comes to them in the ordinary way. While these steamships take their departure from Port Hawkesbury, in Inverness county, they make no call along the coast of Nova Scotia until they come to Halifax, and from Halifax they sail direct to Boston. It would be a very desirable and commendable object if the Government would adopt a system which would induce, if not the present steamship company plying from Port Hawkesbury and Halifax to Boston, then some other steamship company, to place steamers on that route that would call not only at Port Hawkesbury but also call at Arichat and take the fish week by week that would offer for transportation along that route. The county I have the honour to represent is about in the same position as Guysborough as regards the incompleteness of its railway accommodation. We have a railway from Point Tupper to St. Peters. But it is a privately-owned road, and so, unfortunately, a shipment of fish sent over it by express must pay a double rate before reaching its destination. The acquisition of the Cape Breton railway by the Government, the extending of it to Arichat and Sydney and Louisburg, and its operation as a branch of the Intercolonial railway, would be a boon that I have endeavoured to urge upon the Government in the past. I reiterate the desirability of this project, and I hope that the plan for the acquiring of these branch lines as feeders for the Intercolonial railway has not been abandoned, notwithstanding the fact that no intimation has been given by His Royal Highness at the opening of Parliament that would lead us to believe that the present Government intends taking up that question in the very near future. The present transportation is entirely inadequate for the people of the province of Nova Scotia as respects the important industry to which I refer. I desire to impress upon the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as well the absolute necessity of accepting the principle embodied in the resolution moved by the hon. member for Guysborough and voting at an early day a sum of money to assist the transportation problems of Nova Scotia in the shipment of fresh and salt fish to Boston in the same manner as that in which they have dealt with the transportation between Victoria and the city of San Francisco.

Mr. B. B. LAW (Yarmouth): The resolution brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), to my mind, embodies one of the most important questions that this House has been called on to consider. Representing as I do the county of Yarmouth, which is the gateway between Nova Scotia and the United States, I should not be doing my duty if I did not say a word in connection with this subject. The hon. member for Guysborough has dealt with the matter in a very large and broad manner; I propose, in the few minutes which I intend to occupy, to deal with it more from a local standpoint. We have had from the port of Yarmouth for sixty years, owing to the energy and enterprise of the people of Yarmouth, a steamboat service
9 p.m. between Yarmouth and Boston. For many years these boats were owned by the people of Yarmouth, down to the time when the Dominion Atlantic railway absorbed the old Yarmouth Steamship Company. Afterwards this was taken over by the Canadian Pacific railway, and lately the Canadian Pacific railway has transferred the boats and steamboat service to the Boston and Yarmouth Steamboat Company. Twenty or twenty-five years ago we had two ships per week from Yarmouth to Boston. We have the same to-day. But I am happy to say that the steamboat service is, at the present time, and since the coming into effect of the Wilson tariff in October last, has been inadequate to carry the fresh fish and other goods that are offered for transportation from Yarmouth to Boston. As I have said, Yarmouth is the gateway to and from the western part of Nova Scotia. There is no steamboat communication between the Maritime provinces and Boston short of St. John on the north and Halifax on the east. And in many instances fish has been sent direct from Halifax by train to connect with the boats from Yarmouth to Boston. The people of Yarmouth realized the truth of what we said when we told them, weeks and weeks before September, 1911, that to give the fishermen of the Maritime provinces entry for their fresh fish into the United States

market would bring about an era of development such as they had never seen before. And the present state of affairs proves the truth of what we said at that time. I am glad to say that the people of Yarmouth were not hoodwinked by the excuses and arguments used by our friends on the opposite side when they said that we did not want the United States market, that the United States were composed of ninety millions of hogs and we wanted no dealings with them. I can only say that if the people of the United States are hogs, we like to deal with them. The money we get from them is clean, and it is about the only money we do get. I do not wish to speak in an offensive manner, but every dollar we get from the sale of fish to the United States we have to spend to pay for flour, feed, harness and almost everything else we use. There is nothing we can ship to Ontario, but our trade is naturally with the United States. Since the Wilson tariff came into effect there has not been a trip of these steamers when they have not been obliged to leave freight behind. I desire to read a letter which appeared in the Yarmouth Herald of the 27th of January last, which deals with the question of transportation:

Dear Sir,—Kindly allow us a short space in your valuable columns for a few remarks concerning our transportation facilities. It comes to this: Something must be done in order to make provision to have more accommodation for carrying the freight from Yarmouth to Boston.

There has not been a single trip this season that all the freight has been taken to Boston, and in a few instances there has been almost a load for the boat left on the wharf and at other stations.

Now there is one sure remedy for this, and that is to get a line of boats in opposition. Already there is a petition afloat, and is being freely signed by the shippers of all kinds of fresh and salt fish in the different localities.

Hoping that this will meet with the approval of all concerned, and thanking you, Mr. Editor, for your valuable space, we are,

Yours truly,

Shippers.

I must say I do not quite agree with the third paragraph of that letter, that the only sure remedy is in an opposition boat. I am afraid that if another boat were put on that route, we should have a very poor service indeed. I think that the proposals which I intend to make to the Government before I conclude would be very much better. In order to give you an idea of the amount of traffic carried on in fresh fish between Yarmouth and Boston I wish to read the list of cargo of the steamer Boston, from Yarmouth, on January 24 last:

Steamer Boston had as part of her outward cargo: 232 crates live lobsters, 821 boxes boneless cod, 300 drums dry salt cod, 8 barrels salt herring, 2 barrels salt mackerel, 20 cases pickled fish, 65 packages fish waste, 161 packages fresh fish, 130 boxes smelts, 1 box halibut, 11 barrels eels, 13 boxes finnan haddies, 80 cases canned lobsters, 10 bags hake sounds, 54 barrels clams, 2 barrels apples, 1 crate moose horns, value $18,316.

On her next trip on January 28 she carried the following cargo:

513 crates live lobsters, 129 boxes boneless cod, 550 drums dry fish, 151 cases fresh do, 139 packages smelts, 20 barrels herring, 7 cases pickled fish, 2 barrels salt mackerel, 3 boxes finnan haddies, 24 barrels clams, 100 cases lobsters, 2 cases eggs, 85 packages junk, 12 packages hides, 5 barrels fish waste, 3 barrels turnips, 5 boxes scrap iron, value $39,651.

On the two trips she carried fish and fish products to the value of $59,000 and she left behind on the wharf at Yarmouth quite a quantity of fish which she could not carry. Something, of course, must be done. The fishermen of the province of Nova Scotia and of Canada have had very little done for them. I do not know of any means of helping them except the proposals I intend to make. They are engaged in one of the most hazardous occupations I know of. They are exposed to danger and storm and hardly a week passes without the loss by drowning of one, two, three or more of these fishermen. The boats which they use to prosecute their business are small gasoline boats and they are anxious, of course, to get off to their lobster traps in the winter; and on that coast it is no pleasure trip to go on the sea at any time during the winter season. These fishermen have not had very much done for them. I was in hopes that the people of Canada, when they had an opportunity of voting in September last, would have voted for reciprocity which would have given the greatest era of prosperity that Canada has ever seen. We are getting some of the benefits of it to-day, but of course only to a small extent. Where the Boston is making two trips a week to-day, I am positive that inside of two months they will have to make four trips a week. The Board of Trade have taken this matter up with the Steamship Company, and I understand that they have promised four trips before the first of March. I think that under the circumstances this Government should do something for the fishermen. They were promised many things in the campaign of 1911, and I am sure that the member for Queens and Shelburne (Mr.

McCurdy) will remember many of these promises. The argument was used that a lot was to be done for the fishermen if this Government came into power. They went so far as to say that the fishermen of Nova Scotia would be provided with medicine free. If they wanted a box of pills or a dose of salts or anything this Government was prepared to furnish it to them; but I am sorry to say that up to the present these fishermen have suffered, I presume, untold miseries from the lack of these medicines which were promised them. I desire to say that my idea of assisting the fishermen of the western part of Nova Scotia is by the installation of cold storage on board the steamers plying between Yarmouth and Boston. The lobster, as many of you know, has to be marketed alive and is different from most any other fish. A lobster arriving in Boston dead or, as they call it, sleeping, is immediately thrown away as unfit for use. On the boats between Yarmouth and Boston there are not proper facilities for handling this fish or landing them without much loss. By the installation of cold storage a large amount of money would be saved for the fishermen, and I believe the Government should assist the steamboat company in providing cold storage on board these steamers for the better facility of handling not only lobsters but other fish which is sent to Boston.

The second point I would urge upon the Government to-day to assist the fishermen in marketing their fish would be to improve the harbour accommodation. The managers of the Boston and Yarmouth Steamship Company tell me that to put another boat on the route between Yarmouth and Boston involves a very large amount of money, and, having handled ships for some years, I am quite confident that they are right in this statement. Larger boats could be built and run between these two ports and the service could be increased. My own opinion is that with free entry of fish into the United States market it will not be long before two boats are required.

The third suggestion I have to make to the Government is that in order to improve the facilities between Yarmouth and Boston dredging should be done and our harbour should be improved. The boats which are running there to-day, making two trips per week in winter and six trips in summer, are as large as the port of Yarmouth will accommodate, and I sincerely hope that the Government may see fit, instead of putting a large amount of money in the Estimates, as they have done during the time they have been in power, and not spending it, will put a large amount in the Estimates and spend it. Our port at Yarmouth is one of the most important on the coast. It serves the counties of Digby and Annapolis, and it serves the whole south shore, all the way to Halifax. It is the port for the transportation, not only of fish, but of all other articles of produce, and I trust that the Government will see its way clear to give a large appropriation for improving and dredging the harbour of Yarmouth so that larger boats can be put on the route and that transportation companies will not have the excuse that there is not water enough in Yarmouth harbour to put on large boats. Let us put the horse before the cart and not the cart before the horse, let us not wait until the boats are ready to come and then find that there is not enough water for them to enter the harbour. Let us do the dredging first and invite the transportation companies to put on larger boats and give our fishermen and farmers proper transportation facilities, which they must have between the western part of Nova Scotia and Boston. The western part of Nova Scotia has dealt with Boston for many, many years. To-day, with the duty off fish and with the duty off our produce to a certain extent, although nothing like the same extent as it would have been under the reciprocity agreement, a trade will spring up between those ports which the boats at present on the route will be quite unable to handle.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.): I would like to make a suggestion to the Government in regard to this matter, which I think would be of advantage to the people of the western part of Canada and of Ontario. Instead of subsidizing steamers to carry this beautiful fish from the Maritime provinces to the United States, I would suggest that the Government provide transportation facilities in connection with the Intercolonial railway so that the people of Ontario, Manitoba and the West can get the benefit of the fish taken from the eastern waters of Canada. A great number of people are engaged in the Maritime provinces to-day in fishing. The cost of transporting this fish to Ontario is very great and I think the Government instead of subsidizing steamers as suggested by the hon. gentlemen opposite, should reduce freight rates between the Maritime provinces and the West, there-

by giving western people the benefit of this fish. To-day if the people of Ontario want fish they have to get it from Portland. The United States provides facilities for shipping this fish from Portland, and why should not our own railways be utilized for distributing this fish throughout Canada? In the province from which I come, a great quantity of fish is caught, especially on the north side, but unfortunately we have no railway facilities to take that fish from the north side to the main line of the Prince Edward Island railway, but I think that within a very short time the Government will see fit to provide such facilities. I have no doubt that when the car ferry from Prince Edward Island to the mainland is built a great impetus will be given to the fish industry, and then the people of western Canada, and especially Ontario —we in the East call Ontario West—will receive the benefit of this fish. I know the Minister of Railways is inclined if a sufficient inducement is held out, to put on fish trains from Hawkesbury and Halifax to Montreal, and I should think that these men who have been shouting for a subsidy for steamers from Yarmouth and Hawkesbury would see that it would be in their interests to work up a trade within their own country.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM (Inverness): I desire to place myself on record as supporting the resolution of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). I have listened with considerable interest to what my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. McLean) has said. He would intimate that the late Government did not do very much for the fish trade upon the Atlantic coast. I am of the opinion that the late Government did a great deal in that direction. My hon. friend must not forget that the late Government made certain arrangements by which cold storage cars from Atlantic ports to Montreal were placed at the disposal of eastern shippers on two days in the week and were to be hauled by fast freight. Not only that, but the late Government guaranteed the payment of one-third of the express rates from Mulgrave and Halifax to the eastern boundary of Manitoba. I think similar concessions were given to the western part of the country. My hon. friend should not forget these facts. I am quite in agreement with him that anything that can be done to help along the trade between the East and the centre and West of Canada, is an excellent idea, and I would always be in favour of that. But we in the East are ambitious; we are not satisfied with one market. If there is another market offering—and a good market we know it is—have we not a perfect right to look for it? If there are a dozen markets offering I think we should try to get them. In my opinion, that is what constitutes a great nation. However, my hon. friend will not forget after this, to give credit where credit is due. I must thank my hon. friend from Guysborough for bringing up this matter in the House. I must also congratulate him and other hon. gentlemen for having given us so much information. I cannot hope in the short time at my disposal to contribute very much to this discussion. I wish, however, to refer to the fish trade as it affects my own county. The fish trade in eastern Canada previous to 1907 was at a low ebb and in anything but a satisfactory condition, and remained so until the concessions I referred to were made by the late Government. Ever since then, the trade of Montreal, Toronto and western Canada has been increasing in a very satisfactory way. That trade was formerly in the hands of our American neighbours, but we succeeded in capturing it from them, and it is now a great boon to our eastern shippers.

I desire to refer to a return I received this afternoon with regard to the Fishery Advisory Board, which to my mind is an institution calculated to greatly benefit the industry. I am sorry however, and I want to call the attention of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. A. A. McLean) to this, that there is not a man on that Advisory Board east of the city of Halifax. That is unfortunate, because our best fishing grounds are around the Island of Cape Breton and off the coast of Guysborough County and our biggest fish shipping ports are around the coast of the county of Guysborough and in Cape Breton Island particularly Port Hawkesbury, Port Hood and Margaree, Grand Etang and Cheticamp. There is another defect in this board—a very serious defect to my mind—and that is the absence of real fishermen. There are eighteen members on the board and with the exception of one, I think, they are all business men. I regard that as a great mistake. I consider that one-half of the members of that board should be men engaged in the fishing industry. I take it that the duty of the board is to inform the Government as to what the fishing industry and trade really requires, and I wish to call the attention of

my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to that. Possibly he may revise the list. This Advisory Board could be of great help to the fishing industry, but I fear that industry will not receive the attention from the board that it would receive if we had, at least, a sprinkling of fishermen on it.

Just a word or two with regard to the American market which has been thrown open to us by the Underwood tariff. Some hon. gentlemen opposite will tell us that the Underwood tariff has opened up the markets of the United States to us and that we will get the same measure of benefit from it as we would have from reciprocity.

I do not believe that it would do this at all. The fact is we had the exclusive trade privileges under reciprocity whereas under the present American tariff we must share that privilege with all the nations of the world. I took the trouble to look up the shipments from other countries to the United States. We have competitors today in the American market with some of the mist aggressive traders in the world in fish and fish products. We must compete particularly with three countries—Norway, Newfoundland and the United Kingdom. Of the very articles of fish that are shipped from our country into the United States, I might say that the United Kingdom sends nearly $2,000,000 worth to that country. We are in competition with Newfoundland which sends in a million dollars worth of the very same class of article of fish. We are in competition with Norway which sends a million and a half dollars worth of the same kind of fish to the United States. Under the reciprocity agreement we had an exclusive right, which we cannot hope to enjoy under the Underwood tariff. That is one reason why I believe we should get as much aid from the Government as we possibly can to enable us to cope successfully with those countries. I trust that the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Guysborough will fall upon fertile soil. I trust that it will be productive of some good result and that our means of transportation to that country will receive honest and careful consideration from this Governement.

I am particularly anxious for the reason, I suppose, that I represent here a constituency that is more in need of the improved transportation facilities for fish than any other constituency in Canada. We have one of the finest fishing counties in Canada, we have a hundred miles of coast along the county of Inverness, fronted by the finest fishing grounds in the world, but unfortunately. we are deprived of good harbours. They are all bar harbours along that coast. We are also bound up for four or five months of the year with ice. This makes it very difficult to carry on the fishing industry as we would like to carry it on because the industry can be carried on along this particular coast to a marvelously greater degree that it has been in the past if we can only get improved facilities for transporting our fish to the American market. I may say, as my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Law) has already said, that it is an unfortunate thing that our harbours have been neglected so very much for the last two and a half years. I am not going to refer to this particularly now as I hope to have another opportunity later on to discuss several cases in detail.

When the late Government went out of office there was at least $200,000 of public grants to be spent along that coast. Not one dollar of that money has been spent, but the saddest thing of all is that our harbours, wharfs and breakwaters along the coast are in a deplorable condition. I can say without the slightest exaggeration that at least $100,000 worth of public property along the coast of Inverness was destroyed within the last two years when an expenditure of not more than $3,000 would have save this property. The money was granted but it was never spent there. It is most unfortunate, but it is true. That is the situation we are in. We have no proper harbours and we are tied up by ice for a large section of the year.

There is only one way by which we can hope to develop our fisheries along that coast and that is by the construction of a line of railway from Orangedale on the Intercolonial to Cheticamp. I have advocated the construction of this road since I have had the honour of a seat in this House. Before the late Government went out of office I had the assurance—and I make the statement in the presence of hon. gentlemen who were members of that Government— that this line would be constructed and I am convinced had the late Government been returned to power this road would be nearing completion now. Further than that, I called the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) to it. I intend to go more into detail in connection with the construction of this proposed road later on.

However, I may say that this proposed road from Orangedale to Cheticamp was surveyed. I called the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to it two years ago. A delegation came from my county, we saw the minister, and I suggested to him that he send an engineer down to find out the traffic prospects of this line. This the minister agreed to do regarding this suggestion as a good one. An engineer was sent down, I think a competent man, at least who was selected by the minister from his own staff. The report of that engineer I have seen and I am proud to say that it advocated strongly the construction of the road from an economical standpoint. He, the engineer, said in his report that this was a line that would justify its construction. We know the doctrine propounded by the Minister of Railways in regard to the construction of branch lines to the I.C.R. He said that if any line could be shown as likely to be a feeder rather than a milker of the Intercolonial Railway, he would agree to its construction. Here was a case where his own engineer stated in his report that the road would be a paying road and that it should be constructed. With these facts before us I was very much disappointed indeed that nothing was shown in the Estimates brought down the other day in respect to this road. However, as a delegation is coming up from my county in a short time, I will refrain from saying anything more about that road at present.

I may say again that the only way in which I hope to see our important fishing industry developed in the north end of the county of Inverness is through the construction of this road. In a certain section in the south the industry could be helped along very materially by placing along the coast a daily boat that would carry the product of the fishermen's industry from this southern portion of the county to the Intercolonial railway at Mulgrave. This of course would have reference to that part of the county not served by the proposed Orangedale-Cheticamp line. I am in hopes that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) will see his way clear to placing from year to year in the Estimates an amount by way of subsidy to induce a company to send daily boats along that part of the coast of Inverness County not served by the proposed branch railway after that road is constructed, but until that time such daily service to go along the coast as far as Pleasant Bay.

With these two things, I am satisfied that the county of Inverness is destined to come to its own. Considering the number of men engaged in the industry and the quantity of fish caught daily along that coast, even with antiquated methods of exportation, I am sure that with the adoption of modern methods great results can be expected. There are 1,500 men engaged in the industry now. My hon. friend from Guysboro has shown the results of the industry as carried on at Canso, and I am sure that if we had similar facilities to those enjoyed by the people at that port, at least 5,000 men would be engaged in this industry alone. I trust, Sir, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce will see his way clear to give us a subsidy for a boat to ply along the coast of Inverness, and that the Minister of Railways and Canals will take into consideration the report of his own engineer and that he will see his way clear to the construction of a line from Orangedale to Cheticamp. This will solve the question of transportation as far as the county of Inverness is concerned.

Just another word and I am through, and that is in regard to this advisory board again. Let me suggest to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he place upon this advisory board at least one member from the county of Inverness, and that one a fisherman. I will allow other hon. gentlemen to speak for other parts of eastern Nova Scotia, but I speak for this part of it, and if the minister would only take into consideration how important it is to have a fisherman on this board, he would realize that it would be a step in the right direction to name a man from the county of Inverness. He has a number of friends there; too many I am sorry to say. It will be my pleasure to recommend to him a man of whose staunch Conservative faith I can assure him, and he need not have any hesitation in taking my word for it. There are a number of fishermen there who are well fitted to act as members of this board. I took the trouble of looking over the names of the men on the Fisheries Advisory Board, and I have nothing to say against any of them except that they are not fishermen; they are fish buyers mostly. I state most emphatically that the fishermen should be represented on this board. The allowance of $10 a day given to the members of the board while they are on duty, together with their travelling and other expenses, is quite sufficient to ensure that the minister will get good men. I

conclude by saying that if the minister has not a larger sprinkling of fishermen on this advisory board, it is going to prove a failure, and I would be very sorry to think that it should.

Mr. F. B. McCURDY (Shelburne-Queens): I was very much pleased to hear the statement of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Law) that the steamship company which operates between Yarmouth and Boston, had given an assurance to the Yarmouth Board of Trade that they would, on March 1, put extra boats on that service to give the much desired four trips a week. It has always been somewhat of a puzzle to me why, with such a large quantity of freight—and valuable freight at that—offering at Yarmouth, the steamship company which undertakes to look after that business should not of their own volition supply sufficient boats to take care of the traffic which is pressing on them.

It goes without saying that every one interested in the development of the fishing industry along the southern shore of Nova Scotia, and I am keenly concerned in this matter, is interested in any proposition which makes for better transportation facilities for our fish to all points on which we depend for our market.

I would be the last to fail to appreciate the assistance given by the late Government towards improving transportation facilities and the safe and rapid despatch of fish and fish products to the markets. I believe that the assistance given by way of a rebate on express charges on fresh fish shipments did much towards facilitating the movement of fresh fish to the western market, but I would remind hon. gentlemen opposite that the present Government has already taken another and very important step in advance in that direction. We must all know that in order to land fish fresh on the market, we require not iced express shipments or a refrigerator freight car service, but an express refrigerator car service .

The efforts of the late Government were devoted towards shipments by express which embraced ordinary package shipment and iced shipment; the latter was not effective, because the ice often melted before the fish had travelled 100 miles on their journey, and the fish being placed on the market in poor condition made a poor advertisement for the Canadian fishing industry.

To afford further facilities and to place the trade on a better footing, the present Government has made arrangements by which regular express refrigerator service is available, and that is a most decided advantage to the industry.

It was with surprise that I heard such an astute gentleman as the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) refer to what he described as the 'hysterical campaign' against reciprocity.

I may say that when the reciprocity campaign was launched, I had no hesitation in leaving a quiet business life and most pleasant surroundings to do what I regarded was my duty, in opposing what I then considered a 'bad bargain', and I claim that subsequent developments in connection with the fishing industry and the changes which the Americans have voluntarily made in their tariff on fish, amongst other of our natural products which they purely in their own interests made, have vindicated the stand taken by the Conservative party on the reciprocity question.

The hon. member for Guysborough has admitted the value of the home market. He probably knows, as well as any of us, that prior to the time when a duty was placed on finnan haddies, bloaters, kippers and other mild-cured or cured fish, our supply for consumption in Canada came from Gloucester, Portland and Boston. He knows well that the placing of a duty on such fish, and the assistance given by way of a rebate on express charges, built up in western Canada a valuable market for Canadian fish of that class. He knows that that market is now supplied, not from Boston, Gloucester, and Portland, but from Lockeport, Digby, Halifax, Canso and other places in eastern Canada. The hon. member (Mr. Sinclair) has to-night admitted the value of that market, and he has even gone so far as to say that he considers it our best market. When the reciprocity pact was put forward, we were in effect asked insofar as the Canadian market was concerned, to revert to conditions which existed in the old days when the Canadian market for this fish was supplied from Boston, Portland and Gloucester. We were asked to admit the American fish free into the Canadian market, which, as the hon. member for Guysborough says, is our best market, and we in turn were to have our fish admitted into the Boston market, which altho a broad, is an erratic market. I repeat that the policy of the Conservative party with regard to reciprocity has been vindicated because we have got without cost to us as valuable concessions from the United States as we would have obtained had the reciprocity pact been confirmed by the electors and our home markets sacrificed.

Our fish is now being admitted free into the American market, whatever that is worth, and it is worth something, I admit, and we have, at the same time, retained our home market. I cannot but think that the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), in his heart of hearts, knows that we are better off to-day than if his fiscal theories had been approved of in 1911 by the Canadian electors. The hon. gentleman is a man of shrewdness who can appreciate a good bargain when he sees it, and I am quite sure that the view which I have put forward will appeal to his good business judgment.

Of course, every hon. member of the House approves of the idea contained in the resolution: that so far as legitimate assistance can be given to encourage the fishing industry it should be given. But when we come down to ways and means hon. gentlemen opposite are as diverse in their recommendations and differ as much in their ideas as to how actually the industry can be assisted, as they differ in regard to their selection of a new trade policy. They talk of subsidizing numerous and diverse steamship routes. There is one thing that occurs to me in connection with this discussion, and it is, that although these gentlemen opposite were in power for fifteen years, if I am correctly informed, they never initiated a precedent by subsidizing one single steamship line to develop trade between Canada and the United States. Fifteen years was surely long enough for them to decide upon some action, and be it remembered that their inaction was during a period when owing to more unfavourable conditions in the fishing industry, assistance was more required than under the conditions which exist to-day.

Being in somewhat constant touch with the Department of Marine and Fisheries, I am very pleased to note the great interest which the minister at the head of the department takes in the improvement of the administration of his department and the improvement of the many services connected with it.

In that regard, reference has been made to-night to the appointment of the Fisheries Advisory Board. A Shell-fish Commission has also been appointed. Accurate knowledge must precede action, and the hon. minister has been active in order to get the best suggestions possible as to what should be done in regard to the improvement of this industry. Those who are as closely in touch with the fishing industry as I have had the good fortune of being, cannot have failed to note the improvement in the enforcement of the fishery regulations under the administration of the present minister; also to the clearing out of streams, the abolition of the saw-dust nuisance and other things which tend to improve the fishing industry in its basic principles. Other phases of action will doubtless be personally touched upon by the hon. minister before this discussion closes.

One other point that I should like to emphasize is in connection with the statistics which have been placed on 'Hansard' to-night. I wish to point out that the administration of the Marine and Fisheries service under the present minister is apparently bearing abundant fruit, because the returns for the year 1913 given by the hon. member for Guysborough to-night show that in that year there has been the largest increase in the output of fish for any period during the last ten years.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (South Cape Breton): I desire to say a few words in regard to the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Guysborough with reference to increased facilities for the transportation of fish to the United States. So far as I personally am concerned, I am much indebted to the hon. member for Guysborough, firstly for bringing this resolution before the House, secondly for the vast amount of information which he has given us. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. McCurdy), while he taunted members on this side of the House, who had spoken of this subject, on being bad indicators as to the way in which it should be done, resumed his seat without giving us very much light as to how it should be done. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queens should be as much interested as any member on this side of the House in getting wide markets for the Maritime provinces for the products of the sea; and if he is in a position to criticise hon. members who have spoken on their inability or incapacity to show how a better market and increased facilities could be obtained for the transportation of our fish, then he should be in a position to tell us exactly how the whole matter should be carried out. I wish to be fair with the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens, as I believe he is as much interested in this particular subject as any hon. member from the province of Nova

Scotia. I do not think, however, that he did himself justice in the way in which he approached this subject. He said that a great benefit was given to the fishing industry of the province of Nova Scotia by the killing of reciprocity, but in the same breath he told us that the free market with the United States is worth something to the fishing industry of the province of Nova Scotia. If the United States fish market is to-day worth something to the people of Nova Scotia, it would have been worth a great deal more under reciprocity, because whereas to-day, under the Underwood tariff, we have to compete in that market with the whole world, under the reciprocity agreement we were the sole people of this world who would be allowed to send our fish into the United States market free of duty. In Newfoundland we have to compete with the greatest fishermen in the world. As a matter of fact the people of Nova Scotia are to-day unable to compete with them. We have not got the same facilities.

We are not, however, discussing reciprocity; we are discussing a proposition which will enable the fishermen of eastern Nova Scotia to get their fish to the best market in the easiest way. So far as the county of Cape Breton is concerned, the southern portions of that county, which I have the honour to represent, is practically without railways. The fishermen along the southern shore are not in a position to send their fish to market. The hon. member for Queens P.E.I. (Mr. A. A. McLean) and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens said that we have a great market in Canada. Undoubtedly we have a great market for fish in Canada, but what we in the eastern part of Nova Scotia are concerned with is the facilities for getting our fish to market. We do not care where the market is, whether it is in the United States, in Ontario, in Quebec, or in the West.

For the past two years resolutions have been introduced for the building of branch lines in the eastern section of Nova Scotia as feeders for the Intercolonial railway. I supported those resolutions on the ground that they would give the southern section of my constituency the opportunity of getting our farm products and the products of the sea to market. The Government have not given these resolutions much consideration. If they have given them any consideration, they have not told us so, and there is nothing in the Estimates to show that they are going to assist us in this respect.

The hon. member for Guysborough has put two propositions before the Government. The first is the building of branch lines as feeders of the Intercolonial railway. That would lessen the difficulties that the fishermen in his constituency have in getting their fish to market. It would also lessen the difficulties which the fishermen in southern Cape Breton have in getting their fish to market. It will take some time however, to build railways, and the Government have not started doing so yet. They have nothing in the Estimates for that purpose, and I must say that the first proposition of the hon. member for Guysborough seems to be a dead letter at the present time. Now, so far as the product of our fisheries is concerned we have only one way of getting them to market, and that is by a line of steamboats. Although I believe that at the present time the Boston market is the very best market the Nova Scotia fishermen have, yet I am not very particular where these subsidized boats carry the fish so long as they carry them to a good market.

We have in the southern section of the island of Cape Breton very good harbours. We have Louisburg, one of the very best harbours in the world, open the year round. We have a fairly good harbour at Gabarouse, which is one of the most important fishing stations on the north Atlantic, and another very important fishing station at Main-a-dieu. Unfortunately the harbour there is not good; but in the summer, with a line of steamers running along that shore, they could easily take their fish out and put them aboard these steamers. With reference to the question of whether we should or should not have a direct line from the eastern section of Nova Scotia—and I would call attention to the fact that my own constituency is most easterly—to the city of Boston or the New England states, that is a matter which the Government should consider. It was suggested, I think, by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that perhaps a line of steamers might be subsidized along the eastern shore of Nova Scotia which would connect with the Yarmouth line. From the statement of my hon. friend from Yarmouth I should think that the Yarmouth line as it at present exists, is over taxed, for he tells us that freight is being left on the wharfs at Yarmouth that these steamers cannot carry. It is sometimes considered very peculiar that we should be

losing population in the eastern part of Nova Scotia, and especially in the fishing and farming districts of Cape Breton. We are sometimes told that it is the people's own fault, that they flock to the mine and steel works and industrial centres. That is not the case. The people of the district I represent, especially around Louisburg, Gabarouse and Main-a-dieu would never have to go into the mining industry or into the steel works if they had proper facilities for shipping their fish from their homes. The lack of such facilities has been a grievance with them for many years. They have the very best fishing grounds in the world along that shore. And the prices are good, both in Canada and the United States. The only difficulty is in getting the fish to market. What is the good of taking fish from the sea if you are going to let them rot on the shore? As a result of the inadequacy, or I may say the absolute want, of facilities for transportation in that part of the country, the people are forced to leave their homes and go into the industrial centres. I desire to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and also the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) who is in his seat, that, in my humble estimation that is the reason why the districts along the shore of southern Nova Scotia are becoming depopulated. And I think the hon. minister could not do a better thing for the province of Nova Scotia, especially the southern districts, than to subsidize, this session, a line of steamboats which would either connect with the boats at Yarmouth or run direct from the eastern sections of Nova Scotia to New England. Now, we are thankful to both Governments, the present and the late Government, for anything they have done to make the transportation of our province easier. But I say they have not done enough. The port of Yarmouth, at least, has not very much to complain of. In the first place, they have a railway running into that district, and then they have a direct line of steamers to Boston. As to our part of the country—and I say this in all seriousness, I never was more serious in my life—if something is not done to help the fishermen get the products of their labour to the market, the district from Port Hawkesbury to Glace Bay will be depopulated in a short time, and I hold that the Government—any government, either this or any other—would not wish to see that; every government wishes to do the best it can. But if they wish to do the best they can for that section of the country, it is their bounden duty, at this session—not letting it be further postponed—to do something to subsidize a line of steamboats to that section of the country that will give an outlet to the product of the fisheries of eastern Nova Scotia.

10 p.m.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): The resolution which my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has moved in favour of providing better transport for fresh fish between the Maritime provinces and the United States is one that, I am sure, is worthy of very careful attention on the part of the House and of the Government. It refers more particularly to matters which come within the control of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) and my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), because the means of transportation which the hon. gentleman suggests are, first the construction of branch railways in the county of Guysborough and, second, the providing of steamers for the purpose of carrying the products of the fisheries to market. The hon. Minister of Railways has not been in his place this evening, but I will call his attention to the matter,—though, perhaps it is hardly necessary to do so, for on several previous occasions I have heard the hon. member for Guysborough, when the Minister of Railways and Canals was present, pointing out what a great advantage the construction of these branch lines would be, and, among the advantages he claimed was that they would afford facilities for the shipment of the products of the fisheries. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is in his place, and it will not be necessary to call his attention to the matter further. I was sorry that the hon. member for Guysborough did not formulate some plan or tell us in what way he would suggest that his ideas could be carried into effect. And when I interposed and asked him if he suggested that there should be a direct line of steamers from Canso or other ports along the eastern coast of Nova Scotia to the markets, or whether he would favour a line of steamers along the coast connecting with the steamers from Yarmouth to Boston, he had not his mind thoroughly made up and would not give an opinion on the subject.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I would be in favour of a direct line from Nova Scotia to Boston, if it be possible to get it.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. gentleman did not give me that information before. He rather sidestepped the question when I asked it. We have now his opinion with regard to it. While the subject for discussion to-night was the importance of affording better transportation for the fishermen in the Maritime provinces, at the same time, it seems to me that my hon. friends opposite who have discussed the question, with scarcely an exception, while I do not in any way dispute their bona fides and desire to advance the interests of the fishermen in their constituencies, seemed even more desirous of making political capital against the Government than of advancing the interests of the fishermen who are their constituents. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Law) have harked back to the reciprocity question of September, 1911. The hon. gentlemen are very fond of telling that they accept public opinion and how desirous they are that the public should be consulted on questions, and yet, when the public are consulted on a great question like reciprocity and give an emphatic verdict on it, the hon. gentlemen are not willing to accept the verdict of the public and come here and complain about the verdict having been given against them.

Mr. LAW: I accept the verdict given in the county of Yarmouth.

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friends, both of whom represent counties where there are large fishing industries, are entirely oblivious of the fact that in the county of Lunenburg, the greatest fishing county in Nova Scotia, and the county of Queens-Shelburne, a great fishing county with great fishing interests, the reciprocity pact was discussed from the business and trade standpoint as thoroughly as possible, because the Liberal candidate in Queens-Shelburne was a gentleman able to discuss the question probably as well as any man in Canada, he himself had been one of the originators of the pact—they entirely forget that those two great fishing counties of the province of Nova Scotia, in no uncertain term pronounced against the reciprocity pact and in favour of the policy advocated by the Conservative party in 1911. It seems to me that in view of that it is rather absurd for the hon. gentlemen to come to this House now and say that the fishermen of Nova Scotia were in favour of reciprocity and that the reciprocity pact was in the interests of the fishermen of Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Yarmouth who has tried to introduce some politics into the discussion by referring to the condition of Yarmouth harbour, asked why are large appropriations not made for the purpose of dredging? A very substantial appropriation is being made this year. We know the condition of Yarmouth harbour, we know that when, a few years ago, the Niobe was brought from Halifax to Yarmouth at the request of the hon. gentleman and against the wishes of the responsible official of the Naval Department in order that the officers might take part in a ball given in connection with an old home week, it was unable to enter the harbour and a storm coming up when she was in the roadstead she put to sea, the result being of a character which cost this country $300,000 of the people's money. Let me ask my hon. friend who drags this in now simply for political purposes, where he was during the fifteen years the Liberal party were in power that he allowed Yarmouth harbour to remain in that condition? Why did not my hon. friend, who is a very influential supporter of the Liberal Government, try during those fifteen years to see that Yarmouth was put in the condition in which he thinks the Conservatives should put it in the two and a half years they have been in power? My hon. friend from Inverness suggests that the harbours in Inverness county were in a deplorable condition. They have not got into a deplorable condition in two and a half years. If they were in good condition when the Conservative party came into power they would not be in a deplorable condition now, even if they were neglected. Then let me ask my hon. friend why it was that during the fifteen years the Liberal party were in power he permitted the harbours of Inverness to get into this condition, why he did not get his friends to put them into good condition in that time.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM (Inverness): The breakwaters along our harbours at Port Hood and Margaree were destroyed owing to the storms of last year and the year before, with the knowledge of the Department of Public Works and of the engineers of the Government; and notwithstanding the fact that $200,000 had been appropriated for use in the county of Inverness, and would

have been spent in that county if the late Government had remained in power, all these wharfs were destroyed. The wharf at Port Hood, which cost $50,000, was absolutely destroyed. An appendix to a wharf was started last year under the supervision of my hon. friend. That new structure has been carried away, with the knowledge of the Government, and they never spent even a dollar to preserve the property of the Government.

Mr. HAZEN: As I understand storms came last year which carried away wharfs and breakwaters.

Mr. CHISHOLM: And the year before.

Mr. HAZEN: One would almost imagine that the hon. gentleman held the Government responsible for having brought these storms and that the damage which resulted from the storms last year and the year before should have been repaired by this time. A moment's reflection will show the hon. gentleman how weak his argument is in that respect.

I was referring to the fact that hon. gentlemen, in discussing this question, were unable to get away from political considerations, and were dealing with it in a way to make political capital. I come down, however, to a consideration of the facts. My hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Chisholm) said he would like to give credit to the late Government for what they have done in the way of developing trade in fish between Nova Scotia and the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. I would not for one moment detract in the slightest possible degree from any credit that might be due the Government which my hon. friend supports or anything they did in connection with the development of that industry. They arranged that fish should be taken by fast freight in fast freight cars. That was good as far as it went, and the present Government has taken a step far more in the public interest and a great step in advance by arranging for the fish to be taken from the Maritime provinces, in the last twelve months, in refrigerator express cars, with results most beneficial to the fishermen of the Maritime provinces in enabling them to get fish on the markets of Ontario and the West in a very much better condition.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I would like to understand exactly the difference between the plan adopted by the present Government and that put in force by the late Government for the carrying of these fish.

Mr. HAZEN: Under the arrangement made by the late Administration the fish went forward by fast freight. That was continued, but there was an arrangement made by which fish now goes forward by express cars.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I think the minister will find that it went forward by express before—

Mr. HAZEN:—going more rapidly, going under better circumstances and delivered on the market in better condition than previously.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How do trains go more rapidly than under the old system? The arrangement made by the late Government provided not only for fish going forward by express cars, but for payment of one-third of the express charges, which the present Government is also doing. I want the minister to point out the difference between the plan of the former Government and the present Government in regard to express cars.

Mr. HAZEN: There is not the slightest trouble in showing the difference. Now a cold storage express refrigerator car is sent forward every Saturday attached to an express train and the Government guarantees that that car will contain a certain number of pounds of fish; if it does not contain that much the Government will pay for the deficiency, and that has proved such a very great success that in many cases there is no deficiency to be paid for at all, and we believe it will be practically self-supporting and will be no burden on the country.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Did not the late Government provide express cars?

Mr. HAZEN: The guarantee under the former Government was for fast freight cars not attached to express trains, and cars, not running every day, but only two or three times a week. We have provided for this car, attached to an express train, to run every Saturday.

My hon. friend from Guysborough referred to the report of the Marine and Fisheries Department this year and made some quotations. The hon. gentleman approved of what was being done by the department in regard to having fish placed on the markets of the upper provinces. I may say that the movement inaugurated by my

predecessor in office, and carried on with extensions and improvements since, has proved a great success. There has been an increasing amount of fish going forward, and at one-third of the charges prevailing under the arrangement made by the late Government. I do not want to take up the time of this House or bore it in any way, but my hon. friend from Guysborough has referred very properly to the report of the Marine and Fisheries Department, and I think it is only proper that I should place on 'Hansard' an extract from that report covering the part of the extract referred to by my hon. friend. On page 15, hon. gentlemen will find under the heading, transportation of fresh and mildly cured fish, the following statement:

The department's policy in aiding in the stimulation and development of the trade in fresh and mildly cured fish in the interior portions of the country, by placing at the disposal of the shippers cheap rates and additional facilities and equipment, is having most gratifying results.

Prior to the time that the department undertook to assist, such markets as those in Montreal and Toronto were being very largely supplied from United States sources. The Canadian business was so small that the railways did not find it feasible to place cold storage cars, which would be hauled by fast freight, at the disposal of the shippers and the express rates were so high that successful competition with United States shippers was not found possible. This will be realized from the following: The express rate on fish from Halifax and Mulgrave is $1.50 per 100 pounds, while from Portland the rate is but 80 cents. As, however, there is an import duty of 1 cent per pound the gross rate is $1.80. The advantage of 30 cents per 100 pounds to the Canadian shipper was more than offset by the fact that at United States ports, owing to the very large number of vessels operating therefrom, a supply of fish could always be relied upon, and as the haul is short, orders could be sent up to within a few hours before the consignments were needed. Along the Canadian coast the demand for fresh fish was comparatively small and uncertain. Hence no great effort was being made by the fishermen to land fish during unfavourable weather, so that dealers could not rely on having their orders filled exactly when required, which is an absolute necessity in the carrying on of a successful business in the sale of fish.

To overcome these disadvantages and to assure, not only the Canadian market being supplied from Canadian sources, but a rapid expansion of such markets as well, the department took up the question of procuring better rates and shipping facilities. The railway and express companies did not, however, see their way clear to do more than they were doing, keeping in view the volume of the business that seemed available. The department, therefore, arranged to have the railway place at the disposal of the shippers a cold storage car on two days each week, which car would be hauled by fast freight to Montreal. To enable this to be done the department guaranteed that the earnings on these cars would be at least two-thirds those on a minimum carload lot of 20,000 pounds, at carload lot rates from the point of starting to destination, plus $4 per car for icing.

This service has proved a great boon to the trade. While it cost the department a considerable amount annually for the first few years, it is now being taken advantage of to such an extent that it is practically self-sustaining.

While a cold storage freight service is efficient for the supplying of a substantial market, such as that of Fridays, it soon became apparent that if a considerable demand for fish on other days were to be worked up, express facilities at reasonable rates must be available to the shippers.

This was done about a year ago, if my recollection is correct.

The department consequently arranged with the express companies to accept responsibility for one-third of the ordinary express rates on all shipments of fresh and mildly cured fish including shell-fish, from the Atlantic coast as far west as the eastern boundary of Manitoba, and from the Pacific coast as far east as the said boundary. This gave the shippers from Halifax or Mulgrave a rate of $1 per 100 lbs. to Montreal, and proportionately from intervening points, or an advantage to the Canadian coast dealers of at least 80 cents per 100 lbs. over the United States shipper.

With such facilities and rates the Canadian dealers did not take long to demonstrate that they could control the situation. Not only has the importation of fresh fish along the Canadian Atlantic coast been stopped from the United States, but the demand in the Canadian markets is being very rapidly expanded.

While the dealers on the Pacific coast have for several years been sending fish through to Toronto and Montreal in carload lots, on which they are given a rate of $3 per 100 lbs., the express charges in less than carload lots to the prairie provinces were so high that the working up of any large trade there seemed out of the question. The rate from Vancouver or New Westminster to Calgary is $3.50 per 100 lbs., and to Edmonton, Qu'Appelle or Winnipeg $4.50 per 100 lbs.

With the cheaper rate given owing to the departmental assistance the trade has increased wonderfully and now shipments are being sent in carload lots to quite an extent making departmental assistance unnecessary.

Then follow the figures showing how the business from the East and West by express alone has been expanding. It is evident from the facts as they present themselves, that the department has not been at all lacking in its desire to develop the fish trade between Nova Scotia points and points in Ontario and Quebec. A further arrangement was entered into last year with the express companies and the Intercolonial railway, whereby a cold storage express car for the transportation of fish leaves Mulgrave for Montreal on Saturday of each week. Shipments for Halifax are consolidated in this car at Truro. It arrives in Montreal on Sunday night in

time to connect with the Toronto train, so that the shipments for Toronto reach there by ordinary express cars Monday morning —leaving Mulgrave on Saturday, the fish are ready for delivery in Toronto on Monday morning. In addition to that, I may say that the Fisheries Department during the year had an exhibit at the Toronto Exhibition—the first exhibit of our fisheries that was ever made there which attracted a great deal of attention, and which, in the belief of many dealers, has done a great deal to develop the business in the markets of Ontario and of the lower provinces, and has been the cause of larger orders being given in the Maritime provinces. There has been some controversy here to-night over the Advisory Board, and I am glad to find that the general opinion of hon. gentlemen is in favour of the constitution of that Board, and that their belief is that it will be of benefit so far as the development of the fisheries of Canada is concerned. The only criticism that has been made is in regard to its personnel. My hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Chisholm) has suggested that some member from that county should be appointed to the Board. I am sorry I cannot comply with his request, much as I would like to. There are four members on the Board from Nova Scotia at present, and while no doubt there is not a part of Nova Scotia interested in fishing that would not like to have a representative on the Board, I am quite sure my hon. friend will see how impossible it is to have every county represented. The four representatives from Nova Scotia, I believe, are gentlemen well qualified to deal with the question. There is a gentleman from Lunenburg, Mr. Smith, who thoroughly understands deep-sea fishing; Mr. Gideon A. Hemeon, of Queens and Sheldon, a practical fisherman; Mr. Short from Digby, who is thoroughly au fait with this question. Then there is a gentleman from Halifax, appointed on the recommendation of the Board of Trade of that city, who has a special knowledge of the salt fish and dried fish industry, which centre very largely in the city of Halifax.

From St. Andrews, New Brunswick, on Passamaquoddy Bay, we have Mr. Russell, a gentleman who is a practical fisherman himself and a fish dealer. We have a gentleman from Kent county, and we have Mr. Young from Gloucester county. Mr. Young has been in the fish business all his life, is in touch with the fishermen and he was appointed to the Advisory Board at the request of the fishermen and those interested in the fishing industry. We have a gentleman from the Gaspé coast and these gentlemen I have named, four from Nova Scotia, four from New Brunswick, one from the Gaspé coast and one from Prince Edward Island, Mr. Longworth, constitute the eastern section of the Advisory Fisheries Board. I think it would be a very difficult matter to find any number of gentlemen with a more thorough or intimate knowledge of the fisheries of the Maritime provinces than that possessed by these gentlemen. I am glad to be able to assure this House that the permanent officers of the Fisheries Department are of the opinion that this board as constituted is of most valuable assistance in the development of the fisheries of this country and one which can give sound advice as to the line along which we should proceed and the methods which should be adopted in the development of the fisheries and of the fishing trade.

One word more about some remarks made by the hon. member for Guysborough. He referred to the subsidy granted to the West Indian line of steamships and the subsidy granted by the country to the line of steamships sailing to South Africa. It seems to me that the subsidy granted to the West Indian line of steamships is one that is very much in the interest of the fishing industry of the lower provinces, because a great deal of the freight that is carried by the West Indian line of steamships is fish exported from Halifax to the West Indies who are large consumers of fish caught in Nova Scotia waters, cured and dried there and sent to the consumers of the West Indies. I am sure that the hon. member for Guysborough and other hon. gentlemen from Nova Scotia, knowing the importance of that service, would be among the last to suggest that the money is not properly expended or that the service is not a proper one in the public interest.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I did not make any such suggestions.

Mr. HAZEN: I did not say you did.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I simply referred to the fact.

Mr. HAZEN: I referred to the fact and I said that I believed that my hon. friend would be the last one to suggest the stopping of this service altogether.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I did not suggest anything of the kind.

Mr. HAZEN: What was the purpose of my hon. friend in referring to it at all?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I made the statement that if the Government would give half of the amount that it was giving for the expansion of trade in South Africa and in South America, we would get better results from the trade between the Maritime provinces and the United States in connection with the fresh fish trade.

Mr. HAZEN: Am I to understand that the hon. gentleman suggests a reduction of one-half of the subsidy given by the Government to this West Indian service?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Not at all.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. gentleman referred to it for one purpose only, and that was that he wanted to create the impression in Nova Scotia that the Government had plenty of money to give to a service which was not very useful to the country, not nearly so useful as the one he advocated, and the subsidy which he tried to make it appear was not very useful was the subsidy granted to the West Indian steamship line. I am pointing out that this subsidy is of very great value to the fishing industry of Nova Scotia, because I think that I am correct in saying that the bulk of the freight that is carried by the West Indian steamships down to the West Indies is composed of fish caught and cured in Nova Scotia and sent down to the market of the West Indies.

As far as the South African service is concerned, perhaps I might point out that, whereas a few years ago we were sending comparatively small quantities of products to South Africa, owing to the steamship service, I find by the Trade and Navigation returns that last year we sent to South Africa $3,340,513 worth of Canadian products. They went, I think, practically altogether by this subsidized line of steamers, managed by the Elder Dempster Company, and sailing from Montreal in summer and from a Maritime province port in winter to South Africa. The business has been a growing one, and it will continue to grow. This export is made up largely of flour, agricultural implements, newspaper print and other products of Canadian workshops and farms, and that this subsidy is having good results is shown in the development of the trade of Canada and in the opening up of such markets for our manufacturers and producers of other sorts.

The Department of Marine and Fisheries has not been idle in regard to improvement in the matter of the transportation of fresh fish between the Maritime provinces and the United States. The question has been receiving the consideration of myself and the permanent officers of the department during the past two seasons. By my direction and at my request last year an officer of the department interviewed the officers of the company operating the steamship service between Yarmouth and Boston and arrangements were then made by which the steamship company undertook the more careful and expeditious handling of fresh fish in transit between the Maritime provinces and Boston. Complaints reached the department similar to those made by one hon. gentleman here to-night, complaints that I think were well founded, that lobsters especially were being very carelessly handled, with the result that they reached the Boston market sometimes in a condition which seriously impaired their value. We had the matter investigated. We had an official of the department go down to Boston and be present at the landing of these boats and see the condition in which the fish were, and I am advised by the Deputy Minister and other officers in the department that the improvements that have been made have to a very considerable extent been carried out by the steamship companies, that a great deal more care in the handling of fish has been exercised, with the result that fresh lobsters are now in a much more marketable condition when they arrive in the Boston market than they were previously to these inquiries and investigations being made. I am advised by the officials of the department that as a result of the representations made arrangements have been made for more prompt deliveries at Boston on the arrival of the various steamers from Maritime province ports and that better transportation facilities are being provided. At the opening of the present fishing season I directed attention to the matter and requested that the officers of the department should give their consideration to it with the view of bringing about some further improvements. The Superintendent of Fisheries went carefully into the subject, and he has submitted a memorandum pointing out the different steps which should be taken in order to bring about the desired improvements. These improvements involve negotiations with the Department of Trade and Commerce and these are in progress at the present time. The steamship

line which has been referred to as running between Yarmouth and Boston operates one boat from the first of October to the first of June, making two trips a week. After that two boats are put on, which make four trips a week up to the end of July. Then a third boat is put on to the end of October. So that from the first of June to the end of October the service out of Yarmouth is a daily service. There have been recent negotiations with the company and we hope that a second boat will be placed on the route from October to June instead of one boat as at present. There has been a very large expansion of the shipping business from Yarmouth during recent months and it is to be hoped that with that large expansion of business the steamship company will find that it will be possible to put on a daily service during the months that I have mentioned in order to carry this trade to Boston, and which, as I understand, has been fairly profitable to the company looking at it from a purely business standpoint. The other suggestion, that these boats run along the coast, connecting with the Yarmouth boats, does not find special favour with my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair), who thinks a direct service would be better. But all these questions will have to be considered by the Department of Trade and Commerce.

I think I am absolutely correct in saying that for a period of 15 years, no subsidy has been voted by the Parliament of Canada for a line of steamers running from a Canadian port to a port in the United States, and that is a matter which is worth remembering in connection with this whole question. No subsidy has been given to the line of steamers running from St. John to Portland and Boston, or to the line running from Yarmouth to Boston and return, or from Halifax to Boston and return. However, with the extensive business consequent on the increased development of our fisheries, it would seem to me that the company itself might find it in its own interest, without any subsidy from the Dominion Parliament to put on a line of steamers running daily during the fishing season or during the season when business is most active, between Yarmouth and ports in the United States, as steamers run daily during a great part of the season between St. John and Boston.

I agree with the hon. member for Guysborough as to the possibility of developing the fishing industry of Canada. Up to a few years ago Nova Scotia was the premier fish-producing province of Canada. To-day, British Columbia is enormously productive. The northern waters of that province are teeming with fish, and although up to the present the industry has been largely developed in only two varieties, the halibut and the salmon, the waters of British Columbia are filled with herring, and sole, and crabs, and other fish, the trade in which can be developed to enormous proportions. With the opening of the Grand Trunk Pacific from Prince Rupert to the East, I believe, from my own personal knowledge and observation in northern British Columbia this year, that in a few years Prince Rupert will not only be the greatest fish port on the continent of America, but probably the greatest fish port in the world. In addition to our fisheries on the eastern and western coasts, we have splendid fisheries in the immense inland lakes, where the industry is capable of great development, with resultant increase in the wealth of the country, and an added source of food supply for the people of the prairie provinces. Owing to the wanton destruction of fish in the past, we will have to take measures to repair the mischief that has been done, by providing for the artificial production of the fish. To a very considerable extent, measures in that direction are being taken to-day. This Parliament annually votes a large sum of money for the erection of fish hatcheries and for the maintenance of those already in existence. The Superintendent of Fisheries informs me that for the first time since we have established fish hatcheries in Canada, they are to-day filled with eggs and are being more successfully operated now than at any time in the past. It has been demonstrated that the salmon hatcheries have done most useful work. The fishermen along the coast of St. John county, who drift out almost across to the Nova Scotia shore night after night in the prosecution of their calling, tell me that there now is no such thing as a year when they are not getting a good supply of salmon. These salmon come up the bay of Fundy, and along the coast making for the spawning grounds on the St. John and Tobique rivers, and they are being caught at points along that river where they were not caught at 15 or 20 years ago, and they are being caught in great numbers. That is a very desirable state of things, and it is due to the more perfect enforcement of the fishery laws, and due most of all to the work of the salmon hatcheries. The same thing is true as to the whitefish hatcheries on the Great Lakes, and although the results obtained from the lobster hatcheries may at the present time

be a matter of some doubt, I trust that in a few years the utility of these hatcheries will be fully demonstrated and that they may in time to come make up for the past depletion of the lobsters fisheries. I entirely agree with one hon. gentleman opposite who said that there has not been as much done for the fisheries of Canada by the Department of Marine and Fisheries as should have been done, but I can assure my hon. friend that the officials of the department to-day are doing their very utmost to promote and develop the fishing industry, and for my part I am giving them the very best assistance and support that it is within my power to give. I trust that in years to come good results will flow from the efforts now being made by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Now that my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has brought this matter before the House, and has had a full discussion of it, which will no doubt be of benefit, as is every discussion concerning the development of our great national ressources, I presume he will consent to the usual course of adjourning the debate.

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

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Tuesday, February 3, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

APPOINTMENT OF OFFICIALS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had directed the Clerk of the House to lay upon the table his recommendation and the report of the Clerk in regard to the promotion in grade of Mr. A. E. Horton, Clerk of the Sessional Papers and of the Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker laid upon the table of the House on Thursday, the 22nd day of January, respecting the appointment of Mr. Francis H. Gisborne as parliamentary counsel, the promotion in grade of Mr. A. G. Troop of the Law Branch, of the appointment of Mr. J. L. Godwin as assistant in the Votes and Proceedings Office, and of the appointment of Mr. Joseph Smith as chief of stenographers to members, be concurred in, the salary attached to the promotion of Mr. A. G. Troop and the appointments of Messrs. Godwin and Smith to begin as of the first day of the present session of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS POST OFFICE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have a question to direct to the Postmaster General with reference to the post office in the House of Commons, although perhaps the matter does not come directly under his control. The hon. gentleman must have received within the last few days complaints from some hon. members that obscene literature is being distributed in the boxes of the members, and that without any stamp and without any frank. I know the Postmaster General is not responsible, but I point out to him that the distribution of obscene literature in such a manner is very objectionable. I do not know how it is introduced into the post office boxes, but I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that if you saw some of the leaflets which have been distributed recently, you would consider them very objectionable.

Mr. PELLETIER: The post office in the House of Commons is under the direction of Mr. Speaker, and not under the control of my department. In the Post Office Department, even when obscene literature is stamped, we always stop it passing through the mails. So far as the post office in the House of Commons is concerned, we may rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that you will attend to this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the first I have heard of this matter, and I shall take a very early opportunity of instructing the postmaster of the House of Commons with regard to it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

On the motion of Mr. Borden for Committee of Supply:

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I wish again to call the attention of the Prime Minister and of the Minister of Railways to the grievance of which I complained on Friday last. From the remarks of the Minister of Railways I would gather that he is not quite familiar with the increased rates and the local conditions on the Prince Edward Island railway. Of course I am not surprised at that. When I mentioned that the rate of freight

on cordwood for a short distance was $7 a car, he seemed to think it was not very large. The fact is that the capacity of the cars on the Prince Edward Island railway is only about half as great as the capacity of the cars on the Intercolonial railway. Taking that fact into consideration the hon. minister will see that the charges on the main line of the Intercolonial would be about $12 to $14 per car. The rate in my province is prohibitive and is not in the interest of the railway. There are similar rates on lumber of all kinds. From the letter which I read on Friday last, it will be seen that the rates on many other articles are prohibitive.

I have been informed by gentlemen supporting the Government that apparently it is of little use bringing matters of this kind to the notice of the management at Moncton; that they do not seem to take seriously suggestions from business men. So far as the management in Prince Edward Island is concerned, it does not seem to have any power at all.

The Prime Minister will remember that before the last election, in the discharge of his duty as leader of the Opposition, he came to our province and sympathized with the people there with reference to the very great difficulties they had in matters of transportation. He certainly made statements to the effect that if he came into power he would have some remedy applied, and no one understood him to say that if he came into power the rates would be increased. I am sure that the Prime Minister appreciates the responsibility of any statement that he might have made under such circumstances and that he would not wish to mislead the people. This matter is more serious than the Minister of Railways or the Prime Minister appears to think. I am surprised that the members for Prince Edward Island supporting the Government are not pressing this matter more strenuously.

Most of the articles transported over the Prince Edward Island railway are not handled by the railway officials at all; they are loaded and unloaded by the people. Mixed freight and passenger trains run anyhow, whether freight is offered or not, and it would be very little extra expense to the railway to haul these cars which are loaded and unloaded by others. If the railway is to be of any service to the people, this matter should receive some consideration from the Government. It may seem a small matter among the many subjects that come before the Prime Minister, but I would again ask him at least to look into it.

[Mr. J. J. Hughes.]

Mr. COCHRANE: I think the hon. gentleman is trying to mislead the people when he makes the statement that the cars on the Prince Edward Island railway do not carry over half what the cars on the main line do. This, I say, is not true. more than that, the hon. gentleman has never told the House and the country that we have cut out the third rate for the ferry across. This has never been done before, and is more in the interest of the people of Prince Edward Island than anything else we can do, until we get the ferry established. He has brought forward only one instance in which he says there is a hardship. In my opinion, he has not made out his case, because I know that the cars on the Prince Edward Island railway carry more than half what the cars on the main line do. If he has any other instances to give, I shall be glad to instruct the management to look into them.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Will the minister tell me the capacity of the cars on the Prince Edward Island railway and the capacity of the cars on the Intercolonial railway? Then we shall know whether my statement is true or not.

Mr. COCHRANE: You made the statement.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr Blondin in the Chair.

Civil Government—Department of Customs, $330,987.50.

Mr. BUREAU: Does the item 'salaries' cover the outside service?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): No, this is civil government, inside service. There has been no change as compared with last year except that there will be two promotions, one man from second division, subdivision 'A' to first division, subdivision 'B,' and one from second division, subdivision 'B' to second division subdivision 'A.' In addition to this, the commissioner advises that it will be necessary to take on twenty-two new employees during the next fiscal year. In engaging these employees he applies to the Civil Service Commission and accepts the recommendation of that commission.

Mr. EMMERSON: Will the hon. minister state who are to be promoted?

Mr. REID: The details show that there will be two promotions. The Commissioner generally recommends certain gentlemen for promotion. It is not decided yet who will be promoted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand that in the appointment of these additional clerks the minister based his action upon the report of the Commissioner of Customs, he himself taking the responsibility as to whether or not he should accept the advice of the commissioner. Under the circumstances, I think that my hon. friend ought to lay before the House the report of the commisioner, so that we may know the reasons which prompted him to come to the conclusion that such an extraordinary increase in the number of clerks is necessary —because twenty-two is a very extraordinary increase. We will then be in a position to discuss whether or not the reasons given are sound or unsound, adequate or inadequate.

Mr. REID: I have no objection whatever to bringing down the report as requested by my right hon. friend.

Mr. MURPHY: When the hon. gentleman brings down his information, I should like to know what that position is in subdivision 'B' of the first division. There is an increase there.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A friend of mine in Montreal, a wine importer, wrote me the other day complaining about the blank forms used in the custom house at Montreal. He said that certain blank forms which have to be sent back to France are printed in English only, and, as in many cases the exporters do not understand English, much inconvenience results to both exporter and importer. I am quite sure that this is only an oversight on the part of my hon. friend, and that he will remedy the matter by giving the proper instructions to the customs authorities to have the blanks in question printed in both languages.

Mr. REID: It has always been the practice, so far as I can learn, to print the blanks in English. If we were to print them in French, we would probably have to have them printed in other languages, say German or Italian, and if this were done we would be unable to keep our files in proper shape.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend misunderstands me. I am not asking that the forms be printed in German, Russian or any other foreign language. My hon. friend knows that, generally speaking, all blank departmental forms are printed in both French and English. This is a matter not of favour, but of right, and I would ask my hon. friend to see that it is attended to.

Item stands.

Mr. HAZEN: Perhaps I might be pardoned for asking permission to correct a statement I made last night in regard to the transportation of fish from the Maritime provinces to Montreal. I am reported in the unrevised 'Hansard' as having said:

> Now, a car is sent forward every day attached to an express train.

And further down I am reported to have said:

> We have provided for this car attached to an express train every day.

Apparently I must have made the statement, because I am reported in this way and my friends say that they so understood me. If I did make that statement, I did not intend to make it, and it was not correct. The statement I meant to make was that a cold storage express car was sent forward every Saturday. It is clear that this is the statement I intended to make from a subsequent passage in the report of my speech, in which I said:

> A further arrangement was entered into last year with the express companies and the Intercolonial whereby a cold storage express car for the transportation of fish leaves Mulgrave for Montreal on Saturday of each week. Shipments from Halifax are taken on at Truro.

That was the statement I intended to make, but apparently, through inadvertence, I did not make that statement. I am not complaining of an incorrect report, as my friends say I did say what I am reported to have said, but I intended to say Saturday. At the time I was speaking from a report of the Superintendent of Fisheries in which the word Saturday was used. I desire to correct the mis-statement at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. SINCLAIR: We are to understand, then, that there is really no change in the arrangement for the transportation of fish?

Mr. HAZEN: The change is that an arrangement was made for an express car having cold storage facilities attached to an express train to leave Mulgrave every Saturday night so that the fish would arrive in Toronto every Monday morning.

Mr. SINCLAIR: On every express train that leaves Halifax on Saturday night?

Mr. HAZEN: It leaves Mulgrave every Saturday night.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There seems to be a misunderstanding about it among the fishing people.

Mr. HAZEN: The arrangement is described in this memorandum:

The department felt that as it had shown the railways and express companies that the business can be made a big one, they should do their part in offering further facilities. It, consequently, took up with the express companies and the Intercolonial railway, the question of placing refrigerator express cars at the disposal of the shippers. After much negotiation an agreement was entered into with the express companies and the railway, whereby a cold storage express car is placed at the disposal of the shippers from Mulgrave and Halifax one day each week. The car leaves Mulgrave on Saturdays, and at Truro, shipments from Halifax and other points along the Halifax and Southwestern railway are placed in it. It then proceeds to Montreal by the Maritime Express. The companies agreed to accept as a minimum carload for this car ten thousand pounds, instead of twenty thousand pounds. The department guarantees that the earnings will be at least those ten thousand pounds. Only on a few occasions since it was inaugurated in August last, have the shipments been below the minimum.

This car reaches Montreal Sunday night in time to connect with the Grand Trunk for Toronto, so that shipments can be removed from it and sent in ordinary express cars to Toronto which will reach the latter point Monday morning. Negotiations are being continued and it is anticipated that during the coming summer the arrangement will be extended so as to run through cold storage express cars from the Atlantic coast to Toronto, as well as to Montreal.

Mr. MARTIN (Translation): I want to know if the Estimates are printed in French, as I could not obtain a copy.

Mr. HAZEN: I understand that the Estimates are printed in French.

Mr. MARTIN: That is what they said to me—that they are not printed in French.

Mr. HAZEN: The Clerk informs me that he has sent a boy up to make inquiries about the matter, and I shall have the information for my hon. friend directly.

Maintenance and repairs to Dominion steamers and ice-breakers, $1,000,000.

Mr. CARROLL: I notice by the Nova Scotia press that yesterday the ice-breaker Stanley was proceeding to Sydney harbour to keep the lower part of Sydney harbour which would give access to the coal company's and steel company's wharfs open. I would ask if this is correct and whether the boat is to be stationed there all winter.

Mr. HAZEN: She could not be stationed there all winter as she has other work to do. She was sent there, as was done in previous seasons, and the report received at the department this morning was that the Stanley had done the work she was sent to do and that the harbour is now open. As far as possible we keep the harbour open because we realize the great advantage of doing so in the case of a harbour doing such a large business as Sydney does.

Mr. CARROLL: I would point out to the minister that while it is very well to have a steamer go there and open the harbour still, unless she is in the immediate vicinity of the harbour all the time, the work done may not be of much value because the harbour might freeze up again and unless the boat is very near she could not re-open it.

Mr. HAZEN: We do the best we can. The steamer's headquarters are at Halifax. They were at one time at St. John, but an arrangement was made having regard to this ice breaking to have her at Halifax so that she would be nearer the ports.

Mr. CARROLL: Both Mr. McKenzie and myself have in our humble way been ininsisting upon the department having a permanent boat there. This is a harbour in which an immense business is carried on, and we would like to have an icebreaker there all the time during the winter season. The Stanley is not required in Halifax harbour as an icebreaker in the winter time, and I hope my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) will correct me if I am wrong in that, but I think I am right. Why should not the Stanley be stationed at Louisburg which is open the year around and then she would be in a position to get into Sydney harbour whenever required. It is incumbent upon the department to give us an icebreaker in that part of the country.

Mr. HAZEN: I know my hon. friend and his colleague discussed this matter before, and I am in sympathy with him. I think I pointed out to the House before that a new icebreaker will be available in a short time on the St. Lawrence which may release some of the icebreakers there; and when the car ferry from Prince Edward Island to the mainland is running the icebreakers there will be able to give a more satisfactory service than at present.

Mr. MURPHY: Is it under this item, that my hon. friend provides the funds for the experiments that are to be carried out under the direction of Professor Barnes of McGill University?

Mr. HAZEN: No, that is under the vote of Aids to Navigation which we will reach later.

Mr. MURPHY: When it is reached will my hon. friend be good enough to give the committee information as to the success of those experiments?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I would like to ask the minister whether the Stanley or some other boat will make any trips to the Magdalen Islands this winter. I may say that before leaving home to attend the session, I received letters from cerain parties in the Magdalen Islands asking me to bring this matter to the notice of the department and to get the information. For some years past, occasional trips have been made by the Stanley or some other boat to the great advantage of the people living there, and I think if a trip or two could be made in the winter season and then again in March or April before navigation really opens it would be a great benefit to those people.

Mr. HAZEN: I may say that the Stanley has already made one trip this season to the Magdalen Islands, and we hope it may be possible to make another.

M. MARTIN (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order, I move that the vote stands, seeing that the estimates have not yet been distributed in French.

Mr. HAZEN: The clerk informs me that the printing in French is just about completed, and will be ready to-morrow.

Mr. M. MARTIN: We have not got it yet. We must have it.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not know what the rule of the House is. I understand that my hon. friend objects to proceeding until the estimates are printed in French. That will cause considerable delay, but if my hon. friend still objects—

Mr. M. MARTIN: Yes.

Mr. HAZEN: We shall have to look up the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot see anything in the rules and regulation providing for the special case that is now raised, and I am informed by the Clerk of the House that this objection has never been raised in committee before. That is probably the reason why there is nothing in the rules concerning the point.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Deux-Montagnes) (Translation): You are short of translators then.

The CHAIRMAN: In this particular instance, it is the death of the King's Printer that has somewhat disorganized the work in the printing bureau.

M. MARTIN: For the benefit of the members of this House that do not understand English I think that we should postpone the discussion of these estimates.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot maintain the point of order raised by my hon. friend, considering that there is nothing in the rules to maintain the objection.

Mr. HAZEN: What is your ruling, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: My ruling is that there is no rule providing for the special case that is now raised.

M. MARTIN: I appeal from your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAZEN: I understand that the appeal is not going to be pressed.

Mr. LAW: I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the custom that has prevailed in his department, and under the late Government, of having the headquarters of the steamers at St. John, N.B. That has always seemed to me a very great mistake. I think some of the steamers should have their headquarters at Yarmouth or on the bay of Fundy. In the case of the recent wreck of the Cobequid, had one of the Government steamers been stationed at Yarmouth instead of at St. John, there is no doubt that the people could have been rescued without having to wait 36 hours. I cannot see that the expense would be heavier at Yarmouth than at St. John, I am sure there are many occasions during the winter time when a ship at Yarmouth would be very useful. Buoys are continually going adrift on the coast of Nova Scotia and it would be very convenient to have a boat there to locate them. I think it would be in the interests of the department and of the public to have one of those boats stationed at Yarmouth and the other stationed at St. John and I would recommend the minister to take this into consideration.

Will the minister say whether he will take it into consideration?

Mr. HAZEN: I did not know that my hon. friend expected an answer. Any suggestion made in good faith will of course be considered. I may say the reason why these steamers have been kept at St. John and Halifax is that one agency is at Halifax and the other at St. John and the steamers are naturally kept as far as possible at the points where the agencies are. But I may say to my hon. friend, that if there had been a steamer at Yarmouth I do not think the people on the Cobequid would have been rescued any earlier. I think some statement to that effect is made in the report of the Wreck Commissioner, filed yesterday afternoon. He stated that in view of the heavy seas running it is doubtful whether the people could have been taken off at an earlier time, even if the rescue boats had been there. They had to wait till the waves calmed down before they could proceed with the rescue work.

Mr. LAW: If one of the Government boats had been able to lay by the Cobequid all night, it would certainly have been a great relief to the passengers knowing that some vessel was at hand. I still think it reasonable to ask that one of these steamers stationed at St. John or Halifax should be kept at Yarmouth.

There are many times, I know myself, when buoys go adrift, and word has to be sent to St. John and this boat brought away down to Yarmouth or down in the bay of Fundy before these buoys can be rescued, whereas if a steamer were lying at Yarmouth, if buoys got adrift or a vessel were wrecked, it would be right on the spot. This is a question that should receive the due consideration of the minister.

Mr. SINCLAIR: This is a very large item, and it would be interesting to the members of the committee to get some information from the minister. How many steamers are we supporting, and what proportion of this million is expended in repairs, and what proportion upon maintenance? A few years ago, when hon. gentlemen were on this side of the House, they laid down the rule that repairs to steamboats should be done by open contract and tender. It would be interesting to know whether they are carrying out that policy in practice. I would like the minister to give us some details in regard to this vote.

[Mr. Law.]

Mr. HAZEN: The amount asked for is the same as last year. Of the steamers whose operating expenses are paid out of this vote twelve are in commission during the whole year, as follows: Aberdeen, Champlain, Earl Grey, Estevan, Lady Grey, Lady Laurier, Lansdowne, Minto, Montcalm, Montmagny, Newington and Stanley. The others are in commission during a part of the year. I will give the name of each steamer, with the expenditure upon each for all purposes during the year. It is as follows:

Steamer, Service and Expenditure.	
Aberdeen, lighthouse and buoy service, St. John	$53,500
Bellechasse, ship channel, lighthouse and buoy, Prince Edward Island	12,200
Champlain, ferry Rivière Ouelle and Murray Bay	45,500
Dollard, lighthouse and buoy, Montreal.	39,500
Druid, lighthouse and buoy, Quebec	36,500
Earl Grey, Prince Edward Island and mainland, winter	94,600
Estevan, lighthouse and buoy, British Columbia	42,000
Frontenac, ship channel	16,700
Lady Grey, ship channel	40,000
Lady Laurier, lighthouse and buoy, N.S.	57,600
Lambton, construction, Great Lakes	15,500
Lansdowne, lighthouse and buoy, St. John	43,500
Minto, winter mail service, Prince Edward Island	63,500
Montcalm, lighthouse and buoy, Quebec, and ice-breaking	97,000
Montmagny, lighthouse and buoy, Quebec and Nova Scotia	50,500
Newington, lighthouse and buoy, British Columbia	22,500
Reserve, lighthouse and buoy, Prescott.	11,000
Rouville, construction, Quebec	14,500
Scout, lighthouse and buoy, Prescott	13,400
Shamrock, lighthouse and buoy, Montreal district	16,500
Simcoe, lighthouse and buoy, Great Lakes	34,500
Stanley, lighthouse and buoy, Nova Scotia	52,800
Verchères, construction, Montreal district	8,700
Quadra, lighthouse and buoy, British Columbia	40,600
Total	$940,600

It would be somewhat lengthy to give it, but I have a statement showing in detail the expenditure on each vessel for salaries and wages, fuel, board, supplies for the deck and engine, repairs to hull, machinery and miscellaneous expenses, including uniforms.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How much was spent on repairs?

Mr. HAZEN: I will give the expenditure for repairs on each vessel. It is as follows:

Aberdeen	$ 7,000
Champlain	4,000
Dollard	4,000
Druid	2,500
Earl Grey	10,000
Lady Grey	4,000
Lady Laurier	5,000
Lansdowne	5,000
Minto	5,000
Montcalm	19,500
Montmagny	5,500
Newington	1,500
Quadra	5,000
Stanley	8,000

In some cases where it is possible to do so tenders are asked for these repairs and in cases where the repairs are of such a character that the officials of the department are unable to make proper specifications on which tenders are to be based, tenders are not called for.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Were tenders asked for the repairs to the Aberdeen which amounted to over $7,000?

Mr. HAZEN: Will the hon. gentleman pardon me? I am a little in error. These are the sums that we are estimating this year for repairs and so on. The hon. gentleman asked for the figures for last year. The present year does not conclude until the 31st March, so that I have not the details.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I mean for 1913.

Mr. HAZEN: I presume that they would appear in the Report of the Department. I will find them for my hon. friend. There should be no trouble in getting those, but the present year being uncompleted, I cannot give them.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am speaking of the year ended March 31, 1913.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister mentioned a number of cases in which repairs had been made. Can he tell us in how many cases tenders were asked for?

Mr. HAZEN: These are only the Estimates for the coming year. They are based on what it has cost for repairs in previous years. The officials of the department make an estimate having regard to the condition of the ships and to what the repairs have cost in previous years.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Are there public notices inviting tenders?

Mr. HAZEN: There are in some cases and in other cases there are no public notices.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How is that done?

Mr. HAZEN: It is done by circulars sent by the department to different people who are known to be in this line of work asking what they will undertake the work for.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is that confined to one side of politics?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have you the tender list?

Mr. HAZEN: I will be very glad to let the hon. gentleman see the list.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Can we get the list of parties to whom the circulars are sent?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, there is no trouble in getting information of that sort.

Mr. EMMERSON: Did the hon. gentleman mention the steamer Hudson?

Mr. HAZEN: No; these are the items of the Marine Department, but later we will come to the Fisheries Department. The Hudson is a fisheries patrol boat and any appropriation for a fisheries patrol boat would be under the fisheries items.

Mr. EMMERSON: It says 'Dominion steamers.'

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, but this is under the heading 'Ocean and River Service,' and this has reference to the Marine branch of the Department and not to Fisheries.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Did I understand the minister to say that the Rouville was being built in Quebec?

Mr. HAZEN: No, the Rouville is a boat that was built some time ago. It is in the service now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That it was undergoing repairs then? 4 p.m.

Mr. HAZEN: The Rouville is one of those boats the repairs and maintenance of which are included in the item under consideration and the estimated amount required for the Rouville next year is $14,500 made up as follows: Salaries and wages, $7,200; fuel, $3,200; board, $2,600; miscellaneous, including uniforms, $2,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has there been any increase in the numbers of late? I understand that some time during November, or about the end of October last, a yacht was purchased either by the Department of Marine and Fisheries or by the Department of Customs. The yacht is now at Prescott. I would like to know the name of the yacht and the object for which it was bought.

Mr. HAZEN: I cannot tell my hon. friend because it was not purchased by my department. I do not know anything about it. My hon. friend asked if there were any new boats. There is one, the Estevan, and another, the Bellechasse. The Bellechasse was built at Kingston and the Estevan was built at Collingwood and delivered on the seacoast of British Columbia. It is used there now in the lighthouse and buoy service. The Bellechasse is used on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend says that the Estevan was built at Collingwood. It is a sea-going vessel. What was the cost of the vessel, what firm constructed it and what is its draught?

Mr. HAZEN: It was built by the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company. I think the cost was something like $230,000 or $260,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Were tenders confined to Canadian builders?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Or was it open to the world?

Mr. HAZEN: It was open.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And my hon. friend chose a Canadian firm?

Mr. HAZEN: I did.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And he found all the rivets in Collingwood?

Mr. HAZEN: I did not examine the rivets. I think that the contract was let before the change of government took place.

Mr. LEMIEUX: So much the better.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would the minister please inform us as to the repairs for which tenders are asked and for which tenders are not asked? How is it settled--according to the amount of the repairs to be made?

Mr. HAZEN: It depends upon the nature of the repairs. When a vessel is new it is an easier matter for the officials of the department, like Mr. Ferguson and other technical officers who have charge of this work, to prepare a specification on which tenders can be asked, but when a vessel is old and a lot of work has to be removed and torn down and it is impossible to tell what has to be done until you commence tearing down, it is very frequently thought that it is not desirable to ask for tenders because it is impossible for any one to know before hand what the work will amount to.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is hardly an answer to the question I asked. Surely the department must have some rule about this. Certainly the proper rule would be that the department should ask for tenders, perhaps not in all cases, but in the majority of cases and the cases in which it was not done should not reach any substantial figure.

If a boat were to be repaired in Halifax at a cost of $500, what course would be pursued? Whether the boat was old or new should not make any difference. Are tenders asked publicly, or are they quietly solicited from friends of the Government and those whose names are on the patronage list?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is there a patronage list now?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In Halifax there is not only a patronage list but a patronage committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Surely not.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Prime Minister, who represents that constituency, apparently does not undertake to discharge the duties which ordinarily devolve upon a supporter of the Government in respect to patronage, and so they have a patronage committee. In Halifax the policy which would guide the department would be largely determined by that committee.

Mr. HAZEN: The manner of doing the repairs would largely depend upon the report of Mr. Ferguson, inspector of Government steamers, and Mr. McConkey, inspector of repairs to Government vessels. These gentlemen would be guided by the condition of the vessel and the nature of work to be done as to whether they would recommend day's work or contract. The great bulk of these tenders are asked, not by public advertisement in the newspapers, but by asking certain persons and firms, whose names are upon a list for that purpose.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In 1910 the Nova Scotia Iron Works of Dartmouth were paid apparently $5,363 under contract. Were tenders invited in that case before the contract was made?

Mr. HAZEN: I will have to look that up.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What is the meaning of the charges set out in the Auditor General's Report by the Naval Service Department against the Marine Department?

Mr. HAZEN: I suppose that is work done for the Marine Department in the dockyards at Halifax and Nanaimo, which are under the control of the Naval Service Department.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand that the cutters of the Customs Department are under the joint supervision of the Department of Marine and the Department of Customs.

Mr. HAZEN: The Marine Department has no control over the Customs cutters.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The practice used to be to have joint control.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Marine Department supplies the officers and crews and pays them, and that amount is refunded by the Department of Customs, but the steamers are absolutely under the control of the Department of Customs.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is exactly as I understood it. I wish to ask the minister if in October or November last a yacht was purchased for the use of the Customs Department, and which yacht now is said to be in winter quarters at Prescott. From whom was the yacht purchased, for what purpose, and what price was paid?

Mr. J. D. REID: The only yacht I have any knowledge of is a yacht seized by the Department of Customs at Prescott some time last spring, I think. It was hauled up at Prescott and repaired and the owners abandoned it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who was the owner of the yacht?

Mr. J. D. REID: We could not find the owner. I think he left the country a year or two ago. Two men in Brockville, the captain and the engineer, had claims against the yacht. Their claims were paid by the Department of Customs, and the yacht, after being refitted, was sent on to St. John, N.B.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend can find all the details in the Register, because every boat is registered. This yacht was towed from Montreal up the river as far as Prescott or Kingston about the end of October or the beginning of November last, and quartered there for the winter. Names have been given to me, which I do not care to produce, but I should like to know from the hon. minister if it is not true that his department purchased such a yacht.

Mr. J. D. REID: We have no record in the Customs Department of the purchase of such a yacht. The yacht I refer to was purchased in the month of July and was sent down to St. John.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Did the department purchase any yacht as late as October or November last?

Mr. J. D. REID: Not that I know of.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the hon. minister find out if within the last five months any yacht has been purchased by the Department of Customs and quartered for the winter either at Prescott or at Kingston, and give his answer this evening?

Mr. J. D. REID: I will give the hon. member an answer within half an hour.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I saw in the papers lately that the Department of Marine and Fisheries had given a contract for the building of a vessel to Vickers Sons and Maxim, of Montreal, and that the construction of the vessel had been commenced in Montreal. What truth is there in that statement?

Mr. HAZEN: There is no truth in it. No contract has been awarded. Tenders have been asked for and are coming in for the construction of a dredge and also for the construction of an ice-breaker. The time for receiving these tenders is not up yet.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If tenders are received from Great Britain and from Canada, will the hon. minister give the preference to Canadian builders or to British builders, and is there any condition as to where the vessels are to be constructed?

Mr. HAZEN: We are asking for tenders for a vessel to be constructed in Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Then the statement that the vessel has to be built in Canada is true?

Mr. HAZEN: That statement is true.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Of course it is not known where in Canada the vessel will be built?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When were the tenders to be in?

Mr. HAZEN: I think they were to be in on the 31st day of January. We had a communication from certain builders stating that they desired to tender, but could not get in their tenders in time. They asked us to extend the time for receiving

tenders, and we extended it until the 5th day of this month.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the estimated cost of the ice-breaker?

Mr. HAZEN: Half a million dollars for an ice-breaker of the most modern construction for the St. Lawrence river.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have seen in the press that the two ice-breakers, the Montcalm and the Lady Grey, have been removed from Quebec to the Maritime provinces.

Mr. HAZEN: No. They are at work on the St. Lawrence, and their special business is to keep the ice broken on the St. Lawrence river. This has two results: it avoids floods in the spring of the year, and it causes the river to open much sooner, so that navigation will open earlier.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When I saw that statement in the press, I wondered whether my hon. friend had listened to the complaints of certain people from Quebec in regard to ice floes blocking the harbour of Quebec during the winter. I do not think they have any serious ground for complaint, and, as my hon. friend states, the work performed by the two steamers is most valuable, not only to navigation proper, but to prevent a repetition of the devastating floods from which we suffered some years ago. I am glad that the hon. gentleman will not listen to any such complaints.

Mr. HAZEN: We listened to them, but we were not convinced by the representations that were made.

Mr. MURPHY: In the list of steamers which my hon. friend read a little earlier in the afternoon, how many of the vessels are ice-breakers? Where do they operate? Do they operate in the same place each season?

Mr. HAZEN: The Champlain is an ice-breaker and is used in the ferry running from Rivière Ouelle to Murray bay. The Earl Grey is an ice-breaker in the Prince Edward Island service. The Lady Grey is an ice-breaker, used on the St. Lawrence river and on the ship channel during the summer. The Minto is an ice-breaker in the Prince Edward Island service. The Montcalm is an ice-breaker, used on the St. Lawrence river and in the lighthouse and buoy service in Quebec during the summer months. The Stanley is an ice-breaker, used in the light-house and buoy service in Nova Scotia, in breaking ice in different harbours where it is possible to do so, and also in making trips across to the Magdalen islands.

Mr. MURPHY: Are they kept on the same routes each season?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does the Stanley make occasional trips to the Magdalen islands during the winter for mail purposes?

Mr. HAZEN: The Stanley has made one trip to the Magdalen islands. We hope she will be able to make others.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have received a letter from the Rev. Father Turbide, one of the most prominent clergymen on the islands, who states that the service is badly needed. He informs me that there is a lack of coal on the islands this winter. I do not know for what reason, but the islanders were deprived of their usual supply of coal last fall. I shall be pleased to know that my hon. friend will see that the Stanley makes one or two additional trips before the month of March. Does my hon. friend know if the service between Rivière Ouelle on the south shore and Murray bay on the north shore has been interrupted, and the cause of the interruption of the trips made by the Champlain?

Mr. HAZEN: I understand that the service this year from Rivière Ouelle to Murray bay has not been satisfactory. A new wharf is in course of construction at Murray bay, and at present proper protection is not afforded to steamers at that place. We have had a great deal of correspondence about it, and have done the best we could. Circumstances which were not under the control of our department have made it almost impossible for us to give as satisfactory a service as should be given.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If the service is not re-established this winter, there will be very great hardship, because that is the only line of communication for the whole of the north shore with Quebec and Montreal. It is true that a new and very much needed wharf is being built at Murray bay. If my honourable friend will look into the matter he will find that although the landing facilities at Murray bay are not as good as they should be, better facilities may be be obtained elsewhere, for instance at Cap à l'Aigle, Les Eboulements, St. Irénée or Baie St. Paul. Any of these places are a little out of the way, but the people on

the north shore would have at least communication with the south shore and with Quebec and Montreal if landings were established at any of these points. I would ask my hon. friend to look into this matter and see that the people are given proper communication, as they are now as much isolated as the people of the Magdalen Islands.

Mr. HAZEN: Efforts are now being made to effect arrangements by which the Lady Grey, when she can be spared, will be put on the route from Quebec to Murray bay. At present the trouble is that she cannot remain at Murray bay for any length of time, but efforts are being made to give a more satisfactory service than at present exists.

Mr. BUREAU: I read in the papers last night that the steamer Montcalm was leaving in the morning on a cruise to the gulf, the vicinity of the Seven islands and the north shore. On a previous occasion I read that it was the intention of the department to keep these steamers this winter on the St. Lawrence, with a view to keeping the river open up to Three Rivers or lake St. Peter. Representing the county of Champlain, you are familiar, Mr. Chairman, with the conditions in that district, but perhaps you have not suffered as much from the results of ice jams on the St. Lawrence river below Three Rivers as we have further up. When the ice jams in this part of the river the counties of St. Maurice, Champlain and Maskinonge are flooded and a great deal of damage is done. In the years 1906, 1907, 1908 and 1909 the Montcalm and the Lady Grey came regularly to this part of the river and kept the channel open, and in the spring there were no floods and no damage was done. On one occasion the Montcalm ran short of coal at Three Rivers and was caught in the ice, and, no tugs or other boats being available, she could not work her way out and had to winter at Three Rivers. The consequence was that the boat could not do any work at Cap a la Roche, the ice jammed, and there was a flood on both sides of the St. Lawrence. Barns and houses were torn down, wharfs were broken away, and considerable damage was done on the shores of the river. If it be the intention of the Government to charter boats as ice-breakers and keep them at that work, I do not see any necessity of their breaking ice except where the ice takes, for that is where there is liable to be great damage to property. If it is not the intention of the department to recall the Montcalm and have her perform the services for which she was intended, I would urge the Government to take such steps as will give a measure of protection to the people along the shores of the St. Lawrence river between Cap a la Roche and lake St. Peter.

Mr. HAZEN: As far as the breaking of ice in the St. Lawrence is concerned, these boats are under the direction of Mr. Forneret, who is in charge of the dredging operations on the river St. Lawrence. What my hon. friend has said about the desirability of keeping the ice broken so as to prevent these floods is absolutely correct. When certain conditions of tide and weather prevail, the boats are not required for the purpose of breaking ice, and under such circumstances it has been customary to send the boats to the Seven Islands and other places with which there is no communication, in order that the people in those districts may be able to get supplies and have communication with the outside world. That policy has been pursued for the last ten years and, I understand, satisfactorily so. The boats are there for the purpose of breaking ice in the ship channel during the winter season, and no good purpose would be served in keeping them there when they are not necessary for the purpose of breaking ice. Under such circumstances it is much better to have them render service to the people of Seven Islands and other points. They only go under such conditions as I have referred to, and when, in the opinion of the superintendent of the St. Lawrence channel, they can do so without in any way impairing their efficiency as ice-breakers.

Mr. BUREAU: I have every confidence in Mr. Forneret; against him I have nothing whatever to say. I would call attention to the fact that the ice has taken—I have crossed the river on the ice between the counties of Champlain and Nicolet. The year the boat was caught in the ice at Three Rivers—1912; they called it the Borden flood, I think— much damage was done, and if these boats are sent down the river this year, and the work is not started at once, I am satisfiied that the result will be the same. Is it the policy of the Government to try to keep the channel open during the winter, as was stated in the Conservative press last fall?

Mr. HAZEN: It is, certainly—to keep the ice broken so that there shall be no floods, and so that navigation will be open early in the spring.

Mr. BUREAU: I may tell the minister that the ice has frozen over the river and is thickening all the time, just at the places where the boat ought to be to-day.

Mr. HAZEN: I shall certainly call the attention of Mr. Forneret to what my hon. friend says. As evidence of the fact that we are desirous of doing all that is possible in the matter, I may say that we have asked for tenders for a foreign ice-breaker to be used on the St. Lawrence river as an ice-breaker, and for no other purpose. It has been found that the practice of having boats constructed to be used not only as ice-breakers, but for other purposes during the summer, is one which has not been very much in the public interest. These boats built as ice-breakers are tremendous consumers of coal, and their operation for ordinary purposes during the summer is very expensive. The new boat is being constructed for use as an ice-breaker only. It will be of the most modern construction, and I am told by the naval architect of the department that it will be equal to any ice-breaker in any part of the world. When that boat is ready and in operation I do not think that there will be any further complaints. Because of the fact that the people living at Seven Islands are entirely without means of communication with outside districts, a tremendous pressure is brought to bear on the department—and the same is true of the Magdalen Islands—to have boats sent there from time to time to make conditions of living a little more pleasant than they are when the people are absolutely shut out from the outside world. But if by doing so we are imperilling the work upon the St. Lawrence, then the very greatest care ought to be exercised.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not want to be understood as trying to discriminate against the people of the Seven islands or any other place, but they have the Druid that I know of and the Montmagny.

Mr. HAZEN: They are not ice-breakers, they cannot do that service in winter.

Mr. BUREAU: These boats could go down to the Seven islands, they are strong boats and go down there in the spring and late fall.

Mr. HAZEN: They are not built for that purpose, they could not do it in the winter season.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: At page N-22 of the Auditor General's Report, there is an account for $5,353 paid to the Nova Scotia Iron Works at Dartmouth. Were tenders asked for that work?

Mr. HAZEN: The purchasing agent tells me that those repairs were done by tender.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: On page N-22 there is a payment to Stewart, Bruce & Co., Charlottetown, of nearly $3,000 for repairs to the steamer Montcalm. There was also a sum of over $4,500 paid to the same firm for repairs to the Earl Grey. These two accounts are made up of small amounts, but in the aggregate the amount is quite substantial for the year. Was this done after tenders?

Mr. HAZEN: The purchasing agent tells me that the first item is made up of different small items. It was not done by tender. Practically this is the only firm in Charlottetown with a shop of the kind necessary to do the work of that character and this is the firm who for many years past, no matter what Government has been in power, have been doing work for the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is this the only firm in Charlottetown capable of doing this class of work?

Mr. HAZEN: That is what I am told by the purchasing agent of the department.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When supplies of the value of over $100 are purchased what is the practice of the department? Are tenders solicited from friends of the Government or from the public?

Mr. HAZEN: In many cases tenders are asked from friends of the Government. There are cases when they are asked from people on both sides of politics, when people who are not friends of the Government are asked to submit figures.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What amount determines the policy of the Government as to whether friends of the Government or the public are asked to submit tenders?

Mr. HAZEN: The purchasing agent tells me that the same policy prevails as has prevailed for many years past. The local agent of the department asks for figures and the people who are leaders in different lines of commerce supply the different lines of goods wanted. Figures are submitted and the lowest prices are accepted and all goods are obtained on a competitive basis.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: But sometimes the competition is confined to well known friends of the Government.

Mr. HAZEN: I think that would be correct.

Mr. MACLEAN: Regardless of the amount purchased during a season.

Mr. HAZEN: I think that where the amounts are very large, for large quantities of iron, &c., tenders are asked.

Mr. MACLEAN: What course does the minister direct to be taken by purchasing agents in St. John, for instance.

Mr. HAZEN: In St. John four or five different firms are asked to figure.

Mr. MACLEAN: Friends of the Government?

Mr. HAZEN: I think they are in all cases friends of the Government.

Mr. MACLEAN: Then surely there will come a time when the amount would be so large that the hon. gentlemen would be mindful of the public interest and not so regardful of his own party friends.

Mr. HAZEN: I think you have competition enough amongst them to bring them down to the lowest price.

Mr. MACLEAN: What is the amount?

Mr. HAZEN: There is no hard and fast rule.

Mr. MACLEAN: In St. John must the agent inquire of the minister what he shall do?

Mr. HAZEN: Before the agent enters into any contract he submits figures to the purchasing agent of the department in Ottawa, who has been in that position for a number of years; the purchasing agent of the department examines the figures and satisfies himself that the amounts charged are only fair and reasonable charges for the work to be done.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does he consult the member for the city and county of St. John?

Mr. HAZEN: Not at all; in matters of that sort he practically consults no one. He has large responsibilities on his shoulders as purchasing agent.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is there a patronage list for St. John in the Marine Department?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. MACLEAN: For Halifax?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. MACLEAN: Where is this list kept?

Mr. HAZEN: The purchasing agent tells me that he has no patronage list but has a knowledge in every community in Canada of people engaged in different lines of business and he is guided by that.

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not think this was the practice under the late Government. If it was, it never had the concurrence of hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. HAZEN: The purchasing agent tells me the practice is exactly the same as that which prevailed under my predecessors in office.

Mr. MACLEAN: The Minister of Marine did not approve of this practice.

Mr. HAZEN: I was not in the House.

Mr. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman was out of the House, but he took very good care to let the public in New Brunswick know that he did not approve of this departmental practice. I remember the hon. gentleman making a speech in the election of 1911 in St. John in which he condemned this practice in the most severe fashion.

Mr. HAZEN: I think my hon. friend is entirely mistaken; I do not think I ever made a speech in my life in which I condemned the system of purchase being carried on in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It may be that I should have done so, but I did not.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: The minister spoke against reciprocity.

Mr. HAZEN: On many occasions.

Mr. GERMAN: There is a practice in the Railways and Canals Department, and I think in the Public Works Department, that all amounts over $5,000 must be advertised.

Mr. HAZEN: Anything over $5,000 in our department is purchased by tender, and on many occasions for less amounts.

Mr. GERMAN: Open to the public?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I would like to ask about a number of items, found at page No. 13 of the Auditor General's Report, amounting to $20,431.50 paid to George T. Davie & Son, of Lévis, for repairs to some steamer. I do not think it is stated in the item what steamer it is. I would like to know if tenders were asked for in this case, and in the other cases where this firm has made repairs to steamers at Lévis; and if so, whether these tenders

were open to the public or were the contracts awarded simply by private letters written to the firm.

Mr. HAZEN: I cannot give my hon. friend exact information, as the payment he refers to occurred before I was minister. I believe the circumstances were something like this: The Earl Grey was taking the Governor General down the river and ran ashore. She was very badly damaged, and was repaired by the Davie firm, who were the lessees of the Government dry dock at Quebec. There was no other place where the Earl Grey could have been repaired. Of course I am speaking of something for which I have no responsibility at all. But I am told an estimate was made of the cost of repairs by the inspector, Mr. Ferguson, and, based on that, the minister of that day entered into a contract with the Davie firm.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There is another item in which the name of the Davie firm appears. On page N-10 it says:

Geo. T. Davie & Son, Levis, replacing propeller blade, &c., $3,094.

That is in connection with the steamer Champlain. Were tenders asked for, and if so, in what manner?

Mr. HAZEN: I am informed that the Davie firm is the only company in the city of Quebec that is able to make repairs to a ship beneath its water line. It is the only firm in Quebec that has the facilities and the docking appliances for doing that, and therefore any vessel requiring such work has to go to the Davie firm. The custom is to have a careful report and estimate made by the technical officers of the department, and upon that report a contract is entered into.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend can sleep on both ears every evening so long as he has as honest and straightforward a purchasing agent as the one now in the employ of his department. I can testify to his ability and to his honesty. But at the same time I am surprised at the offhand way in which my hon. friend speaks of the system whereby tenders are given to a select few—a select few Tories of course. My hon. friend was not in the House prior to 1911. Of course he had some experience of the House in 1891, but several hon. gentlemen who were sitting on this side of the House prior to 1911, simply roasted to death my predecessor in office, Hon. L. P. Brodeur, because, forsooth, he followed the practice which has been accepted and gladly followed by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries. This is the best possible vindication of the policy of the Hon. Mr. Brodeur. Day in and day out he was taunted by the Conservative Opposition because he accepted tenders from Grit firms, at very reasonable prices, for repairs to some steamers.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: He was being roasted about his trip to England.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend could take a trip to England and learn many things there, but this is not a case of trips to England or trips to Zululand. The question is whether my hon. friend who now interrupts me did not attack Mr. Brodeur, the predecessor of the present incumbent, because he awarded contracts to a few Grit tenderers at a very reasonable price when he was in office? To-day the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries furnishes us with the most complete vindication of Mr. Brodeur. He says: I followed the system of my predecessor. That is about all we can expect from a Tory Government. Each time this Government is taken to task they reproach us with having done a similar thing while we were in office. They admit now that what we did then was honest and fair, but at that time they criticised it. Hon. gentlemen were simply making political capital in order to prejudice the mind of the electors. I am glad to see the minister following the policy adopted by his predecessor, Mr. Brodeur, and taking the advice of this much abused yet able and active purchasing agent appointed by the Laurier Government, Mr. Doutre.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Do I understand that all purchases made by the department must first receive the approval of the purchasing agent?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, for every dollar.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would that apply to repairs on a ship as well?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, to everything.

Mr. MACLEAN: Then before repairs are commenced on a ship the rates pertaining to the different items have to be approved by the purchasing agent. Is that correct?

Mr. HAZEN: No work is undertaken in the way of repairs to ships or anything of that sort, until the purchasing agent has issued a warrant for such work and no

money is paid until he examines the bills and has certified that the charges are correct.

Mr. MACLEAN: Does not the minister think he should lay down a rule for the guidance of his officer, as to when he should ask for public tenders, and when the contract should be given to friends of the Government?

Mr. HAZEN: In cases where there is no question about asking for public tenders, the purchasing agent would go to the deputy head or to myself and discuss the matter. I want to say to my hon. friend that it has not been my practice to interfere with the judgment of the purchasing agent in matters of that sort.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How does the purchasing agent know who are the friends of the Government?

Mr. HAZEN: I suppose the purchasing agent, being a man of affairs, has a pretty fair knowledge of that.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Take the case of a government ship buying supplies from a merchant on the coast of my constituency. Who advises them where to buy their supplies?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not know what goods are purchased in the constituency of my hon. friend except goods purchased by the steward. The stewards are free agents and can purchase where they see fit.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: That is for provisions?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes. I do not know what else they could purchase along the coast of Guysborough.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Supplies for ships?

Mr. HAZEN: That sort of thing would be purchased, I should say, at the agencies through the agents of the department and not by the officers of the ships. They would have to go to the agents of the department except there might be an occasion when something would have to be purchased when there was not time to consult with the agent. But I cannot imagine that anything of importance would be purchased except through the agents of the department.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Coal?

Mr. HAZEN: Coal is supplied by contract, and of course coal is a thing that has a well established market price.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Where was the coal purchased last year in the county of Gaspé for the Government steamers?

Mr. HAZEN: I understand that it was purchased from a gentleman named Carter.

Mr. J. D. REID: Might I be permitted to give the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemiuex) an answer to the question he asked me a few minutes ago? The hon. member for Rouville asked if a yacht had been purchased by the Customs Department.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A yacht or a boat.

Mr. REID: I have a memorandum from the Assistant Commissioner of Customs in which he tells me that no yacht has been purchased by the Customs Department during the last six months and quartered for the winter at Prescott or Kingston. As far as I am personally concerned if a steamer had been purchased for the Customs Department and it had been at any place on the St. Lawrence west of Montreal I would have known something about it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about the yacht said to have been seized and quartered at Prescott?

Mr. REID: I say that a yacht was seized at Prescott or Brockville and that only the parties that had any claim against it were paid. It was hauled up immediately on the marine works and repaired and the Department of Customs paid the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the repairs. The boat was then towed to Kingston, brought down the Rideau canal to Ottawa and taken from Ottawa to St. John direct; it was not used in any way on the St. Lawrence river after it came off the ways at Prescott.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the hon. gentleman tell us who was the owner of the yacht and how it was registered?

Mr. REID: It was an American yacht.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The yacht was the property of some one; it would have been easy to find out.

Mr. REID: There was no way of finding it out.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was it the Phantom?

Mr. REID: No, the name of the yacht was the Albatross. The boat
5 p.m. had been used on the St. Lawrence for a year before it was found out by the preventive staff that it was an American yacht.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How much was paid for the repairs and what was devoted to the people who had a claim against it?

Mr. REID: If I remember rightly the master had a claim of about $150 and the engineer of $300 or $400. That was all that was paid by the Customs Department except the amount paid to the Marine Department for repairs. I could not exactly say what that was. It took considerable to repair her and to put her in the condition necessary to be used at St. John. She went directly from Prescott through the Rideau canal to St. John, N.B.; where, she is being employed in the service.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The minister has told us that coal is always purchased by tender.

Mr. HAZEN: Where coal is required in large quantities, such as at the Sorel shipyards and at Quebec where a large number of steamers are supplied from, it is purchased by tender, but sometimes it is necessary to purchase it without tender, as in the case of the comparatively small quantity purchased at Gaspé from Mr. Carter.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: What system is pursued when tenders are asked for?

Mr. HAZEN: We buy small quantities at the ordinary market price which would have to be approved by the purchasing agent.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: How is that ordinary market price ascertained?

Mr. HAZEN: I suppose it is well understood in any community what the ordinary market price of a certain commodity would be at a certain time. Mr. Doutre, the purchasing agent, tells me that he has a list showing what the cost of coal should be for delivery at every point in Canada.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: How is it, then, that a certain quantity of run-of-mine coal was purchased in Charlottetown at five dollars per ton, and a certain quantity of steamer coal, which is of better quality, was purchased at $5.75 per ton?

Mr. HAZEN: The purchasing agent informs me that the person who was supplying at $4.70 a ton ran out of coal, and we were forced to pay a higher price for a small quantity to get delivery at the time we wanted it. That seems to be a peculiar case.

Mr. CARROLL: For a department that uses so much coal, would it not be better to make a contract direct with the coal companies, especially in the Maritime provinces?

Mr. HAZEN: That is what we do.

Mr. CARROLL: You do not contract for your coal supplies on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, we do. We enter into a contract direct with the coal company for coal used at Sorel, and Quebec, and St. John, and Halifax, and Montreal. I am informed that the Nova Scotia Steel Company has the large end of that contract.

Mr. CARROLL: What price does the department pay the coal company?

Mr. HAZEN: I am informed that the prices are: $4.03 per ton delivered at Sorel and Quebec; $4 per ton delivered at Montreal, bunkered; $3.75 at Halifax, and about $3.80 at St. John.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What do you pay at Gaspé?

Mr. HAZEN: 48 tons were purchased at Gaspé for $5 a ton from Mr. A. T. Carter, and 100 tons at $5.50.

Mr. LAW: Did the minister state that the stewards of the vessels had complete control of the purchase of supplies of stores on the departmental boats?

Mr. HAZEN: That is the fact.

Mr. LAW: Is there a patronage committee in Yarmouth?

Mr. HAZEN: A what?

Mr. LAW: A Tory patronage committee?

Mr. HAZEN: I have no knowledge of such a committee.

Mr. LAW: I can tell the minister that after the change of Government, the very first visit that the steward of the lightship Lurcher made to Yarmouth, he was met before he landed on the wharf by a member of the patronage committee in Yarmouth and told he had to buy his provisions from certain persons there. I have no objection whatever to those from whom he was asked to buy his provisions, but the result was that this gentleman made up his mind that he had to buy his stores—and having a contract with the Marine and Fisheries Department to supply the men at a certain price—he ought to have an opportunity to buy them at the cheapest place. The members of the patronage committee, not only having advised him but ordered him to buy from certain per-

sons, and as he found there was no money in continuing in the work, he resigned his position as steward, and a new man was put in his place.

Mr. HAZEN: He was very foolish to resign his position, because nobody in Yarmouth or anywhere else had authority from the department to compel him to resign, or to prevent him from buying provisions from any person he wanted to buy from. His contract from the department was to supply the men and officers at so much per head, and all he had to do was to carry out that work in good faith.

Mr. CARROLL: Are the coal supplies for the Marine Department, which are from the companies, bought under tender?

Mr. HAZEN. Yes.

Mr. LAW: I ask the minister to make it plain that the stewards of these boats are at liberty to purchase stores from any person from whom they see nt to purchase, without losing their position.

Mr. HAZEN: That is absolutely correct. The department makes a contract with them and the business of the department is simply to see that their work is properly carried out.

Mr. LAW: I am very glad to hear the minister make that statement, because I think it is only fair, when these men take a contract for a certain price, that they should be permitted to buy their goods wherever they can buy them cheapest.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will the department always protect a purchasing agent, we will say the purchasing agent at St. John, if he buys supplies from those from whom he can purchase for the lowest possible price?

Mr. HAZEN: There is no purchasing agent at St. John, but we will certainly protect the agent at St. John or anywhere else if he, first of all, submits the matter to the purchasing agent of the department at Ottawa, gets his warrant to proceed with the purchase, and if the purchasing agent at Ottawa afterwards certifies that the prices are proper prices.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: And you would not take notice of any protest you might receive from say a defeated Conservative candidate, protesting against these purchases or asking for the removal from office of such a man?

Mr. HAZEN: All I can say is that other things being equal any government would prefer to have purchases made from its friends rather than from those who are not. That is the principle and policy which every government, under our system of government, has acted upon since the world began. So far as purchasing is concerned, I have no doubt there is not a port in Canada at which good goods cannot be purchased from persons of one political faith just as cheaply as from those of another political faith. Other things being equal, I would expect the purchases to be made from those who are friends of the Government, but I would not expect the agent to so purchase, if it were against the public interest to do so, or if he had to pay higher prices.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What does the minister do to protect a purchasing agent against a patronage committee?

Mr. HAZEN: The purchasing agent at Ottawa has a thorough knowledge of the value of goods, or he would not be fit to be purchasing agent. He knows the value of goods at St. John, or Halifax, or anywhere else, and he will not certify and allow the goods to be paid for unless the prices are right.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Then why permit the existence of a patronage committee?

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend is too old a politician to ask a question of that sort. He knows that when his party were in power, and when other parties were in power also, people in different constituencies would organize themselves into patronage committees and make representations to the member from that constituency, or to the Government with regard to appointments to office, and as to from whom purchases should be made and so on. That is all very well, but after all, the responsibility for what is done must rest upon the responsible head of the department and the permanent officials, and they will take pains to guard the public interest. I think honourable gentlemen are indulging in a good deal of nonsense when they say that governments will not help their own friends. All governments will help their own friends if they can do so, and if by doing so they are doing nothing that is against the public interest. But governments have no right to purchase from their own friends in preference to their opponents, if by doing so they pay higher prices for the goods purchased. I think that is the

correct principle under our system of party government, and when we talk about governments not favouring their own friends when they can do so without injury to the public interest, we are talking what, at the bottom of our hearts, we know is not the principle which governs to-day anywhere.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the minister have any objection to show us the patronage list in his department?

Mr. HAZEN: Mr. Doutre says he has no patronage list.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I suppose that in some constituencies it is the practice, and possibly has been the practice, to have a patronage committee, but I have very little respect for the member representing a constituency who permits that, and will not take the responsibility himself.

Mr. HAZEN: In the end, the representative of the constituency has to take the responsibility.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is an anomaly in the political system obtaining in this country. I am not complaining so much of preference being shown to friends of the Government by ministers when purchasing, but the minister justifies that upon the ground that the public interest does not suffer. I say the public interest frequently does suffer, and we will be able to show some ministers of the Crown, before the session is over, that by reason of the patronage system public interests have suffered. If the minister adheres to the policy of purchasing from friends of the Government, he should lay down some rule for the guidance of his officers as to when this favour should be shown to friends of the Government; there should be some limit to it in the amount or the quantity of purchases. The minister has been asked several times this afternoon to establish some rule with reference to the matter, but he has failed to do so.

Mr. HAZEN: The universal instruction that the purchasing agent gets is: that he is to purchase the goods used by the department to the best possible advantage from the standpoint of the department and from the standpoint of the public interest. I am satisfied that the purchasing agent of the department lives up to that rule. If the hon. gentleman can show me where, in our department, we have been paying excessive prices for any article, I will be very much surprised indeed. There might be a single case that would pass by accident, but I believe that all the articles we are purchasing are purchased on fair and proper terms, and in many cases we are paying less than the prices paid by private individuals throughout the country for similar goods.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I had not the Marine Department specially in mind when I made that observation; it was the principle I was referring to.

Mr. GERMAN: The purchasing agent in the Marine and Fisheries Department is a gentleman who has been in office for many years.

Mr. HAZEN: For some years.

Mr. GERMAN: So far as I know that gentleman has always filled the position with very great care and satisfaction, and I do not see why he should make any mistake at the present time when he was able to do perfectly right in past years.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: How are the men for the ice-breakers and other Government vessels selected?

Mr. HAZEN: They are selected by the agents of the department. I have no hesitation in saying that the agent of the department, at Charlottetown for instance, would consult with and take recommendations from members for the constituency supporting the Government, Mr. McLean and Mr. Nicholson. The agent would not take their recommendations unless he was satisfied of the competency of the men recommended. If the men are thoroughly competent, an agent is quite within his right in accepting the recommendations of the member for the constituency.

Mr. HUGHES: I thought the captains were consulted with regard to the men.

Mr. HAZEN: The agent probably consults the captain.

Mr. HUGHES: Has the agent the privilege of refusing any man who he knows is not qualified?

Mr. HAZEN: If the captain of one of those vessels said that a man was not competent, he would not be forced upon the captain. It would not be in the interest of the public service to force a captain to take a man who was not competent.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: During the campaign of 1911 one of the policies of the present Prime Minister, in order to obtain the support of the electorate in certain por-

tions of Canada, was the affording of medical aid and free medicine to fishermen.

Mr. HAZEN: That could not properly come up under this item, which is a marine item.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I thought you might carry the doctor and the medicine around in these ships.

Mr. HAZEN: This matter would properly come under the question of fisheries. I have no objection, however, to discussing the matter now.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would like to have it discussed now.

Mr. HAZEN: The matter is receiving a great deal of consideration at the hands of the officers of the Department of Fisheries. They are endeavouring to form some satisfactory scheme for giving the suggested medical service to fishermen. They find it a very difficult problem to solve. Although many of them are men of experience, and have consulted men outside of the department, members of the House and others who are interested in the matter, they have found it most difficult to form any scheme that will be satisfactory and that will be within reasonable financial bounds. Although the problem is such a difficult one, we have not altogether despaired of solving it. My first knowledge of the matter came after the election, when I became a member of the House and a member of the Government.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is it intended to supply all the fishermen in Canada with free medical attendance and free medicine, and their families as well?

Mr. HAZEN: Nothing will be gained by discussing the details of a matter that is at present under consideration and that has not been fully worked out.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What officials are discussing the matter?

Mr. HAZEN: The Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Superintendent of Fisheries and others.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In regard to the construction of ships in Canada, has my hon. friend laid it down as a policy that in future vessels of the description of those used by the Department of Marine and Fisheries will be built in Canada? I would like my hon. friend to state that positively, because the draft and tonnage of these ships would certainly entitle the Canadian ship-builders to have the first consideration. There should be no hesitation in giving our Canadian ship-builders the preference, not only of tendering but of getting the contract.

Mr. HAZEN: Since I have been in the department, not a dollar of our money has gone outside Canada for the building of ships. When I entered the department, certain vessels for British Columbia waters and the Halifax lightship were under construction. These were completed. My policy is this, that in the case of all vessels that will be required for the Marine and Fisheries Department in future, it is my intention, with the approval of the Council, to ask for tenders for these vessels to be built in Canada.

The Canadian shipbuilder has no protection in regard to vessels of this class. There is no duty upon ships of British register; they come into Canada complete in every respect, with their napkins, their china and all their appointments. The rate of wages is lower in Great Britain than it is here, and the result is that the Canadian shipbuilder is at a very great disadvantage in competing for vessels required for the Government service.

Two dredges are now being built at Collingwood for use on the St. Lawrence river; they will be in commission next year. They have been built since I came into office. In the tenders for the ice-breaker to which I referred, the condition is that it must be built in Canada. It seems to me that we cannot protect the shipbuilding industry in the way in which we can protect other industries. The only way protection could be given to the shipbuilding industry would be by giving a bounty of so much a ton upon ships built in Canada. Whether that would be acceptable to the country or not, I am not prepared to state at present.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I must congratulate the hon. gentleman on his policy. It should appeal to every good Canadian. The Government of Canada has already bonused quite heavily some of the shipbuilding firms, and it would be a pity if, for the construction of ships which can evidently be built in Canada, the preference were given to outside firms. I expect that the new ice-breaker will be built in Canada and will be a credit to the fleet belonging to the Government. My hon. friend can testify as to the ability of our shipbuilders. Last year we inspected the Bellechasse and the Dollard at Kingston. I believe these

two vessels are a credit to our Canadian shipbuilding firms. The same thing might be said of the other vessels that have been built at Sorel and in the Maritime provinces. I know that the Montmagny is a splendid ship, very well equipped and of sufficiently large tonnage and draught. Really I do not see that for that class of ships we should not in the future give the preference to Canadian firms. At all events, we have now the declared policy of the hon. minister, and I must sincerely congratulate him on the decision which he has reached.

Mr. ROSS: I agree entirely with what the hon. member for Rouville has said with regard to the building of ships in Canada with Canadian labour. I think that will please every member on this side of the House. I notice in the Auditor General's Report a statement that last year a ship called the Kestrel was sold for $5,000 to one Armstrong. What is the policy of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in regard to these ships? Are they sold by public auction, tender, or otherwise?

Mr. HAZEN: The Kestrel, which was under the supervision of the Naval department, had been absolutely condemned by all the naval officials.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How old was she?

Mr. HAZEN: She was a very old and useless vessel. Offers of purchase of the vessel were publicly invited, but none were received. We then received an offer of $2,500 for her, but my deputy, who looked into the matter, said that we ought to get $7,500. We held the vessel for a time at that price, but without avail, and, receiving an offer of $5,000, we decided that we had better sell at that. The money was paid, and I believe that the gentleman who bought the vessel has been regretting the purchase ever since.

Mr. ROSS: How much did it cost in the first place?

Mr. HAZEN: I have not that information.

Examiners of masters and mates, $16,500.

Mr. LAW: What salary does the Examiner of Masters and Mates at Yarmouth receive?

Mr. HAZEN: The examiner there, Captain Murphy, receives $300.

Mr. LAW: Captain Bradford Hilton conducts a school at Yarmouth; is he not entitled to a salary the same as the officers at Quebec, Collingwood, North Sydney and Victoria?

Mr. HAZEN: I understand that he is not an official of the department, and that he conducts a private school and receives tuition fees from those whom he instructs.

Mr. LAW: Is that a reason why Captain Hilton should not be placed on the list with the gentlemen at Quebec, North Sydney and other cities where schools are conducted? We have always had a school in Yarmouth, and quite a number of masters and mates receive their education there. Mr. Murphy conducted one for a number of years until he was appointed examiner and of course he could not then continue the school. I know that Captain Hilton has applied to the department for appointment; he is a very competent official, and, in view of the fact that he conducts a school similar to that conducted by the officials in the other cities, I think he is entitled to a salary.

Mr. HAZEN: It may be that the gentleman referred to by my hon. friend would prefer to continue his private school and receive tuition fees, as in that way he might make a larger salary than he would receive from the Government. I believe it has never been the policy of this Government to establish Government schools at centres where private schools are being conducted. Government schools are established only in towns or cities where there are men who want instruction, and where there are no private schools.

Mr. SINCLAIR: At what places have these schools been established by the Government?

Mr. HAZEN: There are navigation schools operating this year in Vancouver, Collingwood, North Sydney, Quebec, Yarmouth, Halifax and St. John. The instructor at Vancouver is Captain Eddie; at Collingwood, Captain Coles; at Quebec, Captain Lachance; at North Sydney, Captain Sutherland; at Halifax, the Technical College; at St. John, Captain Cole.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How many masters and mates were passed last year?

Mr. HAZEN: In the eastern division, 70 masters and 38 mates; in the inland waters division, 85 masters and 37 mates; and in the western division, 43 masters and 48 mates.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the minister distinguish between deep sea captains and coasting captains?

Mr. HAZEN: This statement does not distinguish.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Possibly you have no deep sea captains applying.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not know, but I think there would be some.

Mr. LAW: Some deep sea captains passed last year. What are the salaries paid to the examiners of masters and mates?

Mr. HAZEN: Captain J. E. Murphy, Yarmouth, $300; Captain James Sutherland, North Sydney, $300; Captain Alexander Cameron, Charlottetown, $600. At Quebec the examiner of masters and mates, Captain Lachance, also conducts a school and has other work, and so gets a larger salary. Captain George C. Coles, Collingwood, gets $200; Captain A. D. Grant, Edmonton, Alberta, $200; Captain M. Thordarson, West Selkirk, Manitoba, $200; Captain James Gaudin, Victoria, $200; Captain Geo. Hallett, Nelson, $200; and the chief examiner of masters and mates for the Atlantic division, Captain W. R. Lugar, of Halifax, $1,800. The chief examiner at Toronto, Captain H. W. King, gets $1,800, and the chief examiner for the Pacific coast, Captain Chas. Eddie, of Vancouver, $1,800.

Mr. LAW: I see that Captain Murphy, examiner at Yarmouth, gets only $300, and the examiner at Charlottetown gets $600. Captain Murphy is one of the best men for that position to be found in the Dominion of Canada, and $500 looks like a pretty small sum.

Mr. HAZEN: The reason is that Mr. Cameron looks after the entire province of Prince Edward Island and the northern coast of New Brunswick.

Mr. LAW: There is only one other examiner in Nova Scotia.

Mr. HAZEN: There is one at Halifax, one at Yarmouth and one at North Sydney.

Mr. LAW: If there is any way in which the minister could give Captain Murphy more salary, I wish he would do so, because he is a very efficient man for the position.

Mr. HAZEN: The salary seems to be small, but they are all about on a par. I shall look into the matter.

Rewards for saving life, including life-saving stations, $125,400.

Mr. KYTE: Under what procedure are these rewards granted?

Mr. HAZEN: The big end of this item is connected with life-saving stations. In connection with the awards for saving life, the usual course is that some one in the neighbourhood writes the department calling attention to some act worthy of recognition. This goes to the gentleman at the head of the life-saving department, Commander Thompson, formerly an officer in the Royal navy, who makes a report, and if the report is satisfactory the minister gives directions that some recognition in the way of a telescope or watch or something should be presented. No such rewards are ever given to any one in the employ of the department.

Mr. KYTE: Does Commander Thompson institute any inquiry as to the circumstances?

Mr. HAZEN: There is a blank form asking a number of questions with regard to the matter which is furnished to any person to be filled in.

Mr. KYTE: There is a case in my mind where some time ago a vessel was wrecked in the district of L'Ardoise in the county of Richmond. The schooner Bohemia from Newfoundland, laden with fish, was driven on a reef and the crew were rescued by some of the residents of the district, Thos. Clannon and his brothers. They succeeded in landing the crew from this vessel at great risk to their own lives, and I think it would be a case where they should receive some recognition for their bravery.

Mr. HAZEN: I shall instruct the department to send the hon. gentleman one of the forms to be filled in.

Mr. LAW: The minister will remember that on the 17th of January I wrote a letter earnestly recommending to his attention Captain Edgar McKinnon of SS. Westport and Captain Adelbert McKinnon of SS. John L. Cann who displayed great bravery and skill in rescuing the passengers and crew of the steamer Cobequid, lost on Trinity Ledge. I am sure that if the minister looks into the matter of the saving of these lives he cannot fail to realize that these two captains as well as their crews, deserve some recognition from the department and from the people of this country. The newspapers all over Canada as well as in Great Britain and the United States have given these two captains every credit for the bravery they have shown in the rescue of these men. The steamer Westport, which is very small, was the first to go out to this steamer and 62 of her

passengers and crew were taken off before dark, after they had been on the wreck for thirty-six hours, exposed to dangers untold and with the liability of being washed off any moment. They were rescued and landed at Yarmouth that night. The John L. Cann came right after the Westport and rescued all but the captain and ten of the crew who remained on board until the next morning, when they were taken off and conveyed to St. John. I would ask the minister to take these matters into account and trust that a suitable reward will be given to these men. I doubt if you will find in Nova Scotia two men more capable to effect such a rescue. They are thorough sea-going men, born of sea-going families, occupying high positions as ship captains in Nova Scotia, where we produce some of the best and most heroic men in the world. I commend the matter to the minister and trust that these men, as well as their crews will be given suitable recognition by the department.

Mr. HAZEN: This is not the first time the hon. member for Yarmouth has called my attention to this matter. My attention was called to it also by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson). Both of these gentlemen wrote me letters. The hon. member for Digby had spoken to me a day or two before and then wrote me a letter which reached me on the same day as that of the hon. member. Both hon. gentlemen did what was proper and right in calling attention to the bravery of the captains and crews of both the Westport and the Cann.

On hearing from the hon. gentleman who communicated with me, we gave instructions to Captain Thompson to inquire immediately into the facts of the case and make a report. The matter is being considered by the Department and will be dealt with as promptly as possible. The awards are not in the nature of pecuniary recompense, but take the form of a watch, telescope or something of that kind—simply something to show the appreciation of the Government of the country for acts of bravery done in the discharge of duty. Perhaps they are the more highly valued by the recipients than a money gift would be.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: This is a branch of the service from which politics should be excluded, but, unfortunately, in my province at all events, politics have been allowed to enter. Last session I put a question on the Order paper asking the minister for the papers in connection with the dismissal of Norman McIntosh, captain of the life-saving station at Souris, and the minister told me he did not wish to make public the reason for dismissal for Mr. McIntosh's sake. I thought something very serious must be the matter. The minister told me I could peruse the papers in his office. I went there, and saw that the charge against Mr. McIntosh was that he drank whisky and sometimes indulged too freely. I was relieved to find that that was the only charge that could be brought against him, but though there may be some truth in that charge, the man who was appointed to succeed him is a greater offender still. McIntosh was a man who had received one of the awards we are speaking of, for bravery in saving life. He and another young man volunteered to go to the rescue of two men in imminent danger of being drowned on a very stormy night. With wonderful courage and skill, they eventually succeeded in rescuing the two who had taken refuge in the rigging of their ship. Mr. McIntosh also received the Carnegie medal for the same act of bravery, and yet that man was dismissed from the public service. I think it is my duty to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to make the charge against McIntosh public, so that the people of this country will not think there is any serious stain upon his character. Surely the minister must have allowed political considerations, perhaps unintentionally, to influence him in this particular case. Another question I would like to ask is, why was John Ryan dismissed from the life-saving station at Priest Pond, and Mr. Campbell appointed in his place.

Mr. HAZEN: I have not the papers here, but if my hon. friend will repeat his question at some other time, whether we are on an item that appertains to this matter or not, I will give him the information.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I would also like to know why the boathouse at Souris was moved during last summer. I would like all the particulars.

Mr. HAZEN: I will get the information.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Might I also suggest that the minister give us a list of the other life-saving officers who were dismissed during the past year. I made an inquiry last year, and from 19 life-saving stations on the coast, I found that 12 officers have been dismissed, and some of them without any investigation being held

at all. In my constituency there was a man who held one of these Government awards for conspicuous bravery in saving life. He had occupied his position for 34 years and was a splendid officer. He was dismissed without any investigation whatever, and, so far as I know, for political reasons. If all the life-saving officers belonging to the Liberal party have been turned out of office we would like to know it. I think it would be advisable for us to have a complete list of all the dismissals.

Mr. HAZEN: My deputy minister informs me that John Ryan, whom my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes) referred to a moment ago, resigned his position voluntarily; he was not dismissed.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister furnish us with that list?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Investigation into wrecks, $18,400.

Mr. HAZEN: That is the same as last year. It covers the travelling expenses of the Dominion Wreck Commissioner, the travelling expenses of the British Commissioner, the travelling expenses of all witnesses, the salary of British Columbia Wreck Commissioner, stenographers' fees, legal services, services of assessors, services of interpreters, reporting and typewriting, preliminary inquiries, printing and unforeseen incidentals, fees which may be granted to acting wreck commissioners. The latter is only a small amount.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend explain to the House what action was taken in regard to the Lady of Gaspé accident which occurred on the River St. Lawrence during the summer near Cap de la Madeleine?

Mr. HAZEN: The statement I have here is of the casualties for last year, not for the current year. I will get the information for my hon. friend.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Later on. I happen to know the owners of the ship, Messrs. Bouchard Bros., of Quebec, who are highly respectable people and very good navigators. The report goes against them and I do not dispute it. I do not know the facts. I have not followed the case and my information is derived from what I have read in the papers. I know, as a matter of fact, that the owners of the ship, who were found in default by the commissioner appointed by the department, complained, after the investigation, that they had had no chance to explain their case clearly. The reason given was that the commissioner does not speak French. I do not know personally if that statement is true or not. I simply take the allegation of one of the defendants in the case.

Mr. HAZEN: Had he nautical assessors associated with him?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I cannot say; possibly he had.

Mr. HAZEN: I should think that in a case of that sort there would be nautical assessors who would be familiar with the French language.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Possibly so. I am told that one of the grievances is that the case was not made clear because the commissioner did not speak French. Possibly there were others present who did speak French. I do not question at all the decision arrived at by the commissioner. I simply call the attention of my hon. friend to that fact to ascertain whether in such a case it would not be possible to give ample protection to both parties. I am sure that my hon. friend is quite well disposed and that he will see that in future no such complaint is possible. I say again that I do not dispute the decision. I think the decision was right, but at the same time this is one of the grievances of the defendants.

Mr. HAZEN: I think that my hon. friend is absolutely right. Whether the decision is right or not, the court should be so conducted that there would not be any ground given for a grievance in regard to the finding of the court, and it seems to me that in cases of that sort, if the Wreck Commissioner is unable to speak the French language, he should take pains to have associated with him nautical assessors who can. I know from my own experience at the bar how very unsatisfactory it is when you have to get the evidence of witnesses translated by means of an interpreter. I will call the attention of the Wreck Commissioner to the fact and give instructions that in future in cases of that sort, where the parties or witnesses do not speak the English language he shall have nautical assessors associated with him who know the French language.

At six o'clock the House resumed, and then took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 41, respecting The Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

Bill No. 42, respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Shepherd.

Bill No. 43, respecting Queen's University at Kingston.—Mr. Nickle.

Bill No. 44, respecting The Vancouver Life Insurance Company of Vancouver, B.C., and to change its name to The Vancouver Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Stevens.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

Civil Government—Department of Indian Affairs, $147,487.50.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Some years ago, an hospital was opened at Caughnawaga, for the benefit of the Iroquois Indians. This hospital was established through the charity of a good lady, who noticing that for the last ten or fifteen years contagious disease was prevalent amongst the members of the tribe, and that they had not the means to pay for proper treatment, out of her beneficence and with her own means opened an hospital on the reservation. When my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) was Minister of the Interior, I represented the matter to him and he gave an annual grant of, I think, $500 or $600 to help this good lady in her work. I may say that the hospital is equally available to Protestants and Catholics. I now appeal to the present Minister of the Interior to increase that grant to something like $2,000, after, of course, he makes careful inquiries to satisfy himself of the merits of this institution, and I think he will find that the money will be well spent.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Supt. General of Indian Affairs): The grant last year was, I think, $800, and I understand it is rather a small hospital. I will make inquiries from the officials and see if it is possible to increase the grant.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Probably $1,500 would be sufficient.

Mr. ROCHE: Do you know the name of the medical man who is in charge of the hospital?

[Mr. Hazen.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not, but I know that the institution is run on a purely humanitarian basis.

Mr. OLIVER: Why the increase in the vote for sundries, under the head of 'contingencies?'

Mr. ROCHE: It is due to the change in the method of paying the travelling expenses.

Civil Government—Department of Customs. $330,987.50.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why is there an increase in this vote?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): There is just $1,000 of an increase on the sundries. The amount voted last session was sufficient, but the commissioner added $1,000 in case it might be required.

Mr. OLIVER: There is a considerable increase in the number of officials of the second division, subdivision B.

Mr. REID: There are only two promotions in the whole list, but twenty-two new officers are recommended by the commissioner for next year. He recommends the appointment of sixteen new clerks in second division, subdivision B, ten with salaries of $1,000 each, six with salaries of $800 each, one new clerk in the third division, subdivision B, at a salary of $500, two messengers and one packer in the lower grade with salaries of $500 each.

On account of the extra work in the department we had to put on some temporary clerks. They were all selected by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. OLIVER: The Department of Customs is largely a routine department, and an increase of sixteen clerks in one division is quite substantial. Though the Customs receipts have been increasing until recently, they are now on the decrease.

Mr. REID: We had to put on temporary clerks last year to keep the work going. They will now be put on the permanent staff.

Mr. MACDONALD: If the revenue is decreasing, you will not require their services this year.

Mr. REID: We expect the revenue to increase within the next few months.

Mr. NESBITT: Who recommended this increase?

Mr. REID: The Commissioner of Customs, Mr. McDougald, has made a state-

ment for me showing what he thinks is necessary in so far as new employees are concerned. He has consulted the heads of the different branches, and they have come to the conclusion that they require these clerks. These clerks were put on temporarily last year, but we can not put them on temporarily this year and pay them from some other fund. We have to put them on the permanent list.

Mr. NESBITT: How many temporary employees were put on?

Mr. REID: About this number off and on. This is a department in which it is absolutely necessary to have a sufficient number of clerks to check the entries and to do the work necessary to protect the revenue. The hon. gentleman will understand that the entries have to be checked in case of mistakes made by the appraisers or collectors in rates of duty. It is a department in which it is better to have a sufficient number of clerks than to have it undermanned. I am taking the advice of officials in whom I have great confidence.

Mr. NESBITT: I quite agree that every department should be fully manned in order to do the work properly. At the same time this looks like a very large increase, seeing that the revenue is decreasing. With all due deference to the hon. minister, I am sure that the revenue will not increase in the next few months.

Mr. OLIVER: What the hon. minister has said about the necessity of having a sufficient staff is very true, but as Parliament is here for the purpose of receiving and criticising information, I draw attention to the fact that some of the ministers are asking for an increase in the number of temporary clerks, while other ministers are asking for an increase in the number of permanent clerks. It is impossible for the House to keep any satisfactory track of the increases or decreases in the service when there is that movement from the temporary staff to the permanent staff and for a temporary staff instead of a permanent staff. It would be better if it were definitely arranged that, instead of employing temporary clerks, we employ permanent ones. Let it be arranged that way, and not in some of the departments increase the permanent staff this year, increase the temporary staff next year, and then increase the permanent staff by the number of temporary clerks.

Mr. NESBITT: Supposing these additional clerks are appointed and there is a shortage in some other department, is it the custom of the different departments to assist each other by lending clerks?

Mr. REID: I do not know what the other departments do, but in the Department of Customs we keep on only those that are required. If we have to take on temporary clerks and there is not sufficient work for them to do, we let them go immediately.

Mr. NESBITT: You never make any exchange?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: Were the men who were employed temporarily last year certified by the Civil Service Commission before they were employed?

Mr. REID: For the inside service temporary clerks must have a certificate; for the outside service they do not require a certificate.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is this vote entirely for the inside service?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the hon. minister give us the names of those whom he employed temporarily during last summer?

Mr. REID: I promise to give them to the hon. member to-morrow.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL: The Minister of Customs did not, in my humble estimation, answer the question that both the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and myself put to him the other day in connection with the steamboat Alert. I thank the minister for the following part of his reply:

> If on the occasion in question the Alert was not interfering with her regular cruise, I personally do not see any reason why any one, even the member for South Cape Breton himself, should not go on board, and proceed to their destination should the vessel be going in that direction.

The hon. minister said that the coasts down there are not accessible by boat. I want to point out to him that there is no part of the county of Victoria that is not accessible by land or sea. A regular line of boats runs down there. What I want to ask the minister is this: for what purpose was the Alert crossing those waters at that particular time? The time seemed to

synchronize with the departure of the Conservative candidate in Victoria county, and the Conservative organizer for the province of Nova Scotia. I brought to the hon. gentleman's attention the fact that certain barrels were taken from the bonded warehouse in North Sydney and hauled to the steamer Alert by the driver or carter of a local wholesale liquor dealer. The hon. minister has not yet given me any answer as to what freight was carried by the Alert on her northward trip. I do not think that it is proper for any boat in the employ of this Government to be the carrier of the candidates or organizers of any political party. I am told—and this was practically the minister's answer to my question the other day—that the Liberal party sinned in that respect. If they did so, then I say that they were sinners, but that does not justify the present Government or any other government which may come into power in this country in following the same course. I wish to put this question to the minister now: On what business was the boat Alert cruising in those northern waters at this particular time, and what freight did she take on board at North Sydney?

Mr. REID: I take it for granted that the hon. gentleman knows that the Alert is employed to prevent smuggling along the coast. She is engaged by the year, I think, and an officer in that district has charge of the service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What is that officer's name?

Mr. REID: I think his name is Angus Young, of North Sydney. The steamer goes to North Sydney occasionally and keeps running back and forward along the coast, following any instructions that may be given by those in charge or by the captain himself, if he supposes that any smuggling is being carried on along the coast.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. member for Cape Breton says they had a load of liquor on board.

Mr. REID: I think in my reply to the hon. gentleman I said that so far as I was personally concerned, or so far as any one in Ottawa connected with the department was concerned, we knew nothing about the matter, and gave no instructions in any shape or form. As to the freight, I will make inquiries and give the hon. gentleman the information that he wants. I do not suppose this boat could take on very much freight, but she might have taken on some such goods as the hon. gentleman has mentioned. The hon. gentleman comes from that part of the country and knows whether or not these statements are correct. As I said the other day, if any person in that vicinity wanted to go along the coast, and the steamer was going there, I do not think there could be any objection to his going on board. Of course in this case it happened to be the candidate and the organizer.

Mr. MACDONALD: What kind of smuggling would the hon. minister expect to be going on along these northern shores in the month of January?

Mr. REID: They bring liquor from St. Pierre and Miquelon.

Mr. MACDONALD: At this time of year?

Mr. REID: Certainly, at any time of the year.

Mr. MACDONALD: I suppose the hon. minister does not know very much about that part of it.

Mr. REID: I admit that I do not know very much about it, as far as that part of the country is concerned, because I have never been there myself. I am only giving the information which I got from the official in charge of that service.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Did the minister ask of the officer in North Sydney whether liquor was put on board the steamer on that particular occasion?

Mr. REID: I asked the officer to get me the information which was requested.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Did he get it for you?

Mr. REID: I read the other day the memorandum he sent me.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There was nothing in the memorandum about the barrels of liquor.

Mr. REID: I will get the information for the hon. gentleman; I do not wish to withold it.

Mr. CARROLL: Under the statutes of Nova Scotia it is an offence to carry intoxicating liquor from one port in the province of Nova Scotia to another. This matter was brought to my attention by a gentleman of North Sydney who is interested in preventing the sale of liquor in that port, and he asked me to bring the matter before the House. The matter stands this way. The officers and crew of the tug Alert—the owners of which draw, I understand, in the vicinity of $18,000 a year from the Government—a Government boat which was supposed to be engaged in

preventing the smuggling of liquor into the ports of eastern Nova Scotia, committed a breach of the Nova Scotia Prohibition Act by carrying intoxicating liquor from North Sydney to the northern ports of Victoria county. This is not hearsay; it is a specific charge, coming from a gentleman in the town of North Sydney, and it is that charge which I wish the hon. minister to investigate.

Mr. REID: I shall certainly have it investigated.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is the captain of the boat in the employ of your department, or are you simply charterers of the boat?

Mr. REID: We are charterers of the boat; we pay, I think, about $15,000 a year for the service.

Mr. MACLEAN: Have the owners or lessees a right to use that boat for other than Government purposes?

Mr. REID: No, she is supposed to be entirely in the customs service.

Mr. MACLEAN: If the hon. minister learns that this boat was taken down into Victoria county purely for the purpose of carrying liquor for use in this election, what will he do with the officers in question?

Mr. REID: I would not care to consider that supposition; if the hon. gentleman will wait until I get the information, I shall be glad to answer him.

Mr. MACLEAN: The hon. minister himself has no doubt as to the purpose of that trip?

Mr. REID: I have a great deal of doubt. As far as the carrying of liquor is concerned, if the captain or anybody on board had a knowledge of the matter I do not believe they would take it on board. I should not be surprised to learn that they carried groceries or something of the kind, and that the newspapers published reports that they carried liquor. I cannot believe that they would put liquors on board to take down the coast.

Mr. MACDONALD: As one sits in the House and listens to the remarks of the hon. minister on this occasion, one is amused when he remembers the way in which the soul of the hon. gentleman was shocked a few years ago over some whisky that went up to the Arctic ocean. Hon. gentlemen from Ontario who never cease talking about the operations of the steamer Minnie M. might well transfer all their vocabulary and a large part of the indignation which they have always assumed with regard to that matter to the performance of the Alert, which, no doubt, will became quite as famous in that direction as any of the celebrated steamers of which we have previously heard so much. In attempting to make this House and the country believe that vessels come from St. Pierre and Miquelon in the middle of January and try to smuggle liquor to the shores of northern Cape Breton, the minister is drawing a very long bow. His commissioner comes from Nova Scotia, and if the minister does not know, the commissioner does know that access to the shores of Cape Breton by means of a schooner or sailing vessel at that season of the year is an absolute impossibility. As a matter of fact, there are no vessels trading between Newfoundland and Cape Breton and Nova Scotia and those northern waters at this season of the year. Consequently there was no necessity for the Alert to go up to the northern portion of Victoria county to look for smugglers, and everybody, including his friends from Nova Scotia, knows that that is so. Everybody knows that the facts were that the Alert started off with the Conservative organizer and the Conservative candidate on a purely political mission. They were not looking for smugglers, they knew that there were none there and that none could get there, and they never expected to find any. The minister would like to jolly this thing along and amuse the House in regard to looking for information. Let me ask the minister if he has found out that the Conservative organizer of the province of Nova Scotia and the candidate for Victoria county were aboard that steamer.

Mr. REID: Yes, I gave the answer yesterday; it is in 'Hansard.'

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister knows that. He has not found out whether there was any whiskey there or not, that is the only question about which he is in the dark. The minister does not need to wait till he gets information from North Sydney, he can find it in the department among his officials who know that the story about this boat going up to look for smugglers is grotesque and absurd. She started on this trip for one purpose, to take the Conservative candidate in the local election up to the northern part of Cape Breton. The only point at issue is whether

they took the supply of whiskey with them. The hon. member for Cape Breton has information from a reliable authority to the effect that they did, and when the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) wants to know what the minister is going to do if he finds that the whisky was there, it is a pertinent question. Does the minister think it improper for these men to have taken any whisky there?

Mr. REID: Certainly.

Mr. MACDONALD: So it appears that the Government are paying large sums to hire a steamer to carry electioneers in provincial elections around the province of Nova Scotia. That is where the minister stands in regard to this question, and he cannot get away from it. What does the minister proposes to do in regard to the utilizing of this boat for purely political purposes? If the minister had one-half the good intentions that he pretended to have when he sat on this side of the House, he would at once cancel this contract, in order that the Government might be able to claim that at least they had carried out one of their election pledges in regard to honesty of government.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Would the minister tell us what are the regular trips of the Alert? He tried to make the House infer that she was going on some kind of a regular trip.

Mr. REID: I understand that the headquarters of the steamer are at North Sydney, and she cruises around looking for smugglers.

Mr. MACDONALD: What kind of smugglers do they expect to meet?

Mr. REID: I cannot say that, but I understand the steamer cruises around at whatever time she is likely to catch smugglers.

Mr. MACLEAN: Why does not the minister despatch somebody from Ottawa to bring the boat back to North Sydney? Because I can assure him that if she has gone there with the organizer and candidate there is grave doubt of her ever coming back.

Mr. REID: Then, we will not have to pay for her hire.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why should not the minister send somebody after her?

Mr. MURPHY: There is one addition to subdivision B of the first division in the minister's department.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. REID: We are going to promote one clerk from the division below, and add another to that class.

Mr. MURPHY: Who is to be promoted?

Mr. REID: The commissioner has not given me any information, but it is some clerk who has been at the top of his class for some years.

Mr. MURPHY: On the item of contingencies, is the increase of $1,000 due, as was explained in reference to other departments, to the new system of charging travelling expenses?

Mr. REID: The commissioner informs me that this $1,000 will be required for travelling expenses.

Mr. MURPHY: Is the increase represented by that?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: This afternoon there was a reference to a boat that had been brought to the Prescott shipyards. My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) made some inquiry in regard to it, and the minister read a statement sent to him by the department. It is possible that the hon. member for Rouville was under a misapprehension about the boat having been purchased by the Customs Department, and I want to ask the minister if his department has anything to do with the shipyard at Prescott?

Mr. REID: The Customs Department have nothing whatever to do with the shipyard at Prescott. I may add that the Customs Department knows nothing of any steamer having been purchased during the last fiscal year or up to date this year. There is a little yacht that was seized by the customs and not claimed. After it was repaired by the Marine Department the Customs Department paid the Marine Department for the work they did on this yacht. They immediately left the wharf at Prescott, went to Kingston, remained there a couple of days and went down the Rideau canal to St. John, N.B., where the boat is now in service. The only boats I know of that have ever been around Prescott, are the Scout and the Reserve. There was another large vessel there this winter belonging to the Marine Department and used in the surveying of the lakes. I do not know whether the department have bought a small launch for marine work at Prescott; if they have I have never seen it. I would not say that they have not a launch of that

kind. It strikes me that I did hear something to that effect this summer. They were thinking of getting a gasolene launch for the superintendent to use in case the Scout and Reserve were away. But that is only what I heard.

Mr. MURPHY: The boat to which my hon. friend the Minister of Customs has just referred to is different from the craft in regard to which my hon. friend from Rouville made inquiry, and in reference to which I offered some observations to the committee. This boat, I am informed, was brought to Prescott on October 26 last. She was not towed there as my hon. friend from Rouville said. I understand she went there under her own power. She stopped at Valleyfield on the way up, and one of the gentlemen in charge represented himself to be an official, I think he said the private secretary of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. I think he was drawing rather a long bow in making that statement, but that is how he described himself. The yacht bore no name, and reached Prescott on October 26, shortly after the Chateauguay election. Nobody knows the name of the yacht—it was taken off, and I understand she is still without a name. My further information is that she was purchased from the Shea Sales Company of Montreal. I am giving this information to my hon. friend so that he can make inquiry. We on this side will make further inquiry later on. A description of the boat may help my hon. friend. She is 35 feet long, four cylinder engine, with a speed of about 13 miles an hour, nickel-plated wind shield, auto-top, round stern, and hull painted white. These particulars may enable my hon. friend to identify her, and if it is not his department that is concerned with the purchase, I assume it must be the department of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works or the Department of Marine and Fisheries. In any event, I am giving my hon. friend these particulars so that inquiries about this myterious craft may be made.

Mr. REID: I am very glad to get the information. I may say it is all news to me. I never heard of this boat before and have never seen her and until the hon. gentleman just mentioned it, I never knew there was such a boat in existence. The boat is certainly not being used in connection with the Customs Department.

Mr. MURPHY: It must be in connection with the Marine and Fisheries or Public Works.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like to say a word or two about a question I asked the hon. Minister of Customs this afternoon in regard to blank forms used by the customs being printed in both English and French. My hon. friend seems to be under the impression that this is being asked as a favour by the importers of Montreal. My hon. friend said this afternoon, are we going to print blank forms in German, for instance, for the benefit of German exporters? I called the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that all official documents relating to the Dominion Government, blue books, etc., are published in both languages. We do not ask the Government to go to the useless expense of having these forms printed in both languages in cities or towns where there are no French-speaking people, but my hon. friend will understand that in Montreal there is a large commercial community, some of them speaking English and some of them speaking French, and if the merchants ask for these blank forms to be printed in French as well as English—and you can have the both languages printed on the same form without duplicating the form itself—they are simply asking for what is their right, they are not seeking favours. I would like an answer from my hon. friend as to whether or not he will yield to the demand made by the Montreal importers, that these blank forms be printed in French as well as in English. My hon. friend will recall the illustration I gave him this afternoon of a Montreal importer sending one of these forms to an exporter in France who did not understand the English language. The form had to be sent back, and that took up a large amount of time. There is a general complaint about it.

Mr. REID: The form that the hon. gentleman handed me is simply the form of an invoice showing the kind of form the department approves of. The exporter in a foreign country makes out his own invoices and we accept them if they are in this form. The form I have here is not a customs entry form at all. We do not supply these forms to be sent away in large quantities. If a person were to go into the customs office with an entry form printed in French it is accepted, if it is made out in the right way, just as readily as a form printed in English. The misunderstanding between my hon. friend from Rouville and myself is over this form, and as I have said it is simply a form of invoice and not a

customs entry at all. We do not get these forms printed; they are printed by the firms themselves.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The answer of my hon. friend satisfies me. My correspondent informed me that he was handed a form by the customs authorities in Montreal which was printed in English. It was sent to France and sent back again because the exporter did not understand the English language. If my hon. friend will say that both languages can be used on these forms in Montreal or in any other place where both languages are spoken, I shall be perfectly satisfied.

Mr. REID: Certainly. If any person comes into the custom house in Montreal or any place else with an entry form in French we will accept it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And the blank form is supplied by the department?

Mr. REID: It is supplied by the department. This is headed 'Specimen form of invoice approved by the Canadian Customs.' This is in the English language. If any person is sending to France, Germany, or any other place for goods he wants to have the proper form of invoice. Invoices come here without the necessary declaration and it makes a whole lot of trouble. These are a few specimen copies that they have in the department, and if a man comes and asks for the specimen we give him a form like this one.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They should be printed in French because they are supplied by the department for the information of the exporter. The difficulty was that the specimen in English was not understood by the exporter. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he intends in future to see that these blank forms are printed in both languages.

Mr. REID: Yes, I have no objection.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am perfectly satisfied. The hon. gentleman seemed to be under the impression this afternoon that it was not a matter of right but a matter of favour. It is a matter of right. People dealing with the customs are entitled to have these forms in the French language when they are French-speaking people.

Mr. REID: There is no doubt about that.

Mr. MARCIL: The Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies in the province of Quebec have all their forms, tickets and everything printed in both languages. It is a matter of convenience and a matter of business. In all departments where they are doing business in the province of Quebec the same principle should be applied.

Mr. MACDONALD: Where is the Alert now?

Mr. REID: I would be very glad to give the hon. gentleman the information if I could. I can hardly tell. She left North Sydney to cruise along the coast.

Mr. MACDONALD: Not at all; she never went there to cruise for smugglers.

Mr. REID: That is my information.

Mr. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman has no such information, because everybody in Cape Breton knows that at this season of the year it is ridiculous to talk about smugglers. To make the statement or to suggest the theory that the Alert, or any other Government steamer, would go along the north shore of Cape Breton to look for smugglers at this season of the year is to suggest something that is absurd. Perhaps the minister does not know that he is attempting to perpetrate a joke upon this House, but I may tell him that he is. I think the minister, in view of the fact that hon. gentlemen, when sitting on this side of the House, raised such a serious question in regard to the employment of steamers in connection with election work, is entitled to give us the fullest information with regard to this matter before he can expect to get any supplies. My hon. friend should ascertain and let the committee know when the Alert went up there before. How many trips had she made since the middle of December in connection with preventive work in that part of the country? Would he tell us whether or not he is aware of the fact that there is a steamer running from North Sydney up as far as Neil's harbour on that coast subsidized by this Government, a public conveyance by which the Conservative electioneers and agents could have gone up there if they wanted to without appropriating a Government steamer which was put there for their own convenience in order that they could stop wherever they wanted to, and could do so at the public expense? The minister is not going to get off with jollying the thing along and joking about smugglers in midwinter from St. Pierre and that kind of thing. This committee know how the hon. gentleman, in previous Parliaments, dealt with questions like this when they came up. My hon. friend ought not to attempt to abuse the intelligence of this House by perpetrating

such a theory upon them as that smuggling was going on at this time of the year. My hon. friend's Government sent a special ice-breaker, the Stanley, up along the northern coast to go to the Magdalen Islands right through the waters in which this steamer is said to be cruising and the idea of smugglers coming over from St. Pierre in midwinter is one that is so grotesque that my hon. friend has a great deal of assurance if he fancies that he can get away with a story of that kind. In view of the facts in connection with this matter the minister has a right to supply the committee with full information as to what previous trips the Alert has made up that coast within the last two months for the purpose of stopping smugglers.

Mr. EDWARDS: If a steamer could not carry on smuggling for the reason that she could not get into shore during the winter how could a steamer land political agents?

Mr. MACDONALD: I did not say that a steamer could not get into shore in winter time. I was speaking of the extent to which vessels, at this season of the year, engage in that trade. Everyone knows very well that no vessels, except the Bruce which runs from Point au Basque to Sydney, and this steamer which runs from Sydney up along that coast, are navigating those waters in winter time. The navigation is such in the gulf of St. Lawrence—and this is in the gulf—that, with the exception of special steamers which have been running up this coast for the past few years, there is no trade of any kind going on in these months and the theory of smuggling is perfectly ridiculous.

Mr. EDWARDS: That would be a good time for smugglers.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am not familiar with the time when they smug-
9 p.m. gle up on lake Ontario, but that is not the time they smuggle in Nova Scotia. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs should bring down to this committee any report—and I venture to say he has none—from his preventive officer or anybody else suggesting there has been any smuggling along that coast since the middle of December. The minister cannot produce from any official of his department any suggestion, any report, stating that any smuggling has been carried on along these coasts since the 15th of December. My hon. friend intimated that his department was very generous. He said:

> The member for South Cape Breton is aware that certain parts of the coast are inaccessible except by boat, and if on the occasion in question the Alert was not interfering with her regular cruise, I, personally do not see any reason why any one, even the member for South Cape Breton himself, should not go on board, and proceed to their destination, should the vessel be going in that direction.

The facts in regard to this matter are these: It was not necessary for the public business for the Alert to go up along that coast. Instead of her going there to stop smuggling she went up there at the dictation of the Conservative managers in the county of Victoria who are running a provincial election for the purpose of taking the candidate and the organizer to different places in this constituency. She did not go up there to prevent smuggling and take these gentlemen along with her incidentally; she went there for that sole and specific purpose. The information which my hon. friend from South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) that she went there with a large supply of whiskey, to accompany these gentlemen, is of such a character that the minister ought to deal with it in the most serious way. Hon. gentlemen who have heard this same gentleman, who is now the Minister of Customs, inveigh in the strongest possible language against the employment of Government vessels for political purposes, sit in wonderment at the placid way in which he would like to jolly this question along. One of the great boasts of the Ministry was that when they came into power we were to have an ideal condition in regard to all questions of dealing with elections. They have been in for nearly three years and not only has nothing been done but here we have the Minnie M. outdone by the direct employment at the public expense of a Government vessel supposed to be engaged in the revenue service for the purpose of carrying organizers and whiskey to an outlying part of the province of Nova Scotia. I say to my hon. friend that before he asks this committee to vote supplies he should give to the committee all the reports there are from his officials that would show that this vessel had been employed in the month of January in preventive work along that coast and if he has not such reports he should tell the House so. In view of the statement of a member of this House, that whisky was placed on board the steamer in connection with these political organizers, an investigation should at once be held. The strong position taken on such matters, by the Minister of Customs in the

past, makes it impossible for him to escape instituting an investigation.

Mr. REID: The other day I gave the hon. member all the information I had up to that time.

Mr. MACDONALD: You gave us no information that she went there to prevent smuggling.

Mr. REID: That is the service she is employed in.

Mr. MACDONALD: You had no information to that effect then?

Mr. REID: All the officers tell me that is the service she is employed in.

Mr. MACDONALD: Nobody told you she went up there for that purpose on this occasion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MACDONALD: Order what? Do these gentlemen not know that in committee a member can speak as often as he likes; the minister is not complaining.

Mr. REID: She cruises around the coast of Cape Breton for the purpose of preventing smuggling.

Mr. MACDONALD: In the month of January? Would the minister bring down any such statement in writing?

Mr. REID: I can obtain a report from the officials, and when I get it I will have an investigation made. I can say that it was not on any instructions from Ottawa. If the officials at Sydney have taken upon themselves to carry these gentlemen to Neil's Harbour, I cannot help it now, but I will have an investigation made and I shall not permit one of the steamers of the department to be engaged in any such work. If the hon. gentleman does not wish to let the item go through then I will have to let it stand, or, we can hold one of these items over and I can bring down the information before it is passed.

Mr. MACDONALD: I have no desire to obstruct the passage of any legitimate item. If the minister states to this committee that he will make inquiry into the facts as desired by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and that he will deal with these officials in accordance with the proper principles of government in such cases, I am satisfied. I rely upon the word of the minister to that effect. But I attach the condition that the investigation must be immediate.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. REID: I will get all the information.

Mr. MACDONALD: As speedily as possible?

Mr. REID: As speedily as possible.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If the minister finds several barrels of whisky on board will he order its confiscation?

Mr. REID: I should think it would be confiscated long ago.

Mr. MACDONALD: He will not find any there now.

Mr. KYTE: Is it necessary that this vessel should clear from customs when going on these trips to round up smugglers?

Mr. REID: I should not think it would be necessary for a customs steamer to clear, for the reason that the captain is an acting preventive officer, and therefore there would always be a customs officer on board.

Mr. KYTE: Then there would be no entry in the customs office as to what cargo she carried?

Mr. REID: I do not think so, but if there is such a record I will bring it down with the report.

Mr. TURGEON: The minister will remember that last year I called his attention to the dismissal of the sub-collector of customs at Lameque (Shippegan), in my county. It took two investigations to discover some fault against this officer, who was a model civil servant; one of the best educated men in the county, and against whom no charge of partisanship could ever be justly made. After two investigations he was found guilty of having attended my meeting in September, 1911, and the worst charged against him was that he applauded some remarks of mine. I also pointed out to the minister that the man appointed in his place is a partisan every day of his life, and belongs to the party organization committee. The minister told me that if he ascertained that this official was guilty of partisanship he would have to stop it. Since then a municipal election took place in Gloucester county and the new appointee was the Conservative candidate, running his election on federal politics more than municipal issues. I have no fault to find with that if it is allowed to everybody. The minister in reply to a question yesterday stated that the sub-collector of customs at Lameque, as well as the sub-collector at Tracadie had not received per-

mission from him to be candidates in the municipal election, and I was pleased to have that statement. The municipal election to which I refer took place between the new appointee and the dismissed official, and some gentlemen present will be glad to hear that the dismissed official was elected by a vote of three to one against the Conservative appointee. All the same that does not carry out the pledge of the minister that if the present official was a partisan he would be dismissed. Some officials in my county have been dismissed on the sole recommendation of the defeated candidate, notwithstanding that they were no more active in politics during the fifteen years of Liberal rule than the Minister of Trade and Commerce stated publicly in the House an official might be. What will become now of this sub-collector of customs at Lameque who has been a candidate in municipal elections on a political platform, and who has been telling the people that he has the support of the federal Administration as well as of the Conservative Administration of New Brunswick. Will the minister take my word for it, as he has taken the word of the defeated candidate in other cases, and dismiss this man?

Mr. REID: I take the word of the hon. member without question, as to the subcollector taking part in a municipal election. As I understand it, the hon. member asks that I dismiss this man for taking part in the municipal election at Gloucester. As far as I am concerned, I feel that when a person accepts a Government position he should cease to take part in any election, municipal or otherwise. It seems, however, to have been recognized, both by the late Government and the one previous to that, that Government officials are allowed to take part in municipal elections. During the last municipal contest I had quite a number of complaints that civil servants who were Liberals had taken part, and their dismissal was requested. I have also had requests made by Liberals to be allowed to run for the mayoralty and other municipal offices. During the last year or two, in so far as the Department of Customs is concerned, there have been quite a number of officials running in municipal elections at different points. The same thing applies to all the other departments, the Department of Customs being no exception. I suppose the hon. member knows that in the city of Ottawa there are Government officials holding quite important positions, such as city councillors and controllers. At Kingston and other places the same thing occurs. Until there is a general rule that officials in all the departments shall cease to take part in municipal elections or to occupying positions on municipal councils, I am not in a position, so far as the Department of Customs is concerned, to refuse to allow them to do so. During the last municipal election in January, only one official, a Liberal, asked me if I would have any objection to his running. I explained to him that, as it had been allowed for so many years and as other civil servants were running, I could not raise any objection in his case.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Did the man run?

Mr. REID: Yes, and he was elected.

Mr. TURGEON: I believe that in the city of Ottawa any gentleman in the Civil Service or outside of it must have had enough of the city's affairs to discuss without mingling federal politics in his canvass. But when a candidate runs in a municipal election more on federal politics than on municipal issues, that alters the case. If I tell the hon. minister that this gentleman is still a member of the organization in his district, will he look into the matter?

Mr. REID: He must cease to be a member of the organization or else leave the service.

Mr. TURGEON: I am making the statement that he is still a member of the organization.

Mr. REID: I will make inquiries at once. He cannot hold the two positions.

Mr. TURGEON: I would also ask the hon. minister to inquire as to the subcollector at Tracadie.

Mr. MACDONALD: What inquiry is the minister to make?

Mr. REID: Whether the gentleman is a member of the organization or not.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is it against the rule for a Government employee to be a member of a political organization?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. CARVELL: Is that the policy of the hon. minister or the policy of the Government?

Mr. REID: I can explain only in so far as my own department is concerned.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. minister has again tonight laid down the policy of the Government as advanced last year by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White). When, during the absence of the hon. minister, I called the attention of the Government to dismissals in the Department of Customs in the county of Huntingdon, I stated that I had it on an authority which the minister himself would not dispute that in the first investigation the investigator reported that there was no cause for dismissal, but that the persistent demands of so-called independent candidates resulted in the minister chopping off the heads of two custom house officials in the county of Huntingdon, thus establishing a record that the county had not had since Confederation of dismissing men for political partisanship.

To-night we have had a good deal of information from our friends from the Maritime provinces in regard to the mission of a steamer along the coast, and apparently from their statements that vessel was called into the service to distribute liquor during the by-election. That seems to be the general policy of this Government. I want the minister to take note that we shall be prepared to prove in the courts that an official of this Government, appointed by this Government, working in an office close to that of the Minister of Customs in the city of Valleyfield, operated in the by-election in the county of Chateauguay and was caught red-handed distributing whisky on voting day right opposite the polling booth. I am not going to give the minister the name of that official. I make the bald statement. I want to know if the minister is going to investigate that case, and see that that man is no longer retained in the service of the Government. It may be offered in his defence that he was on holiday at that particular time. I want further to point out to the minister that one month later, in the provincial by-election in the county of Huntingdon, the same man was operating in the Conservative interest. All the pretensions of this Government will fall to pieces unless they are prepared to take up this case and to see that this particular man attends to his business as an official of the Government and keeps out of elections.

Mr. REID: Is he a customs official?

Mr. ROBB: No, but his office is next door to the customs office in the same building right across the hall; and he was appointed by this Government, I think, within a year. I submit that the Government has no reason to be proud of that record. Our friends claim that the election at Chateauguay was a victory for their naval policy and their trade policy. In view of the fact that their own candidate ran away from the naval policy, in view of the fact that our good friend the Postmaster General, speaking in Ormstown, in French, refused to discuss the naval policy, and in view of the evidence that we have that an official of this Government was distributing whisky on election day, it seems to me that the Government will have to revise their ideas on the result of that election. I hope the hon. minister will bring this to the attention of his leader and see to it that the Government officials in Valleyfield take no further part in elections.

Mr. CROTHERS: In referring to this distribution of liquor, is the hon. gentleman speaking from personal knowledge or from hearsay?

Mr. ROBB: I am speaking upon the evidence of a man who was sent out there with two witnesses, and who caught the man in the act.

Mr. CROTHERS: Hearsay.

Mr. PELLETIER: Am I to understand that the hon. gentleman said that I never discussed the naval policy in Chateauguay?

Mr. ROBB: I say that I sat in the hall and listened to the hon. minister's eloquent speech at Ormstown. Speaking in English, he made a casual reference to the naval policy, and speaking in French he never mentioned it in any way whatever.

Mr. PELLETIER: My hon. friend must have been asleep. I had been told by the people that when the right hon. leader of the Opposition, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) and the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) were in Ormstown on the previous day, they had avoided the discussion of their own naval policy. I was asked by the gentlemen who came to see me before the meeting if I would discuss both policies, and I did so. I told the people that the gentlemen who were in Ormstown the day before, apart from some abuse that they had heaped upon us, had avoided discussing their own policy. I said, you know all about our naval policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS: What is it?

Mr. PELLETIER: The matter was discussed here for months last session, and I take it that the electors of Chateauguay are intelligent enough to have heard something about it. I do not think there is a man in this country who does not know what our policy was last session.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is it now? What is your permanent policy?

Mr. PELLETIER: Our permanent policy does not exist. The Prime Minister has told my hon. friend that whenever there is a naval policy it will be put before the House and the people will be consulted about it. So, when the hon. member tells the House and the country that we did not discuss the naval policy on that occasion he is entirely wrong. I told the people what the Bill presented to Parliament last session was, and I said: We are going to discuss the naval policy as formulated by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. So the people heard what they had not been told on the previous day, and the result was that on election day we had a majority of seventy-five in Ormstown.

Mr. ROBB: Allow me to correct the hon. Postmaster General. In Ormstown, where he spoke, there was a Liberal majority at the last by-election, whereas in 1911 there was a Conservative majority.

Mr. PELLETIER: My hon. friend does not even know the result of the polling in Ormstown; I was sure he had been asleep. As a matter of fact, in 1911, there was a majority of twenty-six against us in Ormstown, and at the by-election there was a majority of seventy-five in our favour.

Mr. ROBB: The minister is talking about the parish. I repeat that in the village of Ormstown there was a Liberal majority.

Mr. PELLETIER: I was not speaking only of the village; I was speaking of the whole place.

Mr. CARROLL: Last year while the Estimates for the Customs Department were before the House, I brought to the attention of the minister a grievance which some businessmen of Whitney Pier, which is a part of the city of Sydney, had in respect of the sub-collector of customs at that point, Mr. McDonald. They brought to my attention the fact that he is a merchant and an importer of goods, and that he carries on business in three different stores in the city. They instructed me to ask the minister whether or not it was within the knowledge of the hon. gentleman or of his department that this gentleman was an importer of goods. I do not make any charge against this gentleman; I am only placing before the minister the complaint of the merchants to whom I have referred, that his being an importer of goods might cause him to have some advantage over them. At the time I brought the matter to the attention of the minister, he promised me that he would let the House know whether it would be the policy of the Government to allow importers of goods to act as customs collectors or sub-collectors. The House rose shortly after that, and I presume the minister did not have time to bring down the information. If he has not the information now, I hope he will get it and bring it down before his Estimates are all put through.

Mr. REID: It certainly is against the rules of the department for any one occupying any such position to act as collector of customs. Obviously he would have an advantage over the other merchants, as he would see their invoices, the prices of their goods, and so on. When the hon. member brought the matter to my attention, I certainly must have referred it to the officials of the department, and no doubt there is a report on file. I will look into the matter to-morrow, and if this official is still engaged in the business to which my hon. friend refers he certainly must give up either his business or the position. Of course in some smaller places where the revenue is not very great, the salary of the official is so very small that there would be no objection to a farmer, for instance, acting as collector, but a merchant is certainly objectionable, and I cannot understand how the official can be continuing in that business and holding his office at the same time. I shall look up the report on the matter and the hon. member will get it without fail.

Mr. MARCIL: I would like to have it stated clearly whether or not officials of the Department of Customs are free to be candidates in municipal elections, and to take an active part in municipal life?

Mr. REID: This has been allowed in all the other departments. The matter was brought to my attention this year by one of our inspectors, who asked me if I had any objection to his taking part in municipal elections. I suppose it was really a political election too. I think his opponent was likely on the opposition side of politics. It was going on all over the country.

Mr. MARCIL: No order has been issued?

Mr. REID: No, and I have had complaints that certain Liberal customs officers took part in municipal elections and people have wanted them dismissed. On the other hand, the hon. member for Gloucester gives me an instance the other way, and I think there should be some rule. At the same time there is no general rule.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Some years ago a rule was issued by the Customs Department forbidding persons in the customs outside service to become candidates in municipal elections. In the province of Nova Scotia, in many instances, to my own knowledge, persons desirous of becoming municipal candidates who were in the customs service were prevented from running by the Minister of Customs. This rule may not have been observed in all cases, but I know of my own knowledge that customs officers contemplating entering municipal elections received word from the Minister of Customs that they could only do so on penalty of losing their offices. Further, in September and October of last year, the customs service was circularized by the Department at Ottawa in the same direction and persons in the service were told that they must not be candidates in municipal elections. I know that an order was made five or six years ago in connection with this matter. I think the minister is mistaken in saying that his department permitted anybody to take part in municipal elections as they saw fit. I think it is a rule that has been pretty generally observed in the past by the Customs Department.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does the hon. member say that the previous Government forbade officers being candidates for municipal elections?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I say that an order to that effect was issued by the Customs Department, and in Nova Scotia it was fairly well observed. Of my own knowledge I know of two persons who were told that they should not be candidates in municipal contests.

Mr. EDWARDS: It was not observed in Ontario. If that order was made to apply to Nova Scotia I would assume it would apply to the other provinces, and I can assure my hon. friend it did not apply in Ontario. A very estimable gentleman was a candidate for several years in Kingston, a very high customs official in that city and an adherent of the Liberal party, but a man who as customs officer took no part in politics. This year, following the natural course of events, he ran in Kingston for mayor. There could not have been any general rule to prohibit customs officers taking part in municipal elections. If there was in Ontario it was honoured more in the breach than in the observance.

Mr. ROBB: Referring again to the Chateauguay elections, from a report I have here, taken from the Montreal Gazette, giving the result of the polls in the village of Ormstown, where the minister spoke, poll No. 11, I see that Morris had 79 votes and Fisher 95, a majority of 16 for Fisher, and the large majorities in the parish of Ormstown were in those particular polls where the Government official had been operating.

Mr. PELLETIER: What is the use of splitting hairs? Ormstown comprises the township of Ormstown and the village of Ormstown. If you take those two places combined—and we had in our audience people not only from the small village but people from all over the township, the member knows that well, as the hall was crowded—and the people who voted the following day were not only the people of the village but of the whole township. If my hon. friend, who seems to have lost his memory as to what took place on that day, will refer not only to the village but to the whole township of Ormstown he will see that what I represented is true, that the majority of the Conservative candidate was 75.

Mr. RHODES: The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), I have no doubt, was trusting to his memory in making his observation that under the previous Administration the Minister of Customs laid down the law that customs officers should not participate in municipal elections.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Not at all; I know it as a fact.

Mr. RHODES: I have a very distinct recollection of discussing the question with the late Minister of Customs four or five sessions ago for at least an hour, when I gave him specific instances where some collectors of customs were candidates for positions as councillors in elections run on straight party lines. Not only was I unable to get redress in cases of partisanship, but I was unable to get the late Minister of Customs to lay down the law that officials should not be permitted to run. What I believe is that collectors of customs in receipt of a fairly good salary ought not to

be permitted to take part in municipal contests which are conducted along party lines and I think the sooner we come to an understanding in this country so that we will have one general policy for all Administrations the better. We will thus save this recrimination and bickering back and forth about petty officials and positions.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will the minister inquire if his department did not, within six months, circularize the outside service against participation in municipal elections?

Mr. REID: I shall certainly do so, I have no recollections of the circular.

Mr. RHODES: I have here 'Hansard' of the session of 1910-11, at page 1055, of which the hon. member will find a full statement covering several pages, setting forth the position I took at the time.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I know and have personal knowledge of two cases at least where objections were made by electors of a municipal district against a certain person being a candidate who was in the customs service, occupying, of course, some minor position; and by reason of these protests he was requested by the Minister of Customs to withdraw from the contest.

Mr. EDWARDS: By what Government was he appointed?

Mr. MACLEAN: By the late Government.

Mr. REID: What surprises me, if that circular was sent out, is that it must have been sent to all officials and yet within the last few months many officials have taken part in these municipal contests and quite a number of them are not in sympathy with the Government. I have had complaints about customs employees appointed by my predecessor taking part in a municipal contest at Yarmouth, I think it was.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Perhaps it was Annapolis county.

Mr. REID: Perhaps the hon. member for Yarmouth would know if any such officials in Yarmouth took part in the municipal elections?

Mr. LAW: None whatever.

Mr. DAVIDSON: The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has referred to Annapolis county. I may say in regard to that, that under the late Government there was a sub-collector of customs by the name of Mr. Porter who was a councillor and who ran in the Liberal interests. I wrote to the then Minister of Customs and asked him if it were not against the rules of his department to allow one of his officers to act on a municipal council, and I was given the reply that there was no such rule. As a matter of fact Mr. Porter sat in the municipal council for a great many years.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That was not the gentleman I had in mind at all when I interrupted. The minister was asked if a request had not been made for the removal of an official of his department for taking part in some municipal election. I do not claim that it is objectionable for an official to take part in a municipal election. I am more interested in the proposition that customs officials should not be candidates. I was told that one officer of the customs at Bridgetown, by the name of Mr. Hicks, was dismissed from office in December or January, 1913, because his son had taken part in a municipal election.

Mr. DAVIDSON: My hon. friend is misinformed in regard to that. No official in Annapolis county was dismissed on any such grounds as that. The firm to which this collector of customs belongs had tried to cajole voters at that municipal election, but that was not the cause for which the official was removed.

Mr. KYTE: I think some good purpose is being served by this discussion. It is perhaps an opportune time to ask the Minister of Customs to lay down some rule which could be observed universally throughout the country. The observations made by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), are absolutely correct and within my own knowledge, although possibly the circular sent out by the late Minister of Customs might not be described as 'instructions' to customs officers not to take part in municipal politics. I am aware, however, that recommendations to that effect were issued to the warden of the county which I represent. He is a most competent official and highly qualified to discharge the duties of warden of the county. Six years ago I remember he was again asked to stand for his district in the municipal council, and he wrote to the Minister of Customs asking if any objection would be raised to him occupying a position on the municipal council, and as a result of the reply received by him from the late Minister of Customs, that gentleman did not offer as

a candidate and has not since been a candidate in the county of Richmond. Whether that rule is universal or not I am not aware, but I say that the late minister recommended that it would be better for that gentleman to take no part in municipal politics.

Mr. J. D. REID: So far as I am concerned, I believe that every customs official should cease to take part in municipal elections or any other elections. I think, however, that if customs officials are prevented, the rule should be universal throughout the whole Service; it should apply to all departments. So far as I am concerned, I have not changed any rule that was in existence when I came into office in this regard. I am satisfied that if the records of the recent municipal elections throughout the Dominion were looked up, we should probably find as many officials of one political faith as of the other, who were candidates in the municipal elections. Of course there are places where it might be necessary for an official to take part in the election, say, in some new town. I remember receiving a letter about a year ago from an official in a new town asking me whether he could take office in the council, and I advised him that at the expiration of his term of office it would be better for him to keep out of municipal contests altogether. I think that is what should be done and hope that some rule of that kind will be put into force throughout the whole service.

Mr. CARVELL: I have a very distinct recollection of two cases during the last fifteen years, where an official was refused the right to take part in municipal elections. One was a case that occurred in Fredericton, concerning an inspector of fisheries, who wished to be a candidate for mayor. He was denied that right. That brings up the general question. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has stated that in his judgment every official should be debarred the right to take part in municipal elections. I cannot agree with that, although perhaps in saying so I may not be in accord with the opinions of hon. gentlemen on this side. It seems to me that a rule should be laid down providing that the man who earns his living as an official, the man who receives sufficient salary on which to live, should be a public official and mind his own business. But the man who gets only a small amount of money, such as a poor preventive officer or a man in charge of a country post office getting $35 a year, these are the men who should not be deprived of the right of citizenship. These men should be allowed to exercise their right and they should not lose their jobs when a new Government comes in, because, they have exercised their right of citizenship. But as I said before, in the case of a man earning his whole living in the public service, an entirely different principal should prevail, and I think it would be well for the Government to lay down some rule which would be fair and reasonable to compel Government officials to be Government officials and to allow the other men to be men amongst men and exercise the right which everybody supposes them to have.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I want to prefer a very serious charge against the Minister of Customs, a charge that may bring about his removal from the Government. The charge is this: he has been spreading a very strong free trade sentiment in my constituency. I do not object to that, but I know his friends in my constituency do. A special officer was sent to the customs port at Coutts during the past year. He was very active, and some of his offences were so serious that Conservatives were repeatedly going over to the Liberal ranks. I will instance a few cases, and in bringing this matter to the attention of the minister I may say that I am very anxious that he should keep this officer on the move throughout the whole country, because his operations will be of great assistance to the Liberal party. In one case a man drove across the boundary from Coutt's to Sweetgrass, Montana, and had luncheon at Sweetgrass because there did not happen to be an hotel at Coutts. He had a sheep camp at the boundary and while he was over he bought a pound of butter. When he came back his entire outfit, team of horses, wagon and pound of butter were seized and he had to go to Lethbridge and get another outfit. He had to put up the value of the team of horses and wagon, and the matter was in the hands of the Department of Customs for some time. There was another case far more serious than that. A gentleman living on the Canadian side of the line crossed to Sweetgrass, got a package of tobacco and when he came over the line the package of tobacco was seized. Innumerable cases of this kind have done a great deal to help free trade sentiment, and I only hope that the Minister of Customs will keep this man going about the country, not so much in the West, because

the sentiment is very strong there at the present time, but through the East. His name is Hughes and that is a name that is very helpful to the Liberal party.

Mr. CARROLL: I wish to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Customs the matter of a return for which I asked last year. It was in connection with the dismissal of the collector of customs at the port of Glace Bay—Mr. M. J. McKinnon. There were two investigations into the charges that were preferred against Mr. McKinnon, and I was instructed by Mr. Duchemin on the occasion of the second investigation that his report, including the evidence taken in the first investigation, had been sent to the department. I got the documents in relation to the second investigation, and I brought to the attention of the minister, here in the corridors last spring, the fact that the return of papers I had asked for was not complete in that it did not contain the report of the first investigation into the charges of political partisanship. I wish to ask the minister if he will kindly bring down to the House the report of the first investigation including the evidence taken by the commissioner. I may tell him that I require this as I intend to discuss some phases of this dismissal when the Estimates for the outside service are brought down.

Mr. REID: Is the hon. gentleman sure I did not bring that down? I brought down some reports the other day.

Mr. CARROLL: I got part of it last winter.

Mr. REID: I know I brought down some the other day and I thought that was included in the return. I shall bring down that report to-morrow.

Mr. KYTE: While on this matter I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to the case of the dismissal of Martin Johnston, preventive officer at Red Islands. This dismissal took place shortly after the present Government came into office and the reason given by the minister for the dismissal was that there was nothing for this officer to do and that his services were on that account dispensed with. But I was able to remind the minister that a few weeks afterwards they appointed another preventive officer to take his place.

Mr. REID: At the same point?

Mr. KYTE: Oh, yes, practically the same point. I desired to know
10 p.m. what the salary of the new preventive officer was, which information has not been given to me, and I would be glad if the minister would get the information. Michael E. Gilles of Irish Cove was appointed in his place, and I want to know what the salary of Mr. Gilles is and what salary Mr. Johnston enjoyed while he was in office.

Customs—Salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Dominion, including pay for over-time officers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $3,590,000.

Mr. REID: I will explain this item. The vote for the fiscal year 1913-14 was $3,290,000, and we are asking for $300,000 more this year. The total salaries of the officers employed at the various ports of the Dominion were, when the estimate was prepared, $2,760,445. The contingent expenses for the nine months ended 31st December, 1913, amounted to $337,845, and it is estimated that for the whole fiscal year we will require $394,745. Add to this the net over-time as expended during the year 1912-13 amounting to $124,000. That is to remunerate landing waiters and officers who work evertime at the different ports. That makes a total estimated expenditure of $3,279,190. From this total we deduct the estimated bonded warehouse refunds, based on those of the previous year, amounting to $32,000, bringing the estimated expenditure to $3,247,190. We ask for $3,590,000, there being an increase of $342,810 over the estimate of last year.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I suppose the largest increase is in the port of Montreal?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to inform the House as to the number of customs officers that he found when he assumed office, and the increase in the numbers and salaries in the first, second and present years?

Mr. REID: I will make a note of that so that I will be able to give the hon. gentleman the information. I could not give it offhand. I will get it for him before we pass these Estimates.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Would the minister at the same time give us the total number of officers that he has appointed and dismissed in the whole Dominion of Canada since he assumed office?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Inasmuch as the Minister of Customs has, I think, only these items on page 96 to pass, I think he should not press for a vote to-night, but that we should take them up some other evening, because we have not had an opportunity of looking into them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like to get the names and the increases in salaries for the port of Quebec for the same years when we take up these Estimates again.

Civil Government—Department of Railways and Canals, $201,150.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Minister of Railways cannot be here to-night, as he is not permitted to come out after dinner, and I would ask hon. gentlemen to pass these items. One assistant engineer is dropped in A1 and an assistant engineer is appointed to B1. In B2 there are two additional clerkships of $1,200 each, and in A3 five new clerks at salaries ranging from $500 to $1,200 per annum.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: None of these are in the Moncton office?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is the salary of Mr. Gutelius included in this?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: I would like the minister to bring down at as early a date as possible the Order in Council appointing Mr. Gutelius. The friends of the Government in the Maritime provinces are told when they ask something from the minister: Mr. Gutelius says it cannot be done. We would like to know whether Mr. Gutelius is bigger than the minister and just what his duties are.

Mr. REID: The Order in Council will be brought down.

Mr. MACDONALD: I would like also to have all the papers brought down in connection with the purchase of American coal by the Department of Railways in the month of December last. To-day the coal miners of Nova Scotia are lacking work, and it is rather unsatisfactory to know that the Government railway purchased coal in Pennsylvania, brought it by rail to Massena Springs, took it from Massena Springs to Levis and paid the freight on it to that point; while at the same time it declined the opportunity to haul coal over its own railway from the mines along the Intercolonial railway. There are quite a number of small mines, particularly, which are to-

day stopping for want of orders, and a great many others are working half time.

Mr. REID: The papers will be brought down and they will give all the information. I think I am right in stating that the coal companies informed Mr. Gutelius that they could not supply coal at the time it was wanted.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is true with regard to two of the largest coal companies. The trouble is that the Government did not pursue their inquiries among a large number of other companies which could have supplied the coal. As a matter of fact, in the month of January when they purchased that coal, they proceeded to stop the delivery of coal by the larger companies in the province. To say that, all of a sudden, the Intercolonial railway should demand 1,500 tons of coal, to the exclusion of other purchasers, is not fair, when all they had to do was to wait their turn and they could get the coal and haul it over their own railway. I want all the information brought down at once, because I intend to discuss the subject very fully later on.

Mr. KYTE: Apparently the department, according to the detailed statement in the Estimates, is going to employ five additional solicitors, at salaries ranging from $4,000 down.

Mr. REID: There is only one department solicitor.

Mr. KYTE: If that is so the item is very badly worded, because any person reading it would take it to mean that there were to be five departmental solicitors appointed. Who is the departmental solicitor for whom a salary of $4,000 is provided?

Mr. REID: No one has been selected for that position up to the present time.

Mr. KYTE: What is Mr. Aylward's position in the department?

Mr. REID: He was departmental solicitor, but he is down at Moncton now, and not in the department. This is to fill the position formerly occupied by him.

Mr. KYTE: Then there would appear to be a number of right-of-way agents, with salaries ranging from $3,600 down. Are all these officials to be added to the staff of the department here?

Mr. REID: No; that represents the number of officials in that subdivision. There

were fourteen in the subdivision last year and this year there is one less. The right of way and lease agent is Mr. R. H. Fraser. The other officials are men who have been there for years, and have been advanced to these positions.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has Mr. Fraser been appointed recently?

Mr. REID: He was appointed some time ago.

Mr. MACDONALD: Where is he from?

Mr. REID: He is from Nova Scotia, I think.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does he come from my county?

Mr. REID: I think so.

Mr. KYTE: Does the hon. minister know the position that Mr. C. Campbell holds at the present time?

Mr. REID: I can give the names of the fourteen officials. The position of departmental solicitor is vacant. L. K. Jones, Assistant Deputy Minister; E. V. Johnson, inspecting engineer; John Murphy, electrical engineer; J. L. Payne, comptroller of statistics; R. H. Fraser, right of way and lease agent; G. A. Bell, financial comptroller; L. Sherwood, principal assistant and designing engineer; W. C. Little, accountant and superintendent of stationery; F. A. Dixon, chief of correspondence; G. A. Mothersill, auditing engineer; W. V. Cope, departmental auditor. There is one position vacant, that of assistant engineer. Last year we had another assistant engineer, but that position has been dropped this year. Mr. C. Campbell would not be on the list, as this is only for employees in the building.

Mr. MACDONALD: You have made five additions to the third division, subdivision A. What are they for?

Mr. REID: Those positions have not been filled. They are clerkships at $900 each.

Mr. MACDONALD: Under the Civil Service Act?

Mr. REID: Yes, they will be appointed by the commission.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will they be employed in the department here?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the minister tell us anything about extending the Civil Service rules to that branch of the Department of Railways and Canals at Moncton?

Mr. REID: I cannot give the hon. gentleman any information about that. I went into these Estimates with the officials, in order to understand them thoroughly so far as the inside service at Ottawa is concerned, and nothing further.

Mr. MACDONALD: A statement has been made in the press in the province of Nova Scotia that the department contemplate the construction of a diversion of the railway in the eastern part of the province, and that there is to be a new part of the railway constructed along the north shore of Nova Scotia east of New Glasgow. I would like the minister to bring down what correspondence there has been with Mr. R. P. Fraser of Pictou with regard to that diversion of the line.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

Wednesday, February 4, 1914.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Bill No. 46, respecting The Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 47, respecting The Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Fisher.

Bill No. 48, to incorporate The Peace River Tramway and Navigation Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 49, respecting The Saskatchewan Central Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

WEST INDIA STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. What sum is to be paid per annum by the Government of Canada to the Royal Mail Steamship Company of Canada for the Canada West India steamship service?
2. For what period does the contract run?
3. How many steamers are to be engaged in the service, and what is their tonnage, speed, passenger accommodation, and trips per month?

Mr. FOSTER:

1. £70,000 sterling ($340,666.66).
2. On or about November 1, 1913, to October 31, 1918.

3. Four.

Name.	Tonnage.		Average speed—Knots.	Passenger Accommodation.		
	Gross.	Net.		First Class.	Second Class.	Third Class.
Chignecto..	4,744	2,999	11	41	60	90
Chaleur....	4,746	2,994	11	41	60	90
Cobequid..	4,790	2,969	11	41	60	98
Caraquet...	4,889	2,975	11	40	72	80

The Cobequid was wrecked off the Nova Scotia coast on January 13, 1914.

A sailing is to be made from Halifax every 14 days.

WEST INDIA TRADE COMMISSIONER.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Was Mr. Watson Griffith appointed a special travelling trade commissioner for the Government of Canada in the British West Indies?

2. If so, what are his duties, when did they commence, and what salary does he receive?

3. What was Mr. Watson Griffith's occupation and where did he reside prior to his appointment as such trade commissioner?

Mr. FOSTER:

1. Mr. Griffin was appointed a special trade commissioner. He has been sent on a trade mission to the West Indies.

2. His duties are to interest the people of the West Indies in Canada and Canadian products and report regularly to the department, and to assist in securing greater publicity for such information in Canada. His duties commenced on December 17, 1913; salary, $4,000 per annum.

FENIAN RAID BOUNTIES.

*Mr. SINCLAIR:

How many Fenian raid veterans have been paid the $100 bounty to date?

Mr. PERLEY: 16,470.

Mr. BOIVIN:

How many Fenian raid veterans have received the Government grant of $100 provided for by law?

Mr. PERLEY: 16,470.

*Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Does the Government intend to introduce any legislation extending the time for payment of bounty under the provisions of chapter 53, 2 George V., entitled an Act to authorize a bounty to Volunteers who served the Crown during the Fenian raids?

2. Does the Government intend to introduce any legislation providing for the payment of bounty under said Act to the widows of volunteers who, if alive, would be entitled to said bounty?

[Mr. G. E. Foster.]

Hon. SAM. HUGHES (Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. Yes.

2. The bounty is payable to widows of veterans who were alive on the date of the passing of the Act, viz., April 1, 1912.

*Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. What are the conditions under which bounties are being paid to men who drilled or volunteered to repel the Fenian raid invasion of 1866?

2. If no person in the province of Prince Edward Island has received a bounty, what is the reason for the apparent discrimination?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES:

1. Proof of a corps having been called out for active service, and of a volunteer having performed service with a corps so called out during the period of a raid.

2. There is no record or proof in the department of any corps belonging to Prince Edward Island having been called out on active service for suppression of a Fenian raid.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. What was the total number of men, women and children in Canada at the time of the Fenian raid?

2. What was the total number, by provinces, at that time, capable of bearing arms?

3. What was the total number of men then enlisted for military service in each province?

4. How many applications have been made to the Department of Militia and Defence for bounty under the Fenian Raid Bounty Act, in each province?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES:

1. To be answered by Department of Trade and Commerce.

2. To be answered by Department of Trade and Commerce.

3.

	Fenian Raid 1866.
Upper Canada	12,199
Lower Canada	7,398
Nova Scotia	59,379
New Brunswick	44,055
Total	123,031

	Fenian Raid 1870.
Ontario	20,956
Quebec	15,066
Nova Scotia	4,192
New Brunswick	3,327
Total	43,541

4. Impossible to give this information at present, as applications for the bounty have not been entered by provinces.

Mr. BORDEN: Questions 1 and 2 will stand for further answer.

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY STAFF.

*Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Have any appointments been made to the official staff of the Dorchester penitentiary since January 1, 1913? If so, what are their names, to what positions respectively, and at what salaries?

2. Have any new positions or offices been created since January 1, 1913? If so, who were the persons appointed to such positions or offices, and at what salaries respectively?

3. Who recommended the creation of said new positions or offices, and what is the additional increase to the salary list of said penitentiary by reason of the creation of the new positions or offices?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. N. A. Macpherson, industrial guard, at $1,000, vice W. R. Burns, resigned.

2. (a) In pursuance of the uniform schedule of last session the duties of the steward have been extended to the oversight of the clothing department in addition to the victualling department—without increase in salary. (b) Guard Gillespie, guard in charge of the kitchen, has been promoted from the rank of guard at $800 to that of assistant steward at $900. (c) Guard Elsdon who has been for a number of years in charge of the clothing department, has been promoted from the rank of guard at $800 to that of assistant steward at $900. (d) Guard McCaull, who has been in charge of the engineer's shop, has been promoted from the rank of guard at $800 to that of assistant engineer at $1,000.

3. As regards a, b and c, the inspector of penitentiaries; as regards d the warden and the inspector. The aggregate increase in the salary list is $400 per annum.

MAISONNEUVE POSTAL STATION.

*Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the erection of a postal station in the city of Maisonneuve?

2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to utilize the plans made and approved by the department, prepared by Mr. C. A. Reeves, architect?

3. Is Mr. Reeves still in the employ of the Department of Public Works in respect of this postal station? If not, why not?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to change architects in that respect?

5. If so, on whose recommendation has the change been made or will it be made?

6. What will be the cost of such a station and when will operation be started?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Plans are now being prepared by Mr. M. Dufresne, architect, of Montreal.

2. 3 and 4. No. Plans were prepared by Mr. Reeves for site decided upon, but these plans were not acceptable.

5. Change of architects was made by direction of the minister.

6. Plans are not completed, and, in view of this, information cannot be given as to cost of building.

FRASERVILLE HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. What reasons have prevented the works at the harbour of Fraserville from being started during the summer of 1913?

2. Is it the intention of the Minister of Public Works to begin in the near future the execution of these works, which it was expected would start immediately after the session, according to promises said to have been made to that effect?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Question of design and type of the proposed works had not been agreed upon by the Department of Public Works and Department of Railways and Canals, but plan and specification are now practically ready.

2. Minister cannot give definite answer until he has had an opportunity to examine plans and specifications.

QUEENSTON HEIGHTS PICNIC.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Did the Minister of Militia and Defence accompany Sir Ian Hamilton to the political picnic of the Ward Four Conservative Association at Queenston Heights in July last?

2. Did the Minister, so accompanied by Sir Ian Hamilton, wear a badge inscribed 'Borden and Our Empire'?

3. Were the Minister and Sir Ian Hamilton photographed with the officers of the Ward Four Conservative Association at such political picnic?

Mr. HUGHES:

1. General Sir Ian Hamilton was the guest of the Minister of Militia one day last July at Queenstown Heights inspecting it from a military view point. There were a great many picnics going on.

2. The minister did wear a very beautiful badge showing a stalwart young Canadian standing on Canadian soil, grasping across the Atlantic the hand of John Bull, standing on British soil. The minister does not remember whether or not the very beautiful inscription 'Borden and our Empire' was on the badge.

3. The minister and Sir Ian were photographed some score of times that day, with a lot of very fine people. Doubtless many of them, apparently very intelligent, belonged to the Conservative Association.

HOUSE OF COMMONS STAFF.

*Mr. KYTE:

1. Following the investigation into the duties of the staff of the House of Commons in 1912, did Dr. Shortt, of the Civil Service Commission, make a report to His Honour the Speaker, or to the Internal Economy Commission? If so, what was the nature of such report?

2. Does Mr. Speaker intend to lay on the table the report in question?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. Yes.

2. A copy of the report was laid upon the table of the House for the information of members.

RIGAUD POST OFFICE.

*Mr. BOYER:

1. To whom has the Government awarded the contract or the supervising of the construction of the concrete sidewalk in front of the Rigaud post office?

2. What are the names of the parties who received money from the Government in view of that work, and how much did each of them get?

3. Who supplied the material and the amount and nature of their bills?

4. If that work has been given by contract, who has been the contractor and what was the amount of his transaction?

5. Were there other tenders? If so, by whom have they been sent in?

Mr. ROGERS:

1, 2, 3, and 4. Awarded by agreement to E. Monpetit, Rigaud, Quebec, for the sum of $276.50. Work done under the supervision of Clerk of Works G. S. Gingras, Montreal.

5. No other tenders.

*Mr. BOYER:

1. Has the work of draining, levelling and fencing done during the year 1913 on the Government ground where the post office at Rigaud has been erected, been done by the day or by contract?

2. In the first case, what is the name of the supervising officer and the amount he has received, and what is the name of the other employees and the salary paid to each of them?

3. In the second case, (a) what is the name of the contractor, what was the amount of his tender; and were other tenders received? If so, (b) what are the names of such tenderers?

4. What amount has been paid to date, for the abovementioned works?

Mr. ROGERS:

1 and 2. Awarded by agreement to E. Monpetit, Rigaud, Quebec. Draining and levelling, $182.50; fencing, $134; total, $316.50. All done under supervision of Clerk of Works, G. S. Gingras, Montreal.

3. (a) E. Monpetit, $316.50; (b) No other tenders received.

4. $316.50.

[Mr. S. Hughes.]

*Mr. BOYER:

1. How many tons of coal has the Government bought for the use of the Post Office of Rigaud during last season?

2. What is the name of the purveyor?

3. Have tenders been advertised for that object?

4. If so, what are the names of the tenderers and the price by the ton, of each tender?

5. What was the quantity to be supplied by the party to whom the contract was awarded?

6. What quantity has he supplied?

7. If the contractor has not supplied the quantity for which the contract was given to him, what are the reasons for so doing?

8. What is the cubic capacity of the coal-bunker of that post office.

9. Who was the purveyor in 1912?

10. How many tons has he sold to the Government and at what price?

11. Who were the tenderers in that year and what was the amount of each tender?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. About 21¼ tons.

2. Basile Decoste.

3. Yes.

4. One tender, Basil Decoste, at $7.75 a ton.

5. 35 tons egg coal.

6. Account for 21 tons 535 lbs. amounting to $164.83, passed on the 16th September, 1913.

7. Coal bunker would only hold about 22 tons, and when same was filled caretaker wrote to say that he thought that quantity would be sufficient for the season.

8. 780 cubic feet.

9. Chevrier Frères.

10. About 36½ tons at $8 a ton.

11. Only one tender, as above.

RIGAUD WHARF.

*Mr. BOYER:

1. What amount has the Government paid for the repairing of the wharf at Rigaud during the season of 1913?

2. Of what kind were these works?

3. Who was the contractor or superintendent?

4. What amount was paid to either of them?

5. Who are the other parties who have received a salary and how much?

6. Who supplied the material and what was the amount and nature of each bill?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. $233.40.

2. Minor repairs to wharf.

3. Work done by day labour. Supervising engineer, A. E. Dubuc, assistant district engineer, Montreal. Foreman, L. J. O. Chevrier.

4. Foreman Chevrier paid at the rate of $3 per diem, 20 days at $3, $60.

5. Joseph Vallée, carpenter, 22 days at $2, $44; Felix Billard, labourer, 12 days at $1.75, $21; total, $125.

6. Adolphus Cousineau, lumber, $6; Jos. Vallée, lumber, $94.40; I. L. Lafleur, hardware, $8; toal, $108.40.

GRAHAM WHARF.

*Mr. BOYER:

1. What amount has the Government spent for the wharf at Graham in 1913, who has been the superintendent of such work and what daily salary did he get in whole?
2. What are the names of the other employees and the amount of total daily salary drawn by each of them?
3. What are the names of any purveyors and the amount of their bills?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. (a) $1,615.67; (b) Foreman, Nap. E. N. Séguin, paid at the rate of $3.50 per day.

2. From 12th August to 6th November, 1913: Nap. E. N. Séguin, foreman, 72 days at $3.50 per day, $252; Leon Gauthier, carpenter, 45 days at $2.50, $113.75; Nap. Vallée, labourer, 12 days at $2, $24; Elie Lavigne, carter, 17½ days at $4, $70; Peter Berry, carpenter, 40½ days at $2.50, $101.25; Didasse Lavigne, labourer, 2 days at $2, $4; Alf. Séguin, labourer, 15¾ days at $2, $31.50; Ant. Bertrand, labourer, 10¾ days at $2, $21.50; Bernard Séguin, labourer, 22 days at $2, $44. Total, $662.

3. Chevrier & Frères, cable, $6.48; J. A. Bertrand, hardware, $20.24; Hon. Gauthier, cartage, etc., $98; Wm. Graham, hardware and disbursements, $7.84; Nap. Séguin, lumber, etc., $5.75; Capt. Gédéon Vallée, freight charges and disbursements, $46.56; Caverhill, Learmont & Co., rope, $21.13; Durand Hardware Co., hardware, $3.10; Trefflé Pilon, rent of winch, $5; Philippe Lefebvre, lumber, $31; W. A. Wood, rent of pile driver, $40; Alphonse Dumoulin, smithwork, $16.45; Ant. Bertrand, sundries, $1.90; Lachine sand and gravel, towing pile driver, $5; Johnny Gamelin, pilotage, $5; William Hodgson, lumber, $632.54; Montreal Hardware Co., $7.68. Total, $953.67. Grand total, $1,615.67.

DREDGING AT DORION.

*Mr. SEGUIN:

1. At whose request was a dredge sent to Dorion during the season of 1913?
2. What number of cubic yards of material have been taken away?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to have those works completed next year?
4. Have the owners of the ground facing the spot where the work has taken place, been called on to pay any money?
5. What is the name of the dredge?
6. Is it the property of the Government or of a company?
7. If it belongs to the Government, what is the daily expense of running same?
8. How many days did it remain at Dorion?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. A. E. Labelle, S. S. McKay.
2. 8,742 cublic yards.
3. The work has been completed.
4. Yes.
5. P. W. D. No. 103.
6. Property of Department of Public Works.
7. $64.17.
8. 40 days.

HARBOURS IN WESTMORLAND.

*Mr. EMMERSON:

1. (a) Is the Department of Public Works having a survey of Port Elgin harbour in Westmorland county, N.B., made? (b) If so, how many men and who are engaged in the survey?
2. Is the department aware that a complete survey was made of this harbour a few years ago?
3. (a) What is the estimated cost of the present survey, and (b) is it proposed to have the dredging, which was commenced in connection with this harbour, proceeded with during the coming season of navigation?
4. (a) Is the Department of Public Works having a survey made at Little Cape, in Westmorland county, N.B., with a view of securing a site for a wharf at that point? (b) If so, what is the estimated cost of such survey?
5. Is the wharf proposed to be built at the west side of the river to suit the people of Little Cape, Portage and Great Shemogue or is a survey being made also on the eastern side of the Great Shemogue harbour inlet or river to suit the requirements of fish hatchery, and of the Shemogue Oyster Company comprised of Messers. M. G. Siddal, W. F. Humphrey, M.P.P., P. G. Mahoney, M.P.P., Richard O'Leary, and others, who require a wharf for the proposed oyster business at Little Cape or Great Shemogue harbour?
6. Is there any correspondence in the department or any of the departments of the Government or in the hands of any of the members of the Government relating to this subject?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. (a) Yes. (b) Assistant Engineer Martin and General Inspector Loggie are engaged on this survey, with five local men.
2. Yes.
3. (a) $100 in addition to staff expenses. (b) Matter will be considered when engineer's report is received.
4. (a) Yes. (b) The estimated cost of survey is $75.
5. The survey is completed, but the reports are not yet to hand, and the question of site will not be considered until this data is to hand.
6. Correspondence received was forwarded to the district engineer when the survey was ordered, and has not yet been returned.

IMPORTATION OF SLAG.

Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Was there an Order in Council passed recently by the Government of Canada affecting in any manner the importation of slag used by the farmers in Canada for fertilizing purposes? If so, on what date, and in what way was the importation of slag affected?

2. Was this done at the solicitation of any persons, firms or corporations? If so, whom?

3. Was there any duty imposed on slag used for agricultural purposes imported into Canada? If so, what was the rate of said duty previous to the passage of the said Order in Council, if any?

Mr. REID:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. No, duty has not been changed on blast furnace slag, as mentioned in item 372, Customs Tariff, 1907. On 9th November, 1913, the Board of Customs ruled ground basic slag dutiable as fertilizer under item 663 of Customs Tariff, 1907, at 5 per cent preferential; 10 per cent general.

Mr. EMMERSON: I wish to direct the attention of the minister to his answer to the third part of this question, and to ask him to lay on the table of the House a copy of the ruling therein referred to, together with the papers connected therewith.

Mr. REID: I shall be very glad to get the information for my hon. friend.

MARRIAGE QUESTION ARGUMENT.

Mr. PROULX:

1. What was the total amount paid by the Government for fees and disbursements to the counsel retained by them or by the Minister of Justice to argue before the Supreme Court of Canada and the Judicial Committee of His Majesty's Privy Council, the marriage question and the Bill relating to it, introduced in this House during the session 1911-12 by the member for Lincoln, and referred by the Government to the said Supreme Court and the said Judicial Committee?

2. Is the said counsel paid in full? If not, what amount is still owing to them?

3. What was the amount charged to the Dominion Treasury by the Minister of Justice and paid to him for travelling and other expenses in connection with the reference of the said marriage question and of the said Bill to the said Judicial Committee of His Majesty's Privy Council?

4. (*a*) Did the Minister of Justice take part in the argument before the said Judicial Committee? (*b*) If not, why not?

5. What was the amount paid by the Government to their agents or solicitors in London, England, for fees and disbursements in connection with the said reference to the said Judicial Committee?

6. Are they paid in full? If not, what is the amount still owing to them?

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. $21,926.70.

2. Paid in full as taxed by department.

3. The Minister of Justice went to England in connection with the marriage case and other public business. Of his expenses $1,000 was charged to the marriage case.

4. (a) No. The Minister of Justice submitted the questions—obtained leave to appeal and an order that the case be heard in the July term of 1912. (b) Because the Government had undertaken to have the questions submitted to the highest tribunal in the empire and to provide, as it did, independent counsel to represent the opposing views upon the questions submitted.

5. $1,195.62.

6. Paid in full.

THE MINISTER OF MILITIA IN EUROPE.

Mr. PROULX:

1. How many officers of the Canadian militia accompanied the Minister of Militia on his European trip in the summer of 1913?

2. How many stenographers accompanied the party?

3. How many servants were in the party?

4. How many officers' wives and daughters, or other persons, accompanied the party?

5. Were the expenses of said wives and daughters paid by the Department of Militia and Defence, or any portion thereof?

6. What was the total cost to the country for the expenses of the whole party?

7. What amount was paid to the officers, stenographers and servants as pay or allowance?

8. What European countries were visited during the trip?

Mr. HUGHES:

1. 21 officers, including 4 sent over for courses of instruction or on other special duty, and who joined the party in London.

2. One private secretary and one assistant private secretary.

3. Two orderlies.

4. None officially.

5. No, not one cent. The expenses of the ladies who accompanied the party were borne by their own husbands and fathers.

6. $24,262, including the four special officers referred to in No. 1.

7. To the officers—$3,984, for pay of rank. For subsistence and other allowances, $10 a day. To all others, actual expenses for subsistence only, and no pay other than their permanent pay.

8. All the officers visited the manoeuvres of the French army along the frontier between France and Germany. They also visited the Swiss manoeuvres under the direction of General Sir Ian Hamilton and

General Ellison, for three days. They also visited the British divisional manoeuvres in one week, and the British army manoeuvres the following week. The minister personally also visited the German divisional manoeuvres, and the Belgian and Dutch military centres. A full report is being prepared, under the direction of Colonel Cruikshank, and, when published, will be placed in the hands of all the members.

LITTLE SANDS BREAKWATER.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. Have tenders been invited for the breakwater at Little Sands, P.E.I.? If so, how many were received, and from whom, and what was the amount of each tender?

2. Has a contract been entered into with any of the tenderers, or with anybody else? If so, when will the work be commenced, and when is it expected to be completed?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, tenders have been invited and received, but it is inadvisable to give the information until the contract has been signed.

WRIGHT COUNTY POST OFFICES.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. How many post offices have been opened, if any, in the county of Wright, Quebec, since September, 1911?

2. If any, where are said post offices located?

3. What are the names of the postmasters of same?

4. In what parts of the county of Wright have rural mail routes been established?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1, 2 and 3. The following post offices have been opened: At Nesbitt Corners, lot 28, concession 4, township of Masham; postmaster, John Nesbitt. At Lambert Corners, lot 16, concession B, township of Northfield; postmaster Robert Lambert. At Brennan Hills, lot 48, concession 6, township of Low; postmaster, Louis Monette.

4. From Wakefield to Duclos, via Ste. Cecile de Masham and Masham Mills. Established in 1909.

UNDISCUSSED AND UNOPPOSED MOTIONS.

Mr. Lemieux.—For a copy of all correspondence and papers generally concerning the proposed changes of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. Carroll.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams and correspondance of all kinds relating in any way to the applications for Fenian Raid Bounty in South Cape Breton, or relating to or touching in any way, the claims of such applications.

Mr. Carroll.—For a return showing the names and post office addresses of all persons in South Cape Breton, N.S., who made application for Fenian Raid Bounty, of all persons who made two or more applications, of all persons who have been paid the said Bounty, and of all persons whose claims have been disallowed, with the reasons therefor.

Mr. Emmerson.—For a return showing the names and post office addresses of all persons from the county of Westmorland, N.B., who have applied to the department of Militia and Defence for a bounty under the Fenian Raid Volunteer Bounty Act, indicating the date on which each application was received, the names and addresses of the parties to whom such bounty has been paid; also the names and addresses of the parties to whom the bounty has not been paid, with the reason, if any, for nonpayment thereof.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—Return showing the total amount of available cash on deposit to the credit of the Government of Canada on the last day of each month between 1st April, 1913, and December 31, 1913.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—Return showing the following particulars respectively, of all loans placed or extended by the Government of Canada, upon the London market during the calendar years 1912 and 1913: loan; date and copy of prospectus; price in prospectus and price realized; date on which loan matures; rate per cent; total issue; amount realized; charges including discount for immediate payments, &c.; net amount of cash realized; and the annual effective rate of interest per unit.

Mr. Sinclair.—Return showing the names and post office address of all parties from the county of Guysborough, N.S., who have applied to the Department of Militia and Defence for a bounty under the Fenian Raid Volunteer Act, indicating the date on which each application was received, the names of the parties to whom such bounty has been paid, date of payments, and also the names of those parties to whom the bounty has not been paid, with the reason, if any, for non-payment thereof.

Mr. J. J. Hughes.—Return showing the quantities and values of potatoes imported monthly into Canada during the years 1911, 1912 and 1913, and the counties from which such potatoes were imported.

Mr. Kyte.—For a copy of all correspondence relative to the dismissal of Alex. W. Finlayson, keeper of light on St. Esprit Island, Richmond county, N.S., and to his resignation and the appointment of a successor.

Mr. Boyer.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, &c., exchanged between the Department of Militia and Messrs. A. Macdonald, E. Montpetit and others in connection with the organization of the 33rd Hussars, at Vaudreuil and Soulanges.

Mr. Boyer.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents, exchanged between the Department of Militia and Messrs. Archibald Macdonald, Elzear Montpetit, J. H. Chevrier and others, relating to the repairs made or to be made to the armoury at Rigaud, from 1911 to date.

FENIAN RAID BOUNTIES.

Mr. KYTE moved:

For a return showing the names and post office addresses of all persons in the county of Richmond, N.S., who made application for Fenian raid bounty, of all persons who were paid said bounty up to the 15th day of January, 1914, and of all persons whose claims have

been disallowed, with the reasons for such disallowance.

Hon. SAM HUGHES (Minister of Militia and Defence): I have no objection to this and similar motions passing; but for the benefit of hon. gentlemen who are making such motions I may explain that although certain lists are available in some of the counties of Nova Scotia, it will undoubtedly take a great deal of time to obtain the necessary information as to allowances and disallowances, and if there is a little delay I hope that my hon. friends will not feel grieved.

Motion agreed to.

PAYMENTS TO NOVA SCOTIA PUBLISHERS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN moved:

For a return showing the names of all printing and publishing companies, and newspapers in Nova Scotia to whom any sum of money has been paid paid during the calendar years 1912 and 1913 respectively, and the nature of the service rendered therefor.

He said: In my absence the other day, some objection was made to the form of this motion, as evidently some words were omitted. I beg leave to move it with the following amendment: that after the word 'paid' in the third line the following words be inserted, 'by any department of the Government of Canada.'

Motion as amended agreed to.

FENIAN RAID BOUNTY.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, papers and documents between the Department of Militia and Defence, or any of its officers, and the Halifax County Conservative Association, or any of its officers, or any individual in Halifax county, advising them or him of the sufficiency in form or otherwise of the application of any resident of Halifax county for the Fenian raid bounty.

He said: This motion perhaps asks for a little too much, and if the minister thinks he cannot comply with it, as it stands, I would have no objection to leaving out the words in the fourth line 'or any individual in Halifax county.' I understand it would possibly be hard to comply with that part of the motion.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES: I might say in regard to that, that there is no answer to the motion, but it might as well pass.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think that is a mistake; I think there is an answer.

[Mr. Kyte.]

Mr. SAM. HUGHES: Very well, then; no, nothing.

Motion agreed to.

CASE OF GUSTAVUS A. COLPITTS.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON moved:

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, reports, inquiries, and documents or other communications had with any of the departments of the Government, particularly with the Interior, Customs and Marine and Fisheries Departments, relating to Gustavus A. Colpitts, a Canadian citizen returning as a passenger on the Royal mail steamship Empress of Britain, in September, 1911, who alleged that he was not allowed by officers of the Government to disembark at Rimouski from said steamship. Also a copy of all letters, correspondence or other communications received by any members of the Government, particularly by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and by any department of the Government, from the said Gustavus A. Colpitts, who was at the time a student at Mount Allison University, Sackville, New Brunswick, and of all letters or other communications sent in reply thereto.

He said: The reading of this motion gives one an idea of my object in making it. I may state that my principal object in bringing this matter to the notice of the House, is to have determined, if possible, or at least understood, the status of a Canadian citizen who has travelled abroad and who is obliged to return to Canada as a steerage passenger in one of our steamers. Mr. Colpitts is a young man who was a student at Mount Allison University at Sackville, N.B. With a view to broadening his mind and getting further education in a greater university, he went to Great Britain and to other portions of Europe. Not being possessed of a large amount of this world's goods, in returning home, he travelled by the cheapest possible method, namely, by steerage. He came back to Canada on the steamship Empress of Britain in September, 1911. When the steamer reached Rimouski, on her way up the St. Lawrence, it was his desire to land at that point, instead of going on to Quebec. It would save him expense and it was nearer his home; he could take the Intercolonial railway at Rimouski at much less expense than if he were compelled to take it at Quebec. He was prevented from landing by an officer of the customs. The Canadian immigration and other officials, and indeed the officials of the steamer, were quite willing that he should be permitted to land with the other passengers at Rimouski. The first and second class passengers and the mail were landed in large measure at that point, but, forsooth, a Canadian citizen, because he came home

by steerage, was prevented from landing.

Mr. Colpitts has, I think, since completed his studies at the University of Mount Allison, and has removed to Macdonald, in the province of Manitoba. With that persistency that characterizes some New Brunswickers, Mr. Colpitts, desirous of having it determined as to just how far a Canadian citizen has rights in returning to his home beyond those of the ordinary immigrant coming into the country, who is limited and restricted and regulated by the regulations of the Immigration Department or the Customs Department of the Government, brought this matter to the attention of the Government and also communicated with me in regard to it. The matter was not brought before the House last session, although Mr. Colpitts had written me on several occasions. I found that it was too late to bring it conveniently to the notice of the House.

Recently I had a communication from Mr. Colpitts asking me to bring the matter to the notice of the House and of the Government in order that certain questions which he had propounded to the several departments might be answered or at least considered by the Government with the view of having a change, if thought necessary and desirable, in the regulations that in any way restrict a Canadian citizen in his rights, even though he travels steerage. Mr. Colpitts, after he had reached his home, in October, 1911, wrote to several departments of the Government, or to the officials thereof, asking certain questions, thinking to learn why it was that he was thus prevented, questioning the right of the customs officials to prevent him and if there was such a right on the part of these officers to prohibit his landing, he desired to know under what regulations and principles he was prevented from enjoying his rights or the rights which he would have enjoyed had he travelled either first or second class. On the 3rd October, 1911, he wrote to the secretary of the Department of Immigration, asking some very pertinent questions, among them the following:

> Are there any circumstances under which a Canadian custom official may refuse a Canadian citizen permission to enter Canada?
>
> If so, what are the conditions, and what spirit prompts such regulations?
>
> Is a Canadian citizen returning to Canada subject to the same inspection re vaccination, occupation and religion as an immigrant?
>
> Must a child born in Canada, but returning to Canada, be vaccinated before being allowed to enter Canada?
>
> Must a young child less than a month old be vaccinated before entering Canada?

To this, his first inquiry, he received a very courteous reply from Mr. W. D. Scott, the superintendent of immigration, acknowledging the receipt of his communication, and asking Mr. Colpitts to give him full particulars of a specific case in which any of the difficulties referred to in his letter had been experienced. If this was furnished he would have the matter inquired into and advise him as to the result. Mr. Scott very kindly sent to him a copy of the Immigration Act which outlines clearly the procedure followed by officers of the department in their inspection of immigrants entering Canada. Further on, on the 17th October, Mr. Scott wrote to Mr. Colpitts, as follows:

> In answer to your first question I may say that customs officials have to do only with the baggage and personal belongings of passengers. A customs official might, under Canadian law, prevent a passenger leaving a boat or train and taking his baggage until his baggage was examined, but it is unlikely that any custom officer would prevent such a passenger leaving a ship or train under ordinary circumstances.
>
> Replying to your second question I would say that a Canadian citizen is not subject to the same regulations as immigrants, but you can readily understand that it would be impossible for a Government officer or any other person to detect whether a passenger were a Canadian without some form of examination.

Mr. Colpitts had a further letter from Mr. Scott, dated 23rd January, 1912, which reads:

> I beg to acknowledge the receipt in due course of your letter of the 17th instant, and to say in reply that there is no regulation that third-class passengers arriving by ocean steamers via St. Lawrence route must land only at Quebec, but the immigration regulations require that no passengers shall be landed anywhere from an ocean ship without the permission of an immigration officer.

Mr. Colpitts had also written to the Director General of Public Health on the 9th of January, and he wished to know whether there was a quarantine regulation that third-class passengers arriving by ocean steamer shall land only at Quebec, and if so whether the regulation applied to Canadian citizens as well as immigrants. Mr. Colpitts stated in this letter:

> I refer of course to the summer season and to passengers on steamers that land mails at Rimouski. If such be the regulation I shall be glad to know the spirit that prompts such legislation.

The Director General of Public Health sent to Mr. Colpitts a copy of the quarantine regulations of the Dominion, and on the 15th of January, 1912, he further wrote to Mr. Colpitts:

I am in receipt of your letter dated 9th instant, asking me about regulations as to the landing of third-class passengers arriving by ocean steamers at Quebec only. In reply I have to say that this is not a quarantine regulation, but one issued—whether correctly cited by you or not I do not know—but I would refer you to the immigration branch of the Interior Department for full information on the subject. Jurisdiction of the quarantine of this department ceases when the immigrants have been released from quarantine or when the vessel has passed quarantine inspection with a clean bill of health. They then pass under the jurisdiction of the immigration branch of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Colpitts wrote to the Minister of Customs asking for a copy of the Act relating to the duties of Canadian customs officials in respect of passengers arriving by ocean steamer, and on the 14th of November he wrote to the Commissioner of Customs at Ottawa from his university residence at Sackville:

3 p.m.

I was a third-class passenger on the Empress of Britain which arrived at Rimouski on the 28th of September last. Before reaching Rimouski, I had made arrangements, so far as the officers of the boat were concerned, to land there. Upon reaching Rimouski I sought permission from the immigration officer to land there and said official was in the act of signing my landing papers when the customs official who was then in the purser's office, informed the purser that I would not be allowed to land there. I turned to another customs official, not then in the purser's office, and asked why, from the standpoint of the customs, I would not be allowed to land there. He at first said I could, but on learning that I was travelling third-class he said it was impossible for me to land there. I have been quite unable to find any legitimate reason why I was not allowed to land at Rimouski. My destination was Sackville, N.B. I was a Canadian citizen, a native of New Brunswick, and my object in wishing to land there was to save time and expense. The result was I was delayed thirty-six hours in reaching home and was at the expense of a day's board and the difference in fare on account of booking at Lévis instead of at Rimouski. Now, the customs official was either right or wrong. If right, I ask for a copy of the Act or a statement of the ruling under which he acted; if wrong, I wish to know.

Later in the same month, the 22nd of November, he wrote the Commissioner of Customs:

I have to-day received your letter of the 20th instant, and I beg leave to thank you for your prompt reply to my last letter. I have to say, however, that your letter does not make the matter about which I have been corresponding, clear. First, you state that the reason the landing of passengers at Rimouski was objected to was because the steamer did not make entry at the customs house at Rimouski. The fact remains that passengers did land there and further that I was not allowed to land there. Before lodging any complaint I made careful study of the Immigration Act and of the quarantine regulations and I failed to find there anything justifying the customs officer in detaining me when the immigration officer was willing to allow me to land.

I have no disposition to continue a correspondence to make it tedious, but probably another letter will give me the desired information.

Section 6, page 5, to which you refer me, does not, so far as I can see, refer to the case in question, since the quarantine officer must have given his permission or no passengers would have landed at Rimouski. I would call your attention to section 25, page 9, which would apply to the Empress of Britain, since she carried mail, and to subsection (b) under which I claim that I should have been allowed to land.

In conclusion I will say that I wish to know why a Canadian citizen in perfect health, willing to establish the fact of his citizenship, should be detained on board a vessel by a customs official, the immigration officer having given his permission to said citizen to land, with the result that he is carried away from his home, delayed thirty-six hours in reaching his home, and subjected to considerable expense.

On December 20, Mr. Colpitts again wrote the Commissioner of Customs as follows:

Your explanation of the fact that I was prevented from landing is no doubt correct. But I wish to say that a Canada customs official was the man directly responsible for preventing my landing, that is to say, the customs official was the man who prevented my name being placed on the partial clearance to which you refer in the last paragraph, and I have been asking his authority and have as yet failed to get a reply. Either the Customs Department will have to shoulder this and explain, or else shift the responsibility to some other department, As a Canadian citizen, I request an explanation. To an ordinary citizen like myself it is not apparent why a direct answer to such a question as I have been asking cannot be given by your department.

Mr. Colpitts further informed the Commissioner of Customs on the 9th of January that, before making any complaint, he had made a careful survey of the quarantine regulations and had found there no such rule as referred to in the letter of the Commissioner of Customs of the 26th of December, 1911. He also stated that, acting upon the suggestion of the Commissioner of Customs, he would write the Director General of Public Health.

On the 1st of February, 1912, Mr. Colpitts again wrote the Commissioner of Customs as follows:

Yours of the 26th December, 1911, came duly to hand. In my acknowledmgent of it on January 9, 1912, I stated that I would follow your suggestion and write the Director General of Public Health. This I did, in reference especially to your statement that 'the quarantine rules require that third class passengers shall

be landed at Quebec' and 'the quarantine rules forbid the landing of third class passengers at Rimouski.'

The reply from the Director General of Public Health was to the effect that such is 'not a quarantine regulation' 'but one issued by the immigration branch of the Interior Department', and I was referred to your department for further information.

I then wrote the Commissioner of Immigration regarding the same matter. The reply from him states that 'there is no regulation that third class passengers arriving by ocean steamer via the St. Lawrence route must land only at Quebec.'

The discrepancy between your statement in yours of December 26 and these of these other two officials will be apparent. And the statement of these officials agrees with the opinion which I formed from a careful examination of the Immigration and Quarantine Acts made before entering any complaint, as I have already stated in my letter to you of November 22.

I beg leave also to call your attention to the fact that there is a very apparent inconsistency between your letter of November 20, in which you give as the reason why I was not allowed to land at Rimouski, that 'the steamer did not make entry at the customs house, Rimouski,' and your letter of December 11, in which the reason given is that my 'name was not included in the partial clearance granted by the quarantine officer at Rimouski for the landing of passengers at that point,' and again in your letter of December 26, in which you defend the last statement and add that 'the quarantine rules require that third class passengers shall be landed at Quebec.'

I have still to inquire then why I was not allowed to land at Rimouski from the steamer Empress of Britain on September 28, 1911, the immigration officer having given his permission, the objection to my landing having been made by an officer of Canada Customs. I trust that you will be able to give me this information, or else admit the error of the customs officer referred to above by return.

The letter of the 20th of November from Mr. John McDougald, Commissioner of Customs, written to Mr. Colpitts in reply to his letter of the 14th of November, 1911, reads as follows:

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of our letter of the 14th instant, respecting the refusal of the customs officer to permit your landing at Rimouski from the steamer Empress of Britain on the 28th September, 1911, you being a third-class passenger on the said steamer.

In reply I am to say that the landing of passengers at Rimouski from the steamer Empress of Britain was objected to because the steamer did not make entry at the Customs House, Rimouski.

I enclose copy of Quarantine Regulations. You will observe in section 6, page 5, that a steamer coming from a port outside of Canada is not allowed to make customs entry at Rimouski until it has received a clean bill of health from the quarantine officer at such place. These steamers, for quarantine purposes, are inspected at Grosse Isle above Rimouski. You will observe that under section 12, page 6, there is a prohibition against the landing of passengers before the inspection of the ship for quarantine purposes.

Hon. J. D. REID: What is the date of that letter?

Mr. EMMERSON: November 20, 1911.

Mr. REID: That explains the whole matter.

Mr. EMMERSON: It certainly does not do so, because other passengers were permitted to land. If such a rule applied to the third-class passengers, it should have had equal application to the second and the first-class passengers. To contend that the customs official was justified in preventing Mr. Colpitts from landing would be to condemn that same official for permitting the second and the first class-passengers to land, as he did on the occasion referred to.

The circumstances of this case are quite apparent from the correspondence which I have read. Mr. Colpitts had satisfied the immigration officer that he was a Canadian citizen, that he was returning to his home, that it was desirable in his own interest—and not only in his own but in the public interest—that he should land at Rimouski. But the customs officials interposed and said: No, notwithstanding the permission of the immigration officers, notwithstanding their willingness, the Customs Department absolutely prohibit your entry. And the Commissioner of Customs puts in as a defence that the steamer had not entered at the port of Rimouski. Childish, such a statement is; for the reason that if it required an entry at the port of Rimouski to permit the landing of passengers, then none of the first-class or second-class passengers should have been permitted to land. If these rules which have been cited are applicable to third-class passengers only, it is not so stated; there is no distinction or discrimination made either in the regulations or in the law in that regard. Therefore, there cannot be, fairly, rightly or legally, any distinction made between Mr. Colpitts, a Canadian citizen travelling as a steerage passenger and Mr. Somebody-else, a Canadian citizen travelling as second-class or first-class passenger. That is the crux of the case. Mr. Colpitts is a Canadian citizen; he goes to Europe on his own affairs, and he seeks to return to his university duties. And yet he is treated as an immigrant and prevented from again landing, prevented from getting to his home; and he wants to know—and rightly wants to know—under what regulation a ban was placed upon his landing at Rimouski. Mr. McDougald wrote a letter, dated the 26th of December, as follows:—

Referring to your letter of the 20th instant, I am to state that the names of the persons to be placed on the partial clearance by the quarantine officer permitting the landing of passengers at Rimouski, are in the judgment of the quarantine officer.

The quarantine rules require that third-class passengers shall be landed at Quebec.

There are no such rules apparently: though the statement was made by the Commissioner of Customs he is entirely in error on that point.

The Canadian customs officer was performing his duty in assisting in the observance of these rules.

This in the face of the fact that the quarantine officer, the immigration officer on board the steamer wanted to permit Mr. Colpitts to land, and the customs officer, instead of assisting the immigration officer in the discharge of his duties or in the observance of the rules provided for his guidance. Mr. McDougald in closing his letter says:

If you desire further information as to why the quarantine rules forbid the landing of third-class passengers at Rimouski, you may communicate with the Director General of Public Health, Ottawa.

As I have already shown, Mr. Colpitts did act upon this suggestion of Mr. McDougald and made application to the Director General of Public Health, Dr. Montizambert, and that official answered to the effect that there was no such regulation preventing the landing of third-class passengers at Rimouski. Now, here is the statement made by Mr. McDougald in a letter to Mr. Colpitts dated February 6, 1912:

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st instant, in which you ask why you were not allowed to land at Rimouski from the Empress of Britain on the 28th of September last, and would state in reply that the customs officer refused to permit you to land because your name was not included in the partial clearance granted by the quarantine officer for the landing of passengers at the place mentioned.

Hon. J. D. REID: That is plain enough.

Mr. EMMERSON: If it were true. The point is and the officials so state, that the immigration officials who are the ones to give this clearance wanted this man's name placed on that clearance, and the customs officials declined to permit it to be done. The customs officials, to that extent, did interfere with the duties of the quarantine officials.

Now, this case from an individual standpoint, I suppose is not a very serious one. But I apprehend that it involves a principle of importance to every Canadian. The question is whether a Canadian citizen, having gone abroad, has a right to return to Canada at the minimum of expense without foregoing his rights as a Canadian citizen equal with those of other Canadian citizens who happen to be a little more fortunate and to be able to travel either first-class or second-class. To me it seems an amazing condition of affairs. I have no particular interest in the matter; I am simply carrying out a request made courteously of me by a gentleman who is not even a constituent of mine and who to-day resides in another province. I have letters from Mr. Colpitts repeating his declaration that his desire is to know what his rights are as a Canadian citizen under these circumstances.

If there is any misunderstanding in the several departments with respect to the matter; if there are no regulations governing the conduct of officials under such circumstances, it is time that a remedy was applied. I certainly think that it is the duty of the Government to have this matter inquired into, and to establish a precedent governing all future cases of a similar character. I have before me a letter written to Mr. Colpitts by the gentleman who was purser of the steamship Empress of Britain on her voyage to Quebec in September, 1911. He recites a condition of affairs that, to say the least, is anomalous, and refers to an order issued by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to its officials, which, if followed out, certainly would be, and is, an act of very grave injustice to Canadian citizens. He says:

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 3rd instant. I have a slight recollection of your wishing to disembark at Rimouski. I also recall the fact of the immigration officials in the act of examining you when a customs official who came on board would not allow you to land, but I do not remember the reason adduced for holding you back. . . The instructions issued by the Canadian Pacific railway to pursers state that no third-class passengers can land at Rimouski, and this fact I indicated to you at the time. As a special favour, however, and owing to the fact that you were a Canadian citizen, I went to see what I could do for you. If all third-class passengers wishing to do so were allowed to leave at Rimouski the ship would be detained for quite a period. I believe that no other company allows third-class passengers to land at the point mentioned.

I can quite understand that it is in the public interest that immigrants travelling by steerage should not be permitted to land at Rimouski, but I cannot for the life of me understand why any Canadian

citizen who, by reason of circumstances of whatever nature, travels third-class, should not have the privilege, in common with first and second-class passengers, of landing at Rimouski. This is the crux and gist of the whole matter. I do not bring it forward in any spirit of antagonism; in the interests of this young man and of all other Canadian citizens who may, perchance, be like situated, I invite the attention of the Government to this matter in the hope that some measure of readjustment or regulation may be effected whereby in the future no Canadian citizen will be subjected to the inconvenience to which Mr. Colpitts was subjected in September, 1911. I think the full facts should be laid before the House, that a complete return should be made, and that an official notice should be issued to the general public detailing just what the rights of Canadian citizens under such circumstances are. I am sure that it is in the interests of the country at large that our young men should be encouraged to travel abroad, to widen their field of knowledge and improve their education. Many young men do seek thus to broaden their ideas by travelling, but they have to travel, perchance, at the minimum of cost, and I am sure it is not in the interests of this country that they should have stripped from them their rights as Canadians simply because of the impoverished condition of their finances. I commend the matter to the careful consideration of the House and of the Government.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): The motion offered by the hon. member for Westmorland asks for the production of all documents in and correspondence with any department of the Government, particularly the Department of Marine and Fisheries. There has been no correspondence on this matter with the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and that department is not concerned with it in any way. I myself had some personal correspondence with Mr. Colpitts, who, being a native of New Brunswick, wrote to me in regard to the matter, and, while I think this correspondence is of a personal nature I would not have the slightest objection to bringing it before the House.

Mr. EMMERSON: In drafting the resolution in the first instance I was under the impression that the correspondence was with the hon. minister, and that is the reason why his department was particularly mentioned.

Mr. HAZEN: Mr. Colpitts wrote to me as minister from New Brunswick in the Cabinet; that is why he solicited my good offices in the matter. As I understand it, Mr. Colpitts came out from England on the Empress of Britain, which arrived at Rimouski on September 28, 1911, at the time the Customs Department was being administered by the predecessor of the present Minister of Customs.

For some reason or other Mr. Colpitts was not allowed to land at Rimouski, and had to go on and disembark at Quebec. He felt that he had a right to disembark at Rimouski, and took the matter up with several departments of the Government, writing letters to the Customs Department, the Immigration Department, and the Department of Public Health. On the 20th of February he wrote me a letter enclosing copies of this correspondence, and stating that he had been unable to get what he considered a satisfactory explanation of his not being allowed to land at Rimouski, and he asked me if I would ascertain what the reason was. He enclosed me the original correspondence, which I returned to him, and which I have not now in my possession. I replied to him on the 26th of February, and after acknowledging receipt of his letter, said:

> The letter from Mr. R. R. Farrow, assistant Commissioner of Customs, dated the 11th of December, 1911, states the law very clearly as to why you were not permitted to land, and in view of the same, I would not care to interfere in the matter, as I am quite sure it would be of no avail.

Apparently, among the letters he enclosed me was one from Mr. Farrow, which, when I read it, seemed to me to give a correct explanation of the reason why this young man was not allowed to land at Rimouski, and in view of that letter I thought nothing was to be gained by pursuing the matter further. However, Mr. Colpitts, who seems to have been somewhat persistent, and to have had a good deal of that quality which is known as 'stick-to-itiveness'—a very good quality to have in life—was not satisfied with this, and he wrote me again. I was absent when his letter reached here, but when I reached home from England in 1912 I wrote the Minister of Customs pointing out what Mr. Colpitts had said, and pointing out, further, that his complaint was that no explanation of the action of the customs officer in refusing to let him land at Rimouski had been given; and in my letter I said to the Minister of Customs that I thought a satisfactory explanation could

easily be given, and that I would be very glad if he would take the matter up and write me in regard to it. In reply to that I received a letter from the Minister of Customs telling me that he had taken the matter up, and enclosing a letter which Mr McDougald, the Commissioner of Customs, had written to Mr. Colpitts on the 29th of March previously, and the minister said that he did not think he could add anything to the statements of the commissioner. Mr. McDougald's letter to Mr. Colpitts is dated the 29th of March, 1912, and reads in part as follows:

I would state in reply that I am advised by the Director General of Public Health as follows: 'The best course for a passenger under the circumstances related by Mr. Colpitts would be, after arranging with the ship's officers and getting his luggage prepared, to give his name and state his desire to land to the quarantine officer, when that official is preparing a clearance for the ship, and making out a nominal roll of the partial customs clearance for those who are landing at Rimouski.

That is the last I had to do with the matter. So far as I understand it, the officials of the Customs Department or other officials on board the boat, felt that Mr. Colpitts had not complied with the necessary regulations to enable him to land at Rimouski. The matter being referred to them, they adhered to that opinion, and gave their reasons—reasons which seemed good to both the Commissioner of Customs and the permanent officers of the Immigration Department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What are those reasons?

Mr. HAZEN: The reasons are given in the original letter, which I returned to Mr. Colpitts at his request, and I have not got a copy of that letter by me. So far as any injury to Mr. Colpitts is concerned, I may say that he was a student at college, and at the time was preparing to return to take up his studies. His time could not have been of very great value to him, and the only injury that was done to him was that he was carried on the Empress of Britain from Rimouski to Quebec, when he wanted to get off at Rimouski. He took the train for his home in Sackville at Quebec instead of at Rimouski. There was very little of anything that could be called damage.

Mr. EMMERSON: It is the principle.

Mr. HAZEN: Perhaps he has made a fight for principles, yet, after all, I do not think there is very much principle in it. The Minister of Customs points out the steps that should be taken in order for him to land at Rimouski, and as he has had the benefit of a full inquiry on the part of the customs officials, I fail to see where any injury has been done to him. I do not think for a minute that he was not allowed to land simply because he was a third-class passenger, and not a first or second-class passenger; that is not the reason at all. He did not take the necessary steps to get what I may call a clearance (for the sake of a better word), to enable him to get off at Rimouski. I simply rose to make these remarks, as I had some correspondence with Mr. Colpitts. I have no idea what his politics are.

Mr. EMMERSON: Nor have I.

Mr. HAZEN: It is not a matter of politics. I would have been very glad to render him any assistance in my power if any wrong had been done to him. That was my sole connection with the matter.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): The Empress of Britain, on which Mr. Colpitts was a passenger, reached Rimouski on September 28, 1911. This man, as the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has stated, blames the customs officer at Rimouski for not allowing him to land there. The officer, it is true, did allow a certain number of the first and second-class passengers to land there. Mr. Colpitts was, I understand, a steerage passenger. The quarantine officers did not give a clean bill of health to the steerage passengers, and for that reason Mr. Colpitts was not allowed to land. The quarantine regulations, passed by Order in Council in 1907, provide, in section 25:

In the case of a vessel carrying His Majesty's mails and arriving by the St. Lawrence, clearance certificate shall be from a quarantine officer at Rimouski (or at any other port designated by the minister) or at Grosse Isle, and in the case of every other vessel from Grosse Isle only, unless special permission to the contrary be obtained from the Minister of Agriculture;

(a) In the event of his finding a quarantinable disease on board, the quarantine officer at Rimouski (or at any other port designated by the minister) shall withhold the final clearance for customs entry, which shall only be given to the vessel when she has been released after quarantine inspection at Grosse Isle;

(b) When, however, in the judgment of the quarantine officer at Rimouski (or at any other port designated by the minister) mails and persons and their effects may be permitted to land at Rimouski (or at any other port designated by the minister) from such a vessel a partial clearance shall be given by such quarantine officer covering only the mails and the persons allowed to land there with their effects.

These are the regulations under which Mr. Colpitts was detained. The quarantine officer was the man to give him a clean bill of health; the customs officer had nothing to do with it. He would simply take the list made up by the quarantine officer. That was explained in the letter of Mr. Farrow on December 11, as mentioned by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Here is the answer sent to Mr. Colpitts on December 11, 1911, in which, I think, the case is explained fully by the commissioner:

Gustavus A. Colpitts,
The Residence,
Sackville, N.B.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22nd ult., in which you ask for further information respecting the regulations under which the customs officer refused to permit you to land from the steamer Empress of Britain at Rimouski on the 28th September, 1911.

I note your statement that before lodging any complaint in this matter you made a careful study of the Immigration Act and of the quarantine regulations, but failed to find anything therein justifying the action of the customs officer in detaining you on board the ship when the immigration officer was willing to allow you to land.

If you will refer to section 25 of the quarantine regulations you will observe that in the case of a vessel carrying His Majesty's mails and arriving by the St. Lawrence, clearance certificate shall be from the quarantine officer at Rimouski and under sub-section 'B' of the same section mails and persons and their effects may be permitted to land at Rimouski in the judgment of the quarantine officer, but in such instances a partial clearance shall be given by such quarantine officer covering only the mails and the persons allowed to land there with their effects.

The form of partial clearance for use of the customs collector is shown on page 25 of the quarantine regulations and you will note that under such clearance the Customs officer is only authorized to permit the landing of designated persons with their effects.

An officer of the Department of Customs is not therefore authorized to permit the landing of a passenger who is not designated in the partial clearance granted by the quarantine officer and we are advised that your name was not included in the partial clearance granted by the quarantine officer at Rimouski for the landing of passengers at that port from the steamer Empress of Britain on the 28th September, 1911.

My hon. friend the member for Westmorland has explained the whole matter very fully. I suppose that, if a steerage passenger wanted to get off, the quarantine officer might have felt: If I start with the steerage I may have to go through the whole steerage and inspect the vessel to see if I can give a clean bill of health. He may have felt that he did not wish to assume that responsibility until the vessel got to Grosse Isle, where they have a staff of officers to inspect the whole vessel.

Mr. EMMERSON: Then, it is not feasible to permit any person to leave the ship.

Mr. REID: In so far as the Department of Customs is concerned, I suppose there is no reason why, if the Canadian Pacific railway wishes to have the Empress of Britain detained there, a sufficient number of quarantine officers should go on board and allow as many off as they wish. Under the quarantine regulations, when a vessel comes to Rimouski, the quarantine officer goes on board. The mails are only supposed to go off there, but if he wishes to assume the responsibility of issuing a partial clearance for a number of persons and hand it to the officer, giving these persons a clean bill of health, the Customs Department has no alternative but to allow them off. But if the quarantine officer does not wish to certify to another man who happens to be in the steerage, or in any one of the other parts of the vessel, it is impossible, according to the law as passed, or the rules that have been in effect for years, to allow him to go off the vessel without that certificate. I think the whole matter is very plain indeed. It is not the object of the Customs Department to try and prevent any man from getting off at Rimouski or any other place so long as a bill of health is furnished, or the other requirements of the Act are carried out by other departments. The whole difficulty seems to have been that the quarantine officer, for some reason or other which I do not know, did not include on the list of those who had been passed the name of Mr. Colpitts. Otherwise, there is no doubt whatever that he would have been allowed to go off the boat with the others.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that if there is any blame in this matter, the blame is not to be attached to the customs officer. The customs officer, under the law, is prevented from passing any passenger unless upon a certificate of the quarantine officer, and if there is any blame it is upon the quarantine officer, who is an officer of the Department of Agriculture. It is well known to everybody that a steamer coming up the St. Lawrence stops at Rimouski and that passengers from the Maritime provinces are allowed to land there and take at once the train which is waiting for them to carry them home. This is what was done in this case, and there was no objection at all as far as the first and second-class

passengers were concerned. There was no disease on that steamer as far as I understand. The first and second-class passengers were allowed to land, and were taken to their destination at once.

Mr. REID: Because they had a certificate from the quarantine officer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not blame at all the officer of the Department of Customs. This young gentleman, Mr. Colpitts, who was from New Brunswick, came up and proposed to land also, but it appears that he was not the son of a millionaire or a millionaire himself, that he had been travelling for his education and was coming back as an ordinary steerage passenger. It is evident to me from the statement which has been made that he was not allowed to land because he was a third-class passenger. The quarantine officer may be blameable or not blameable—I do not know and I would not say; in fact we were still in office at the time when this occurred—September 28. I would not say that the officer was wrong, but the evidence is quite plain, the matter is very clear. The quarantine officer would not pass him because he was a steerage passenger, and if there is any disease in the ship it is supposed to be in the steerage and not upon deck. The officer said: You must go to Quebec and pass the examination, and if you pass the examination, you will be allowed to land. This young gentleman was sent to Quebec, he passed the examination and was released immediately. He might go home on the following day. There is no damage, but there was a great deal of inconvenience to this young man because, instead of taking the train to go home at once as he was anxious to do, no doubt, at Rimouski, he had to go to Quebec and from Quebec go back to his home, and he was detained probably twenty-four hours.

Mr. EMMERSON: Thirty-six.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Thirty-six hours, perhaps. The question has been well put by my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) in this way: You have a regulation which applies to immigrants, that is passengers who come by the steerage and who are of the class that we know as immigrants, but if a young Canadian, not only a British subject but a resident of Canada, chooses to come back into Canada as a steerage passenger, for reasons which are sufficient to himself, why should he not be allowed the privilege of landing at Rimouski instead of being made subject to the law which would apply to every immigrant; you can detain these men until they pass the examination, but that does not apply to this young gentleman. That is the only point I see in the matter, and as far as my hon. friend from Westmorland has made out his case, he has made it out in this way: Your law may be wise, there is no blame to be attached to anybody, but at the same time this law, as all laws when they are followed to their extremity, may work an individual injustice. There is no doubt that the operation of this law did work an injustice to this young gentleman in the fact that it compelled him to go to Quebec and prevented him from reaching his home thirty-six hours earlier than he would otherwise have reached it if he had been permitted to disembark at Rimouski. The suggestion made by my hon. friend from Westmorland is whether or not, under such circumstances, the quarantine officer should be instructed to allow an exemption from the laws which would apply to immigrants.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, I was not in the House all the time that this subject has been under discussion, and I am not very conversant with the facts. There is no doubt that the officers, whatever their course may have been, were acting in good faith and doing what they believed to be their duty. The point, as the right hon. gentleman has said, is whether or not there should be some amendment made to the regulation. In the first place, it must be patent that in such circumstances not very much change could be made unless there were some means by which persons returning to Canada as third-class passengers could be readily identified among a great number of such passengers. That seems to me to be the main essential. Perhaps the means for such identification are available at the present time if one saw fit to use them, because it would be possible, I should think, for a person going abroad in that way to get a passport from the proper department of Government here, which would absolutely identify him and upon his return enable the immigration officer to see at once that he was a resident of Canada. If the passenger then had a clean bill of health it would seem to me that he could land at Rimouski if he so desired. I speak thus without any comprehensive knowledge of the conditions, or, of the practice which is followed by the officers in respect to necessary precautions and safeguards. Now that the matter has been brought to the attention of the Government, it will receive consideration by the ministers of the various

departments which it concerns. If any possible and reasonable regulation can be made, by which delays and inconvenience of this kind may be prevented without detriment to the public interest, I need hardly assure the House that we will be very glad indeed to have such regulation put in force.

Mr. EMMERSON: I thank the Prime Minister for his assurance that the subject will have the consideration of himself and of the heads of the different departments. I do not think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries quite recognized the gravity of the case. It is true no great damage resulted, and no doubt Mr. Colpitts, like any other sturdy New Brunswicker, would be quite disposed to take the brunt of such hardships as he experienced, but this case involves a principle which should be dear to every Canadian, and that is, the liberty of the subject. I am not bringing any charges against officials, neither am I condemning the Government nor the departments concerned, nor the regulations, but it seems to me in view of all that has been said, and particularly in view of what was stated by the Minister of Customs, that there has been a manifest misinterpretation of the regulation. A regulation designed to protect this country in the matter of immigrants, has been read to include Canadians returning to Canada by third-class passage, and that, I think, was never intended. It is apparent on the face of it, and particularly from the letter of the purser of the steamship Empress of Britain, that the interpretation put upon that regulation is that under no circumstances shall a third-class passenger be permitted to land at Rimouski. The Minister of Marine referred to a letter written on the 29th of March, 1912, by Mr. McDougald, in which Mr. McDougald states:

4 p.m.

I am advised by the Director General of Public Health as follows: the best course for a passenger under the circumstances narrated by Mr. Colpitts would be, after arranging with the ship's officers and getting his luggage prepared, to give his name and state his desire to land to the quarantine officer when that official is preparing the clearance for the ship and making out the nominal roll of the customs clearance for those who are landed at Rimouski.

Under the evidence presented, Mr. Colpitts did that very thing, and the answer given to him was: no third-class passenger can land at Rimouski. This also is apparent from the instructions given by the Canadian Pacific railway and other steamship companies to their officials, and that is what I want the Government to inquire into. Surely that regulation is not intended to apply to Canadian citizens, surely it was never contemplated that a young man returning to his Canadian home in that way, should be prohibited from taking advantage of landing at Rimouski. I ask the Government to provide that in future every Canadian citizen whether he travels first-class, second-class, or third-class, shall have the privilege of landing at Rimouski if he so desires.

Motion agreed to.

THE KING VS. FALARDEAU.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and documents generally concerning the withdrawal of an appeal in the Supreme Court of Canada, in the case of His Majesty the King, appellant, and Alfred Olivier Falardeau and Constant Napoleon Farlardeau, respondents.

He said: I regret that neither the Minister of Justice nor the Solicitor General are in their seats now, but I suppose the Postmaster General who is familiar with the facts of this case, as a resident of Quebec, will be able to give me the information I seek.

The facts are the following: As you are aware, the construction of the National Transcontinental railway necessitated the expropriation of lands in and around the city of Quebec. Not far from the bridge, but between the site where the bridge is ultimately to be built and the city of Quebec, there is a property owned by Alfred Olivier Falardeau and Constant Napoleon Falardeau. As that property was required for the right of way of the said National Transcontinental railway, expropriation proceedings were taken by the Crown, the information being filed in court in due form on the 2nd day of October, 1911. The information was filed by the predecessor of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, Sir Allen B. Aylesworth; and, as is usual in such proceedings, the Crown made an offer for the lands which were to be expropriated. These lands were described as follows:

A parcel of land being part of lot number 260 on the official cadastre and book of reference thereto for the parish of Sillery, in the county of Quebec, covering an area of 328,552 square feet, more or less, being a strip of fifty feet in width on each side of the central line of the Transcontinental as far as Champlain street to the east of said lot 260, bounded to the northeast by lot 232, to the southwest by lot 261, to the northwest partly by Champlain street and partly by the balance of lot 260, and to the southeast by the southeastern limit

of the right of way of the Transcontinental railway.

The offer made by His Majesty the King, through the Minister of Justice, or the Attorney General, who acts also as Minister of Justice, is as follows:

That it may be declared that the sum of $26,257.47 is sufficient and just compensation to the defendant, or to whosoever may prove to be entitled thereto, for and in respect of the above described lands and real property and for all claims in respect of any damage or loss sustained or to be sustained, by reason of the said entering upon, taking possession of and expropriation of the said lands and real property as aforesaid. Such further and other relief as this Honourable Court shall deem meet.

Ottawa, 22nd September, 1911.

This information was amended a little later on. On the 19th of February, 1913, the new Minister of Justice being then represented by his solicitor, Mr. J. E. Chapleau, a lawyer from the city of Quebec, the information as amended changed the offer that had previously been made by Sir Allen B. Aylesworth, Attorney General for the Dominion. The amendment had regard first to the area and secondly to the amount. I need not refer to the area; but as to the amount, instead of $26,257.47, the following offer was made:

That it may be declared that the sum of $39,000 is sufficient and just compensation to the defendants, or to whosoever may prove to be entitled thereto, for and in respect of the above described lands and real property, and for all claims in respect of any damage or loss sustained or to be sustained, by reason of the said entering upon, taking possession of and expropriation of the said lands and real property as aforesaid.

Mr. DOHERTY: Was not the area increased?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes. That is what I stated.

Mr. DOHERTY: I did not understand you to state that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The area was increased, and the offer was amended accordingly.

The defendants were represented by Messrs. Belleau, Baillargeon and Belleau. On the 2nd of November, 1911, they filed their plea by which they averred that the offer of $26,257.47, made by His Majesty the King through his Attorney General, Sir Allen B. Aylesworth, was insufficient, and that the defendant was entitled, not to $26,257.47, but to $52,000. Later on, as the first information filed by Sir Allen B. Aylesworth had been amended by his successor, the area increased and the offer also increased, so the defendants increased their claim, and on the 7th of February, 1913, Messrs. Belleau, Baillargeon and Belleau, attorneys for the defendants, filed an amended plea.

This time, they did not care to accept even the large amount which they had previously mentioned as being sufficient to cover their indemnity and damages, namely,, $52,000, but raised their claim to the fabulous sum of $217,261.97, with interest from the 12th of September, 1912, and costs. This case was heard before the Exchequer Court of Canada presided over by Mr. Justice Audette. And let me say in passing that it is far from my mind to cast any reflection on this judge who is integrity and honour personified, and who is one of the ablest judges I know of. On the 10th of May, 1913, Mr. Justice Audette gave judgment for the defendants to the amount of $69,256. This property, as proven in the case, was purchased in 1894 for the sum of $1,000. I have here the defendant's exhibit 'A' filed as the case was heard in court. This document shows that on the 9th of October, 1894, an agreement was made between Eleanor Seaton Karr and other trustees represented by Charles Gauvreau, of Quebec, agent, on one side and Alfred Olivier Falardeau—the defendant in the present case—on the other, with regard to this property. The agreement contains the following clauses:

Whereas on the eleventh day of June last, 1894, the hereinafter described property was offered for sale at public auction by Messrs. A. J. Maxham & Co. and adjudged to the said Alfred Oliver Falardeau the last and highest bidder, for the sum of one thousand dollars.

After further recitals, this document proceeds:

And lastly the present sale is thus made for and in consideration of the price of one thousand dollars current money of Canada, which the said vendors represented as aforesaid do hereby declare to have received partly before and partly at the time of the execution of these presents, whereof quit.

As I have just stated, the amount awarded by the Exchequer Court was $69,256. As soon as this award was made Mr. Chapleau, solicitor for the Attorney General of the Dominion of Canada, served the following notice upon Messrs. Belleau, Baillargeon and Belleau, solicitors for the defendants—respondents, as follows:

Take notice that His Majesty the King is dissatisfied with the judgment rendered in the above case by the Exchequer Court of Canada on the 10th day of March, 1913, whereby the defendants-respondents, were awarded the sum of $69,256, with interest at 5 per centum per annum upon the sum of $13,071.53 from the

15th day of February, A.D. 1910, and upon the sum of $56,184.48 from the 12th day of September, A.D. 1912, with costs, and intends to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada from such judgment.

The defendants-respondents also filed a cross appeal which was lodged on April 7, 1913. The solicitor representing my hon. friend the Minister of Justice—I have not the pleasure of knowing him personally, but he is a young solicitor of good reputation—immediately took the proceedings in appeal. I hold in my hand the factum of the appellant—that is to say His Majesty the King—and the statement of facts by the solicitor representing the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General of Canada. Perhaps the House will be interested to know what was the opinion of the solicitor acting for the Minister of Justice on behalf of His Majesty the King with regard to the judgment or award made by the Exchequer Court:

On the 15th day of February, 1910, a plan and description of a strip of land, part of cadastre No. 260 of the parish of Sillery, in the county of Quebec, representing an area of 148,540 square feet, for the purpose of acquiring the right of way for the Transcontinental railway across said lot, was deposited with the Registrar of Deeds for the county of Quebec.

On the 12th day of September, 1912, a second plan and description of the said lot No. 260, representing an additional area of 638,640 square feet was also deposited with the Registrar of Deeds for the county of Quebec.

Furthermore, on the 16th day of January, 1913, another plan with full description by metes and bounds of said lot No. 260, which is all taken and expropriated by the Crown, was also deposited with the Registrar of Deeds for the County of Quebec.

This last plan which was deposited with the object of correcting all previous erroneous description shows a total area of the land taken as 780,000 square feet.

Then he goes on:

The respondents are claiming the value of two piers which are built in deep water opposite the property in question. The Crown, by the present expropriation proceedings is only taking lot No. 260, as shown on plan filed as exhibit No. 3. Therefore, as the piers in question are not erected on said lot No. 260, do not form part of the present expropriation and have not been expropriated, the court had no jurisdiction to entertain a claim for said piers; in consequence the value of the piers is not included in the amount awarded by the court below. The title of the respondents, although not admitted at the trial, was recognized by agreement of both parties before the judgment was rendered.

The solicitor continues as follows:

The Crown having found it necessary for the passage of the Transcontinental railway and the development of the harbour of Quebec to acquire lot No. 260 of the cadastre of the parish of Sillery, took possession of said lot after having deposited plan and description of the land needed in the Registry Office at Quebec under the authority of 3 Edward VII, chapter 71.

The solicitor here recites the facts which I have already laid before the House—that the first offer was made, and then supplemented by a further offer as an indemnity. He adds:

We may say immediately that there was no proof whatsoever that the respondents might have been entitled to an indemnity of that total. This amount of $217,261.97 was merely put in the plea as imaginary figures which were not brought out at the trial by any witnesses, and which must have been put in the plea merely to fill space, under the principle that the more you ask the more you are liable to get. The learned judge who rendered judgment in the court below granted the respondents the sum of $62,960, plus 10 per cent of that amount for forced sale and interest. The appellant humbly submits that this judgment is erroneous, not based upon the evidence, and that the offer of $39,000 should have been declared sufficient for the market value of said lot No. 260 and all damages suffered by the respondents on account of said forced sale or expropriation.

The solicitor representing His Majesty the King says further:

There are two points which one must always keep in mind in going through the evidence submitted by the different witnesses heard in the present case, to wit: the property in question, that is cadastral No. 260, with all the dependencies, buildings, wharfs, etc., thereon was bought in 1894 by the respondents for the sum of $1,000; when the witnesses value today the wharfs on that property at $2 or $3 per cubic yard, their basis of valuation is totally false, so far as the market value is concerned, as these wharfs, although in a far better condition and far better state of preservation in 1894 than now, were nevertheless considered then as pretty near valueless, if we take into consideration the price of $1,000 paid for the land, buildings, wharfs, etc.

After having examined the very extraordinary evidence adduced on behalf of the respondents in this case, the solicitor adds further:

We will thereupon say with the learned judge in the court below, page 189 of the case, line 31: 'The fallacy of the assessment of the wharfs and buildings is too manifest to be dealt with any further.'

Now, let us examine the valuation given to the land per square foot by the witnesses. We must not lose sight that four-fifths of that land is covered by water at every tide.

Then follows a long analysis of the evidence as to the value of the land; and he adds:

We find in the evidence given by Mr. J. de Salaberry Bosse that the property next to Spencer Cove, on the city's side, was offered for sale at about the time the respondent's

property was expropriated. It is a property similar to the one of the respondents, with wharfs, piers, buildings, etc., thereon. This property was called the Ross property or Wolfe's Cove.

It was offered for sale for a lump sum which represented about five cents and two-thirds per foot.

Speaking about the Dobell property, a little higher up on the St. Lawrence, he says:

We find in the evidence given by the plaintiff's witness, Mr. Alfred Curzon Dobell, the prices for different coves nearer to the city limits than Spencer Cove and having the same kind of dependencies erected upon them.

The cove owned by the Dobell estate was sold at a rate of twelve cents per foot, including buildings, wharfs, piers, etc., etc. It was the same kind of property as that of the respondents; there were buildings and wharfs upon it, larger wharfs than on Falardeau's property, and the whole was in a far better condition than Spencer's Cove.

He further says:

Here we have the real basis upon which to form a good idea of the market value of the respondents' property, and we will say, as the learned judge who rendered judgment in the court below, page 189 of the same case, line 33, to wit: 'If the Ross property had, at that time, a market value of five cents and two-thirds per foot, with all erections thereon, why should the Falardeau property immediately adjoining be worth more than six cents a foot, with its wharfs and buildings?' We certainly are, on this point, of the same opinion as the learned judge who rendered judgment; but we do not see any reasons why, after having said the above words, he should fix the respondents' indemnity at eight cents per foot, and we are at a loss to find what reasons must have induced him to increase the indemnity from six to eight cents after having made it clear by the 'considerants' of his reasons for judgment that the Falardeau property should not command on the market more than six cents per foot.

In the valuation of an immovable and of the damages caused by expropriation of said immovable, we must also take into consideration its revenues. The respondents have their place of business and their coal yard within the limits of the city of Quebec on the banks of the St. Charles river. By getting the coal sold to their clients from Sillery, dumped upon a wharf on lot No. 260, they save an expenditure of 73 cents per ton; in other words, they sell that coal at the same price as they would sell it at their yards in the city, but they gain 73 cents on the cartage, making a profit of that amount on every ton. As they sell this way about 1,800 tons, it is a profit of about $1,300 they make by landing that coal there; also a profit of 75 cents per cord on 140 cords of wood; about $115. They have besides that the rental of a building, about $200, and fishing rights bringing them about $35. The total revenue would be about $1,800.

The amount offered by the Crown, calculated at five per cent, would net them a yearly income of about $2,000 clear of all expenses, whilst the respondents have to deduct from their present income the expenses of operating that coal and wood yard and the repairs to buildings, etc., etc.

We humbly submit that for the above reasons the amount offered by the Crown represented the perspective capabilities of lot No. 260 at the time of the expropriation and its adaptability to particular uses.

We also contend that there is not, en fait et en droit, any reason for that 10 per cent increase added to the indemnity for forced sale. The respondents were using only a small portion of lot No. 260, and to grant them an additional amount of 10 per cent over the indemnity, representing the market value of the value of the whole lot, is certainly unjust and unfair to the appellant.

We therefore humbly submit that the judgment appealed from is erroneous, that the appellant was entitled to have his offer of $39,000 declared sufficient, and we respectfully pray for a judgment in accordance.

J. E. Chapleau,
Solicitor for the Appellant.

Quebec, October 15, 1913.

I understand that this factum of the solicitor for His Majesty the King, was duly submitted to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada. I was surprised when I learned that the appeal from the judgment rendered by Mr. Justice Audette, which was duly filed in the Supreme Court, had been withdrawn. I think it would be interesting to know why. The Minister of Justice directed the appeal to be withdrawn; I may be wrong on that, but at all events the House is entitled to have an explanation from the hon. gentleman. The facts of the case are clear. Here is a property valued at $1,000 in 1894 by the defendants, Falardeau. Later on, the National Transcontinental railway desired to expropriate part of this property for their right-of-way. Sir Allen Aylesworth, Minister of Justice, files an information on the property to be expropriated offering in round figures $26,000 for a stated area of that property. Later on, a new solicitor for His Majesty the King is appointed. Friends of the Government are brought into the case, and immediately the area is enlarged; the offer is also increased to the amount of $39,000. The defendants at first were ready to accept $52,000, but as soon as the amended information was filed by the present Minister of Justice, they immediately raised their indemnity to the amount of $225,000 in round figures. The case goes before the courts. I do not criticise for one minute the judgment or the award rendered by the Exchequer Court. I have much pleasure in saying that there is no judge in whose honour, integrity, and legal science I have more confidence than in Mr. Justice Audette's; but the Judge of the Exchequer

Court, like the judge of any other court in the land, has to accept the evidence which is adduced in the case, and I am sorry to say that after having gone through the case, it seems to me that the respondents had an unusually large number of witnesses. Some of them went so far as to say that the property in question would be valued before long at the enormous amount of over half a million dollars. I happen to know this part, not of the city of Quebec, because it is some miles out of Quebec in the suburbs, in the parish of Sillery. I know the property there. I know that the Quebec bridge will before long be built not far from that site. The Transcontinental railway will certainly pass through that property, but no one in Quebec or out of Quebec will dare say that this property, four-fifths of which, according to the solicitor representing the Minister of Justice, is covered by water, is worth the amount it brought before the Exchequer Court. The amount awarded is more than double the amount offered by the Crown. The judge had to base that award on the evidence which came before him, but, as I stated a moment ago, His Majesty the King was dissatisfied. The notice served by Mr. J. E. Chapleau, solicitor for the Attorney General of the Dominion of Canada, on April 5, reads as follows:

> Sir, take notice that His Majesty the King is dissatisfied with the judgment rendered in the above case by the Exchequer Court of Canada on the tenth day of March, 1913.

I am informed that the appeal has been withdrawn. I would like to know from the Minister of Justice the reason why the appeal was withdrawn, and if the amount awarded by the Exchequer Court has been paid.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member expresses curiosity to know the reasons why the appeal in this particular case was withdrawn. The hon. gentleman assumed that the factum from which he has read, and which factum, to my mind, does credit to the counsel who represented His Majesty in this particular case, who apparently made out the very best case possible, as it was his duty to do. The hon. gentleman assumes too much if he assumes that in every one of the cases which are pending before the courts it is possible for the Minister of Justice to examine the factum and determine for himself as to the well or ill-foundedness of the judgment, and more especially of a judgment that is rendered upon a pure question of fact, and where a conclusion has to be reached as the result of a careful examination of voluminous evidence. I have to admit that that is a task which it would be quite impossible for me to fulfil, and I think that in that regard I stand in no different position from that of the Minister of Justice who preceded me. Therefore I regret that I am not in a position to determine whether or not the evidence in this particular case justified the findings of Mr. Justice Audette. I noticed that the hon. gentleman himself said that he had absolute and implicit confidence in the integrity and capacity of Mr. Justice Audette. I need not say that I share that confidence fully.

The position of this particular case, as outlined by the hon. gentleman, is that there was a property in Quebec that in 1894 sold for $1,000, and he expresses intense astonishment that this thoroughly capable judge of sterling integrity and sound judgment should have, in 1913, valued that same property upon the evidence before him at $69,256. I must confess that I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should think that he has any argument based upon the price of property in 1894 as affording a criterion for the valuation that should be put upon that property in 1913. Quebec, like the rest of this country, has progressed. We have frequently heard hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House claiming a great deal of credit for that progress. I am glad that Quebec has shared in that progress and I venture to say that the hon. gentleman is hardly serious if he thinks that there is any importance to be attached to the price at which property of this kind sold at that remote period as affecting the valuation of the property at the present day. My hon. friend himself says that the former Minister of Justice, Sir Allen Aylesworth, valued this property in 1910 at $26,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In 1911.

Mr. DOHERTY: In 1911. Well, I venture to say that Sir Allen Aylesworth took a very small part in the valuation but I think that we can count that the officers of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, whose greater competency in that regard I am sure Sir Allen Aylesworth would be quite willing to admit, as I am myself, conceded that a very small part of

the property that is now valued, was worth $26,257.40. As the hon. gentleman states himself, what it was then sought to expropriate, and what was valued at that figure at that time, was an area of 148,500 feet. Later on it is quite true that a further offer was made but that further offer was for the expropriation of an area of 780,000 feet. While we have this very large increase multiplying by about five the original area as asked for, we have an increase in the offer of something like $12,000, making the offer $39,000. In 1913, on the valuation of the officers of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, those who were about to expropriate, we had a property worth $39,000. I do not think there can be any serious suggestion of fault-finding with the increase in the amount offered, in view of the very large increase in the area thought to be expropriated. So that the issue in this case was as to the value of a property admittedly worth $39,000.

The claim of the defendant on the hon. gentleman's own showing, was $217,261. Undoubtedly, when the Commissioners were asking for 148,500 feet they were only asked for $52,000, but when the Commissioners were asking for 780,000 feet, the defendant asked for $217,000. If their original demand was at all reasonable I should say on the face of it that the increased demand would have at least been as reasonable. But whatever they may have asked for this large area, by the judgment of this thoroughly competent judge, they were awarded $69,256 falling very far short indeed of the demand for $217,260.

The hon. member has told us that the Crown felt dissatisfied at the judgment ordering the payment of $69,000. The respondents, who were proprietors of the property, felt also dissatisfied. On the face of things, looking at their demand and at the offer of the Crown, the respondents had very much larger reason to feel dissatisfied if they were at all earnest in their original demand. At all events, they felt dissatisfied and they appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada. As the hon. member has pointed out, the learned counsel retained on behalf of the Crown put forward in as forceful a manner as possible—and making the most, I have no doubt, of what he could find in the evidence to justify his submission—an argument that he thought militated in favour of the reduction of the award against the Crown. We have not the advantage of the argument made by the other side, but I have no doubt the learned counsel retained in the case made the strongest argument they could make in support of the demand for an increase of the award. I am not quite sure that it is not a fairly strong assumption in favour of the correctness of a judgment in a case of this kind when both parties feel dissatisfied, at all events at first blush. An appeal was lodged, and it is true that the appeal was withdrawn. I am not in a position to say, that, as a matter of fact that appeal was withdrawn by my instructions and after any examination of the case. When we retain counsel to represent us in cases of this kind, we retain, like him, gentlemen of whom the hon. member himself has spoken in the terms in which he spoke of the counsel concerned in this case. In all cases of this kind where the whole question involved is a question of valuation of properties, we undoubtedly have to rely to a certain extent upon the opinions of the officers of particular departments, who have the advantage, not only of such knowledge as they may have of the property involved, and the conditions affecting its values, but in this case who had the further advantage of comparing the award in this case with the awards made either previously or subsequently in similar analogous cases. No doubt acting upon the information which was at his command, the counsel representing the Crown—and representing in a more particular manner the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, who in this instance was acting on behalf of the Crown—apparently arrived at the conclusion that being in this position, that they had an award against them of $69,000 and a claim against them of $217,000, it was under the circumstances wise that in view of the withdrawal of that other appeal making that larger demand, they should accept the award made against them. I am not in a position to speak of the particular reasons justifying the action in that particular case; but the hon. member himself, as a lawyer of distinction and of very long experience, will, I think, bear me out when I say that every lawyer who has had occasion to deal with questions of expropriation, knows that in cases in which the entire question involved is the weight of contradictory evidence as to the value of particular properties, appellate courts are very slow indeed to interfere with the findings of the court of original jurisdiction, which has had the advantage of confronting the witnesses face to face, hearing their testimony, and which, moreover, in a case of this kind, if it chose to avail itself of it, had the opportunity of visiting the property in question

and familiarizing itself to a degree which no appellate court possibly could have with the circumstances of the case.

I may say, without great fear of contradiction, that the jurisprudence of the appellate courts upon questions of that kind is consistent, in the sense that an appellant, to say the very least of it, must make an exceedingly strong case, enabling the appellate court to lay its finger upon some definite error or mistake. Of course, in this case, as I trust in all cases of the judgments of our courts of original jurisdiction there can be no question, except a question of error on the part of the judge. I think I can safely say that the jurisprudence of the appellate courts in a case of this kind is consistently, that it is incumbent on the appellant to make a demonstration—I do not think that is too strong a word—of some precise error or errors that have led to the finding establishing the valuation, before an appellate court will intervene to set that valuation aside. In other words, the appellate courts hesitate, rightly I think, and they even more than hesitate before undertaking to substitute what would amount to merely an opinion with regard to the relative weight of evidence upon a question of valuation—which is necessarily not susceptible of being based upon absolutely definite conclusive reasons, but which is always more or less in the domain of opinion or individual appreciation—for a judgment upon such a question of the court of first instance with all the greater advantages it has to enable it to reach a satisfactory conclusion.

5 p.m.

I assume that these reasons would have weight with the counsel and with the commission and its officers, when they were called upon to determine what was the course of prudence for them to take in face of the award of $69,000 and the demand of $217,000. For my part I can readily appreciate that they may, under these circumstances, have considered that the part of wisdom was to accept the original judgment, though it may not have been absolutely satisfactory, rather than to incur the risk of a possible increase in the original award.

It seems to me entirely beside the question that we should be told the property sold in 1894 for $1,000 and have read to us every word of the deed by which the property was transferred. We are face to face with a property that avowedly in 1913, on the judgment of competent people, who are certainly not interested in overvaluing it, would unquestionably be worth $39,000. We have the judgment of a judge against whom nothing can be said, a judge who had the advantage over both my hon. friend and myself, and probably over every hon. member of this House, of having had long experience in dealing with cases precisely of this kind. The fact that such a judge would have found that a property avowedly worth $39,000 was in his judgment worth $65,256 does not seem to me a matter to give rise to such very great surprise on the part of the hon. gentleman. If he will go through, at hapnazard, any fifteen or twenty expropriation cases, he will find at least as great discrepancies between the offers, on the one hand, of the party expropriating and the demands on the other hand, of the party expropriated, and the final award, as exists in this particular case. I can quite understand that the counsel who instituted this appeal, having studied the case from his point of view, and having that natural leaning which a lawyer has in favour of the views of his client, may have considered that this was a fair case to take to appeal. When, however, he found himself face to face with the fact that his adversaries also considered that they had a fair case to carry to a higher tribunal to make this increased demand, I think it was an act of wisdom for him seriously to consider his position. For my own part, I am not able to see, in what the hon. member has put before the House, any reason why we should assume that the advice, which that counsel gave to withdraw the appeal in view of the withdrawal of the counter appeal, was advice that we are in any position to condemn or to say was not justified by the proceedings that were taken.

As I have stated, I have not had the advantage of personally reading the evidence in this case; but it has been read by lawyers in whom I have confidence and I may say that their appreciation of it was that it made a very strong case to support at least the amount of the award. Under these circumstances, and with what I have pointed out, the indisposition of the appellate court to interfere in cases where the whole question is one of appreciation as in this case, I for my part do not feel that I am called upon to make any apology for the fact of the Transcontinental Commission having accepted the advice that was offered to them that the wisest course was to consent to the withdrawal of both the appeals.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is no disposition at the present time to blame the Minister of Justice for having consented to the withdrawal of the appeal. This motion is made simply for purposes of information. My hon. friend has done nothing more than to relate the facts of the case and to ask for further information as to the reasons which have prompted the Government at the last moment to withdraw the appeal from the judgment rendered by Mr. Justice Audette. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has disclaimed responsibility for the advice given to the Crown, and I do not blame him for doing so. He has stated that, in the discharge of his duty as Minister of Justice, in view of the numerous law cases with which the department has to deal, he cannot be expected to give his personal attention to every case, and that in all cases, when the whole question involved is one of valuation of properties, he has to rely to a certain extent upon the opinions of others. I am quite prepared to admit that. The Minister of Justice, of course, must rely upon the advice of the counsel whom he employs. The hon. gentleman in this case has entrusted the matter to Mr. Chapleau, a member of the Quebec Bar; he, I understand, has acted upon the advice of his counsel.

The only point upon which I should like to have further advice or information, information which perhaps the papers which are to be brought down will disclose, is as to who really is responsible for the action taken by the Crown. It is difficult to suppose that Mr. Chapleau would wittingly give advice to the minister in face of the strong reasons which he previously adduced for taking the case to appeal. I agree entirely with my hon. friend the Minister of Justice that in a case of this kind any court of appeal would be indisposed to disturb the finding of the court below.

In this matter, the only point at issue was the value of the property. The Crown, when the matter was first brought to its attention to take action, offered the sum of $39,000 to the owners of the property. The award was almost double that amount —$69,000. That, of course, is nothing against the propriety of the award, but when there is such a large discrepancy as that, it is not improbable that there may have been an error on the part of the judge, as my hon. friend stated.

My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux), and the hon. Minister of Justice himself have paid a tribute to the ability and character of the judge. Every one knows that Mr. Justice Audette is a most competent man; but my hon. friend knows that there is no man, however eminent he may be, who does not make mistakes at some time or other. On reading the reasons given by the counsel for the Crown, one would come to the conclusion that in a matter of this kind the judge had made such an error that when the Superior Court of Appeal had its attention called to the matter, it would be bound to take notice of the error and come to the conclusion that the judgment should be reversed.

My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has laid some stress upon the fact that Mr. Chapleau may have been induced to give to the Crown the advice of withdrawal owing to the fact that there had been a counter appeal. For my part I am not influenced very much by that consideration, neither do I believe that counsel for the Crown was very much influenced by it. There was an expropriation demanded: and in view of the judgment which was rendered by the court, even if in the contention of the Crown the amount awarded was exaggerated, that would be simply further evidence that the claim had been not only exaggerated, but enormously exaggerated: therefore the counter appeal was more in the nature of a bluff than anything else, and consequently counsel would not be influenced by it.

What was the reason why, when counsel for the Crown had taken such a strong position as to advise an appeal in a pure matter of arbitration and valuation of property, he should all of a sudden change his opinion and advise the withdrawal of the appeal? That is a point as to which, for my part, I cannot see that any sound reasoning can be given. Counsel having taken the strong position which he did take could not, in my humble opinion, afterwards come to a conclusion that he had better withdraw his appeal because the other side had also withdrawn their appeal. This is a case which, I think, calls for more information than we have at the present time. The papers will be brought down, of course, and we will then see what can be the reason the Crown gives for taking the position it did take. Without going further, I can only say to my hon. friend that, on the information so far before us it would seem that the department would have been justified in deciding to get the opinion of the Supreme Court in this matter. I say no

more, at present. I know that at this time the position taken by the Minister of Justice cannot be impeached. But we are entitled to have more information to enable us to reach definite conclusions on this question.

Mr. DOHERTY: Just in case I did not say it in words, let me state now that, of course, the papers will be brought down, and I should be glad to give any information on the subject that I can.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is one point which, perhaps, I did not make clear enough, and which I think the hon. minister should elucidate in the papers to be brought down, and that is why when Sir Allen Aylesworth filed an information for the small area of that property, immediately after his resignation the whole property was claimed for expropriation purposes by the Government. What was the correspondence, what was the influence which was brought to bear on the Government in favour of acquiring such increased area of that property? As is customary with him, my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) has been very courteous in this matter, and I do not doubt that he will bring the papers down as soon as possible. I can only say that there is a strange anomaly somewhere in this case. Notwithstanding the increased value which the late Government brought to land in and around Quebec by its progressive policy, there is certainly a strange anomaly in the fact that property which was bought for $1,000 years ago, has been valued at from $72,000 to $73,000. The hon. gentleman knows the city of Quebec and its suburbs; he knows Sillery where the property is situated. I know those localities also, and nobody will make me believe that the value of that property has increased to such an extent as would be indicated by these figures. Be that as it may, I can only express regret that the Minister of Justice did not himself direct the proceedings in the case. He informs the House and the country that the appeal was withdrawn without his knowledge, as I understand him to say. Although the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General are not expected to follow closely every case from one end of the Dominion to the other, my hon. friend will understand that in a case of this nature when several other cases of expropriation must follow—

Mr. DOHERTY: My hon. friend will allow me. He understands that this is entirely the business of the Transcontinental Commission and not of the Government directly. They retain their own counsel and direct their own cases, and this is not directly the case of the Government. It is impossible for the Government to know every step in each case.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Of course, I have every confidence that my hon. friend has a splendid grasp of his department—no one better fitted than he to be Minister of Justice. But I must express my surprise at the statement made just now by the hon. minister. He says that these expropriation cases are looked after by the Transcontinental Commission, that the commission has its own counsel and that these cases are followed by that counsel. Well, I have a copy of the case here for the Supreme Court of Canada. I have the factum of the appellant, His Majesty the King, and I see affixed to it the name of J. E. Chapleau, solicitor for the appellant. Now, the appellant is represented by the Attorney General of Canada. The proceedings, it appears, were started by Sir Allen Bristol Aylesworth, His Majesty's Attorney General for the Dominion of Canada on behalf of His Majesty.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is fair to assume that the hon. gentleman knows that the case had to be entered in the name of the Attorney General.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my hon. friend will pardon me, he cannot shift the responsibility of his department to the Railway Commission. This is a case before the courts, and the hon. gentleman is responsible before Parliament and before the country for the administration of justice, and as Attorney General for every case which is pending before the courts as between His Majesty the King and any one of His Majesty's subjects.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have no wish to shirk any responsibility. But whatever that responsibility, the fact is, and I think the hon. gentleman knows it, that the affairs of the Transcontinental railway are by law placed in the hands of a commission, and they cannot institute an action in the name of His Majesty otherwise than in the name of the Attorney General for Canada. But, of course, they do not refer every step in every case to the Minister of Justice—this step any more than another.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I still express my confidence in my hon. friend's judgment, but, at the same time, I must express regret that he takes the position he does. No doubt,

the Transcontinental Commission have many expropriation cases throughout the country, and I warn my hon. friend he must make it a point as Minister of Justice to follow these cases lest the Crown and the country be mulcted. It is my candid opinion, my honest opinion, that the country has been mulcted in the present case, and to such an amount that my hon. friend should have been made aware of the agreement which took place between the respondents and His Majesty the King's solicitor after an appeal had been inscribed in the Supreme Court of Canada. This is one of many cases that will come before the courts, and I warn my hon. friend not to leave the cases entirely to the judgment of a young lawyer, able and honest as he may be, but to follow them very closely himself. There will be a series of cases.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman were acting as counsel in one of those cases, whose instructions would he take, those of the Minister of Justice or those of the Railway Commission?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would certainly take the instructions of the Minister of Justice as being the one responsible to his country and His Majesty the King. When there is something wrong you cannot shift the responsibility from the Minister of Justice to the Railway Commission; the Railway Commission has sins enough to carry. I am surprised that a gentleman of the ability of my hon. friend should try to divide the responsibility when there is a bad case before the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under what statute would the hon. gentleman justify his taking the instructions of the Minister of Justice?

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my hon. friend will read the British North America Act, he will see that the Attorney General for Canada, who is the Minister of Justice, is responsible for any case pending before the courts between His Majesty and any one of His Majesty's subjects. As I said a moment ago, I do not cast any suspicion on my hon. friend. If I have one thing to regret, it is that he did not look after this case. He has just informed the House that he had no knowledge of the withdrawal of the appeal. Knowing the hon. gentleman as I have known him for many years, and recognizing his sterling character, I feel that if he had had a knowledge of that appeal and the circumstances under which it was lodged in the Supreme Court, it would not have been dropped after the respondents and the appellant had made the agreement referred to. Once more I say that I shall await the papers, expressing the hope that nothing wrong will be found in that agreement which was made after the appeal was lodged.

Mr. SEVIGNY; Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. member that this is a substantive motion, and that the speech of the mover closes the debate. Perhaps I should have previously reminded hon. gentlemen that after the speech of the hon. member for Rouville there could be no further debate.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I wanted to speak after the right hon. leader of the Opposition had concluded, but the hon. member for Rouville stood up so quickly that I could not do so. I have only a few words to say.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. SPEAKER: My only desire is to carry out the rules of the House. It may be well for hon. members to say 'go on' now, but there may be other times when they will say the reverse. I am doing what I conceive to be my duty in the premises, and therefore I must rule that the debate be closed.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think the hon. member for Rouville intended to close the debate by his last remarks. I think he was only answering an assertion made by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Rouville moved a substantive motion and, according to the rule, after he speaks in answer to any observation addressed to the House on that motion, the debate is closed.

Motion agreed to.

RELEASE OF GEROLMIO FATSARI.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved:

For a copy of all papers and documents concerning the release of one Gerolmio Fatsari, who was sentenced for attempted murder in Montreal in March 1908.

He said: The circumstances connected with this matter bring to my mind some of the chapters in Les Miserables of Victor Hugo. This case has occupied the attention of the country since December 25 last. Gerolmio Fatsari is an Italian who arrived in Montreal from Naples about six years ago ago. Shortly after his arrival he was arrested, charged with attempted murder. His trial took place, and on the evidence of three men he was found guilty by the jury and

sentenced to a term of fifteen years—I forget the exact number—in the penitentiary at St. Vincent de Paul. As I have just said, Fatsari was convicted on the evidence of three persons. Since his conviction and his subsequent incarceration in the penitentiary, one of the witnesses suffered the death penalty, another is serving a sentence in the penitentiary at Dorchester, N.B., and the other is a fugitive from justice. As soon as the facts were made known to the officers of the Montreal police force a doubt arose in their minds. They paid a visit to the judge who sentenced Gerolmio Fatsari, and after reading over the evidence the judge found that a judicial error had possibly been committed. It was many years before that discovery was made, but I am pleased to say that as soon as the judge referred the matter to the hon. Minister of Justice he, examining carefully the records, granted a pardon to the poor Italian who had been behind the walls at St. Vincent de Paul during those long years. On December 24 the news of his pardon was broken to him by the warden of St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, and he was given a suit of clothes and a railway ticket to take him back to Montreal, where he had been arrested five years before.

He was found stranded on the streets of Montreal the next day—perfectly helpless, penniless, and sick. He went to the police station, where five years before he had been taken, and revealed his identity. Before the officers he appeared as a perfect stranger in that great metropolis. That was on Christmas Day. I need not say that the policemen of Montreal were glad to receive poor Fatsari in their midst, and to share with him the good things that were plentiful on their table that day; they were glad to give him a roof under which he could have a little rest. The wife of Fatsari, and his children left Canada soon after the verdict and sentence, and it is a matter of public knowledge how Fatsari was helped by means of the campaign carried on by the newspapers in Montreal and throughout the country, I am pleased to say that some of the charitable institutions in Montreal, and the Italian Consul himself, did something to relieve the anxiety of this unfortunate Italian during the month of January. I need not read to my hon. friend what has been published in the press. I am quite sure that he has been made aware of the general complaints through Canada against the dura lex sed lex with which the Crown, unfortunately, has been obliged to meet the demand of compensation made by Fatsari's friend: It is stated, Mr. Speaker, that the King can do no wrong. That is a beautiful theory, but in practice it is not always true, and in the present instance that theory seems to many but a contemptible subterfuge. Surely my hon. friend knows that King Charles himself did so much wrong that he lost his head at Whitehall, surrounded by the arquebuses and pikes of Cromwell's Roundheads. But, Sir, in a case of this kind, where a foreigner—and it might have been a Canadian— has been deprived of his liberty, of his home, and deprived temporarily of what is dearer than his liberty and his home—his honour—should we not, I say, find a way for compensating such a man? I put the case to my hon. friend, and I await with anxiety the answer which he has to give not only to society, but above all to the unfortunate Fatsari. My hon. friend might perhaps say as in the olden days: fiat justitia ruat coelum—let justice be done though the heavens fall. But in the present instance, if I had to translate the old Latin axiom, I would say, let injustice be done though the heavens fall! In this twentieth century, the theories of the middle ages are passing away. The theory that the King can do no wrong in such a case as the one I have brought to the attention of the House, can not obtain; and I ask my hon. friend what he intends to do in the case of Fatsari and in the case of other Fatsaries who may in the future be found in the same position as this man. My hon. friend remembers the case of Adolph Beck in England; and there was a more recent case in England—I forget the name. There has been considerable public resentment in the old country, as there is at present in this country, against the stand taken by the Crown that the King can do no wrong, even when a man deprived of his home, of his liberty, of his family, and honour, is, after five years spent behind the walls of a penitentiary, found innocent.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY: There is no doubt that there is very much in the case of this unfortunate man Fatsari to attract sympathy, and there is no doubt that he has received very great sympathy from a large number of people who have learned the facts of his case, as they have been very generally stated. While such statement of the facts, as I have referred to as having been very generally made, which statement is in accord practically with the facts as the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) under-

stands them, has attracted a large measure of sympathy, and while, even in view of the facts, as I think I shall be called upon to more correctly state them, the unfortunate Fatsari is undoubtedly deserving of all sympathy, it is nevertheless my duty to point out that the Crown, so far as Canada is concerned, has never taken up the position that it was called upon to justify any conduct upon its part by resorting to the maxim, The King can do no wrong. I am at a loss as to the source of the hon. gentleman's information that this Government has taken up that attitude as a justification of some action of its own, or, in any way in connection with the case of Fatsari. The hon. member complains that Fatsari was the victim of a judicial error, and, as I understand it, he puts before this Government and this House that by reason of that fact, this Government should make compensation to Fatsari for the judicial error for which he alleges the Government is responsible. Let me point out at the very outset that Fatsari's trial and the verdict against Fatsari which consigned him to the penitentiary, were entirely at the instance of the Crown in the right of the province of Quebec. The entire prosecution was a prosecution at the instance of the provincial authorities. In bringing that prosecution they did their simple duty. I am not saying that they are responsible for it as imputing any fault under the circumstances as they stood at that date. It is not denied that the facts that they had before them were such as not merely justified them but called upon them to perform their duty of putting the criminal law in operation. Over that entire action the Government of Canada had absolutely no control. They had nothing to do with what was done, they could have nothing to do with what was done. The entire share of Canada and of the Parliament of Canada was that the Parliament of Canada had enacted the criminal law which made certain acts on the part of people a certain offence and provided a certain penalty for that offence. It was the duty of the province to administer that law, and in the performance of that duty the provincial authorities brought Fatsari to trial. Whether they were right or wrong this Government, and the Crown in the right of Canada, can have no responsibility. He was brought to trial before a provincial court, he was tried before that court by a jury of his peers, and upon the evidence laid before them they found him guilty of an offence which, under the law, subjected him to a particular penalty. The judge in the performance of his duty imposed that penalty, and this man underwent a certain portion of it. If my memory serves me, the sentence was for fifteen years. He served seven or eight years of the sentence.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Six.

Mr. DOHERTY: He at all events served a certain substantial portion of that sentence. What I want to make perfectly clear is that for all of that, and in the bringing about of that situation, the Government of Canada had absolutely no responsibility for it, and had absolutely no part in it. My hon. friend says that the verdict and the sentence following upon it constitute a judicial error. I shall have a word to say in regard to that proposition in a moment, but let us assume for the moment that my hon. friend is perfectly correct in that; I ask him who should bear the consequences of that judicial error other than the parties who brought that prosecution and who, therefore, if there were any error giving rise to a right for compensation, are the persons who ought to compensate for the error committed.

As far as the unfortunate man is concerned, he has all of my sympathy, but the case that is put forward is, in effect, a complaint, not that there was a malicious prosecution, but that there was a mistaken prosecution. I do not want to go into the question whether that was a mistaken prosecution or not, but surely, if they were mistaken in that prosecution, the responsibility is on the Crown in the right of the province of Quebec, who instituted and carried on that prosecution and brought it to the termination which came about. In doing that the province of Quebec, in my judgment, were merely doing their duty, and I do not want to discuss the question whether they, having done their duty, should be held responsible or not. All I want to point out is that if this unfortunate man suffered by an error entitling him to compensation, his compensation should come from those who, unfortunately, were led into that error, and who, acting, as I think, in perfect good faith, brought about that trial which resulted in a judicial error. Why it should be suggested that a Government that not only had nothing to do with it, but which, if it had wanted to stop it, could not have stopped it, a Government that had absolutely no control over these proceedings,

should be compelled to compensate for the mistake, for the judicial error, that occurred in a case at the instance of the Crown in the right of the province of Quebec against this man Fatsari, is more than I can understand. I confess that I cannot see upon what ground it is put up to this Government, even assuming this to be a case where the man should be compensated for what happened, to compensate him. If the hon. gentleman is right in his view that there was a judicial error, and a judicial error of that kind constitutes a proper ground why those responsible for it should make compensation to the victim, then his representations should be addressed to the Government of the province of Quebec. I am quite satisfied that whatever view that Government may entertain as to whether the facts, as the hon. gentleman states them, constitute a case for compensation, they will not repudiate the proposition that the proceedings themselves were at their instance. They did it all. I am not trying to throw the slightest blame upon the provincial authorities. Under the circumstances, as they were then known to the officers, there was no course open to them but to prosecute.

So far I have proceeded upon the assumption that it has been demonstrated that there was a judicial error. Upon that subject I do not think that the hon. gentleman's information is complete. What happened in the case was this: The man was charged with the offence which the hon. gentleman has mentioned. He was brought to trial, and at that trial there was adduced evidence which, if it were true, would undoubtedly justify the verdict that was found against this man. I have not heard it suggested that the evidence was not ample to justify the conviction of Fatsari. Fatsari was sentenced to the penitentiary in 1908. No petition, no prayer for clemency, no suggestion of the exercise of clemency on his behalf, ever reached the Department of Justice until some time in 1912. Then the unfortunate man himself petitioned for clemency. In that petition he said he did not want to enter upon a discussion of his guilt or innocence; he asked for a reconsideration of his case and for clemency. There was nothing to indicate that the convict himself then considered there had been any miscarriage of justice. I do not want to attach overdue importance to that because a man in that position would probably write such a petition as occurred to his mind.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And especially when couched in language not his mother tongue.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, that is so; he possibly may not have understood fully what was in it. I do not mention that as attaching any weight to it, further than, that as a matter of fact there was no pretension brought to the attention of the Department of Justice that this man was innocent. Upon that petition which was examined, it was not considered, in view of the gravity of the offence of which the man had been convicted and the length of the sentence and the portion of it which he had served, that it was proper to exercise clemency at that time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is six o'clock, and I understand the leader of the Opposition intends to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The debate had better be adjourned; otherwise the matter would not again come up for some considerable period of time.

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

At six o'clock the House adjourned without question put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, February 5, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE (Maisonneuve) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 50, to amend the Criminal Code. He said: This Bill is what I might call a double-barrelled measure, in the sense that while it deals with two distinct subjects, and amends the Criminal Code in regard to each of them, there is a certain affinity between those subjects. The general purpose of the Bill is to extend a larger measure of protection to Canadian citizens against the indiscriminate use of fire-arms, and the not less dangerous employment of certain modern contrivances whereby the characters of private individuals as well as the just secrets of deliberative meetings may be publicly exposed. When the Bill reaches its second reading I shall have occasion to dwell more fully upon its details. For the purposes, however, of immediate explanation I will just

touch generally upon the two clauses thereof, and state the reasons of public interest that are behind each of them. The first clause aims at preventing employers of labour, either in person or through their agents, from employing on their works or premises any man or men who carry arms. A proviso to the clause safeguards the watchman, who has a license to carry weapons, as provided for by section 118 of the Criminal Code. As general principles are more easily understood when illustrated by concrete cases, I will take, as an example, the riots and bloodshed that marked the troubles in Buckingham a few years ago. There we find a man armed and employed by a company to protect its property, apparently, but really to enforce its impositions on the discontented workmen. That armed man fired and killed one of those connected with the strike. What has been the sequel? That same man, only a few weeks ago, in Montreal, broke into a house, shot at a woman, killed a child, fled from justice, and, when about to be arrested, shot himself dead. Imagine, now, the arming of a character of that kind, and employing him to move about, revolver in pocket, amongst unarmed and unoffending citizens. But some authority must decide when and where it is needful, in the public interest, to arm employed men, or to employ men so armed, upon the works or premises where other men are employed. This Bill leaves the onus of such decision upon the Attorney General of the province wherein such works or premises are situated. He is the lawful guardian of the peace in the province, and upon him rests the responsibility of according the permit without which no employer shall be able to legally employ any armed man or men.

I pass to the second clause of the Bill, which deals with the detectaphone, a new contrivance whereby conversations or deliberations may be recorded and made public afterwards. You can readily see how much the private character, the personal business, or the most intimate deliberations of any man, or any body of men, may by means of this instrument be exposed to violation and injury and ruin perhaps in some cases. The use of the detectaphone unless legally restricted is a menace to society; no man is safe, no family is secure, no organized body is safeguarded, as long as such means of detection and revelation are in existence. The cause relative to the matter has been most carefully drawn.

[Mr. Verville.]

It deals in the first subsection with the use of such contrivances for the purpose of injuring the character of any person or the disclosing of the deliberations of any body. Just let us suppose that in a Masonic Lodge, or Council of Knights of Columbus, or an Orange Lodge, or a C.M.B.A. Council, or even in the Privy Council, over which the Premier presides, such an instrument were made use of—where would be the secrets so jealously guarded from those who have no right to obtain them? I need but mention the case to have it clearly understood without the necessity of any more elaborate explanations. Subsection 2 deals with the publication of the records of such detectaphones or similar instruments. As in the instance of the employment of armed men so in this case, the Bill leaves to the Attorney General of the province the power to accord the necessary permit allowing such publication, and he becomes the judge as to whether or not such publication is in the general interest of the public. I am fully aware that this detectaphone is used by lawfully authorized persons for the purposes of detecting crime and frauds; and to make it clear that we do not desire to interfere in any way with the prevention or punishment of crime, the third subsection most clearly states that nothing in this section shall be held to prevent or restrict the use of the detectaphone or other like contrivance in the detection of crime or fraud. With a pistol or other weapon a man may maim, would, even kill another person; but with the detectaphone he can destroy another's life, good name, character and future; he can bring ruin upon whole families, disturbance into communities, strife between neighbours; he can render impossible the carrying on of social affairs; he can do injury to any lawfully organized or constituted body in the country; he can militate against the liberty of the subject—in a word, it is questionable which of the two, the revolver or the detectaphone, is the more deadly menace to society.

This brief statement or explanation will, I trust, suffice at this stage of the measure. When the Bill is printed and distributed hon. members of the House will have ample opportunity of studying its details and its construction. I am convinced of the vital importance of placing on the statute-book restrictions such as this Bill provides.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUND.

*Mr. EMMERSON:

1. What was the amount to the credit of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund under the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act on the 1st day of October, A.D. 1911, and what proportion of said balance has been contributed by the Intercolonial railway and the Prince Edward Island railway, and the employees of the said railways respectively?

2. What was the amount to the credit of the said fund on the 1st day of October, A.D. 1912, and what was the amount paid into said fund during the period between October 1, A.D. 1911, and October, A.D. 1912, the last date excluded and the first included, and what proportionate amounts of said payments during said period of twelve months had been contributed by the said railways respectively, what proportionate amounts were contributed by the employees of said ralways respectively, and what was the amount paid out of said fund during said twelve months?

3. What was the amount to the credit of the said fund on the 1st day of October, A.D. 1913, and what was the amount paid into said fund during the period between October 1, A.D. 1912, and October 1, A.D. 1913, the last named date excluded and the first date included, and what were the proportionate amounts contributed during said period of twelve months, by the said railways respectively and by the employees of said respective railways, and what amount was paid out of said fund during said last named period?

4. What was the amount to the credit of the said fund on the 1st day of January, A.D. 1914, and what was the amount paid into said fund between the 1st day of October, A.D. 1913, inclusive, and the 1st day of January, A.D. 1914, exclusive, in what proportionate amounts were the contributions made by the said railways and the employees thereof respectively during said last mentioned period, and what amount was paid out of said fund under the provisions of said Act during said last named period?

5. Have any retirements been made under the provisions of said Act since the 31st day of December, A.D. 1913, or arranged for to take effect in the near future? If so, who were the employees so retired or arranged to be retired under the provisions of said Act, what were the positions held by them respectively, where were they respectively employed, and where did they reside respectively, and if any such retirements were so made or arranged for, what would be the amount of the burden entailed on said fund by such retirements so made or arranged for, if any?

6. Have any retirements been made or arranged for under the provisions of the said Provident Fund Act since January 1, A.D. 1913, to the present date without application from the parties so retired, or whose retirement has been arranged for? If so, what are the names and addresses of the employees requested, if any, to apply for their retirement under the said Act, and without their voluntarily applying to be retired under said Act?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. (a) The amount to the credit of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund, under the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act on the 1st day of October, A.D. 1911, was $286,008.11.

(b) Of this amount $131,801.49 was contributed by the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways; $131,801.49 by the employees of the said railways, and $22,405.13 was for interest and refunds.

2. (a) The amount to the credit of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund on the 1st day of October, A.D. 1912, was $322,894.46.

(b) The amount paid into the said fund during the period between October, A.D. 1911, and September 30, A.D. 1912, was $174,770.35. Of this amount $82,612.45 was contributed by the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways; $82,612.45 by the employees of the said railways, and $9,545.45 was for interest and refunds. Of the above total $78,091.30 was contributed by the Intercolonial railway and $4,521.15 was contributed by the employees of the Prince Edward Island railway.

(c) The amount paid out of said fund during the said 12 months was $137,884.

3. (a) The amount to the credit of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund on the 1st day of October, A.D. 1913, was $364,068.16.

(b) The amount paid into the said fund during the period between October 1, A.D. 1912, and September 30, A.D. 1913, was $196,698. Of this amount $87,956.77 was contributed by the Intercolonial railway, $4,840.70 was contributed by the Prince Edward Island railway, $87,956.77 was contributed by the employees of the Intercolonial railway, $4,840.70 was contributed by the employees of the Prince Edward Island railway, and $11,103.06 was for interest and refunds.

(c) The amount paid out of the said fund during the above period was $155,524.30.

4. (a) The amount to the credit of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund on the 1st day of January, A.D. 1914, was $371,581.97.

(b) The amount paid into the said fund between the 1st day of October, A.D. 1913, and the 31st day of December, A.D. 1913,

was $50,510.50. Of the amount $23,871.46 was contributed by the Intercolonial railway, $1,219.79 was contributed by the Prince Edward Island railway, $23,871.46 was contributed by the employees of the Intercolonial railway, $1,218.79 was contributed by the employees of the Prince Edward Island railway, and $330 was for interest and refunds.

(c) The amount paid out of the said fund during the above period was $42,996.69.

5. No.

6. No.

PURCHASES OF LIVE STOCK.

Mr. ROBB:

1. How many, and what breed, of sheep have been purchased by the Department of Agriculture in the province of Quebec, for farm or breeding purposes during the year 1913?

2. What is the name and address of each seller?

3. What is the name and address of each agent or representative through whom purchase was made?

4. What was the highest and lowest price paid?

5. Was a commission paid for purchase of examination? If so, to whom and how much?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. There were 13 sheep comprised of the following breeds purchased in the province of Quebec by the Department of Agriculture during the year 1913: Cheviot, Leicester, Oxford-Down, Shropshire, South-Down.

2. The names and addresses of the sellers are as follows: Guy Carr, Compton Station, Que.; J. H. M. Parker, Lennoxville, Que.; H. E. Baldwin, Coaticook, Que.; Albert C. Ralfe, Lime Ridge, Que.; H. C. Bailey, Birchton, Que.

3. The name and address of the representative through whom purchase was made is J. A. McClarey, Hillhurst, Que.

4. The highest price paid was $25. The lowest price paid was $10.

5. Purchase was made by a representative of the Live Stock Branch, and no commission was paid.

Mr. ROBB:

1. How many, and what breed, of cattle have been purchased by the Department of Agriculture in the province of Quebec, for farm or breeding purposes during the year 1913?

2. What is the name and address of each seller?

3. What is the name and address of each agent or representative through whom purchase was made?

4. What was highest and lowest price paid?

5. Was a commission paid for purchase or examination? If so, to whom, and how much?

[Mr. Cochrane.]

Mr. BURRELL:

1. No cattle was purchased by the Department of Agriculture in the province of Quebec for farm or breeding purposes during the year 1913.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

5. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. ROBB:

1. How many, and what breed, of horses, have been purchased by the Department of Agriculture in the province of Quebec, for farm or breeding purposes during the year 1913?

2. What is the name and address of each seller?

3. What is the name and address of each agent or representative through whom purchase was made?

4. What was the highest and lowest price paid?

5. Was a commission paid for purchase or examination? If so, to whom and how much?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Five French-Canadian horses were purchased by the Experimental Farms Branch of the Department of Agriculture in the province of Quebec during the year 1913. Two horses, a Percheron and a Clydesdale, have been purchased by the Department of Agriculture in the province of Quebec by the Live Stock Branch thereof during the year 1913.

2. The names and addresses of the sellers of the horses purchased by the Experimental Farms Branch are as follows: Eugene Bernier, Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Que.; L. P. Sylvestre, St. Theodore d'Acton, Bagot county, Que.; Jos. Roche, St. Elizabeth, Joliette county, Que.; Pierre Lavallée, St. Norbert, Berthier county, Que. The name and addresses of the sellers of the horses purchased by the Live Stock Branch are as follows: Sam. Campbell, Cookshire, Que.; N. S. Inghram, Hillhurst, Que.

3. The names and addresses of each agent or representative through whom purchase was made in the case of the Experimental Farms Branch are as follows: 1 mare bought through L. P. Sylvestre, St. Theodore d'Acton, Bagot county, Que. The remainder were purchased through a representative of the Experimental Farms Branch. In the case of those purchased by the Live Stock Branch, the name of J. A. McClarey, of Hillhurst, Que., has been given as the agent through whom the horses were purchased.

4. In the case of the Experimental Farms Branch, the highest price paid was $400, and the lowest $240. In the case of the

Live Stock Branch the highest price paid was $800 and the lowest $400.

5. No commissions were paid.

Mr. ROBB:

1. How many, and what breed, of swine have been purchased by the Department of Agriculture in the province of Quebec, for farm or breeding purposes during the year 1913?

2. What is the name and address of each seller?

3. What is the name and address of each agent or representative through whom purchase was made?

4. What was the highest and lowest price paid?

5. Was a commission paid for purchase or examination? If so, to whom and how much?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. There were five swine, comprised of the following breeds, purchased in the province of Quebec by the Department of Agriculture during the year 1913: Yorkshire, Chester White.

2. The names and addresses of each seller are as follows: J. A. McClarey, Hillhurst, Que., T. F. Owens, Stonefield, Que., A. B. Waldron, Coaticook, Que.

3. The name and address of the representative through whom purchase was made is J. A. McClarey, Hillhurst, Que.

4. The highest price paid was $20; the lowest price paid was $20.

5. Purchase was made by a representative of the Live Stock Branch, and no commission was paid.

STEAM TRAWLING.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has the Government taken any action since the close of last session of Parliament to prohibit steam trawling on the Atlantic coast of Canada?

2. Have any foreign steam trawlers, not being licensed and not being thereto permitted by treaty or convention for the time being in force, purchased coal or other supplies at any Canadian port or ports since the enactment of chapter 14 of the Act of 1913? If so, what are the names of such trawlers?

3. (a) Have any foreign fishing sailing vessels, not holding modus vivendi licenses, purchased bait or other supplies in any Canadian port since the passing of said chapter 14? (b) If so, have any prosecutions been brought?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. On account of the vigilance that was exercised in following the operations of steam trawlers, there have during the past year been no well founded complaints of these vessels fishing in our waters.

2. No.

3. (a) Yes. (b) No.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—WAGES OF LABOURERS.

Mr. BOULAY:

What wages are paid to labourers employed on the working trains in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia?

Mr. COCHRANE: Wages paid to labourers on the Intercolonial railway working trains in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are from $1.50 to $1.80 per day. This rate varies in different localities and at different seasons of the year, but employees are always paid the rate prevailing in the locality in which they are employed.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. What are the names of the employees of the Intercolonial railway appointed chiefs of offices, superintendents or superior officers, since September 21, 1911?

2. What salary is paid to each of them?

3. What were their situations and what places did they come from prior to their appointment to such offices?

4. How many French-speaking employees are there in the offices of the Intercolonial at Monction, and what are their respective salaries?

Mr. COCHRANE:

Name.	Title.	Salary.	Previous Position.
		$ cts.	
W. B. Mackenzie	Right of Way and Land Agent	333 33	Chief Engineer.
T. C. Burpee	Supt. Engineer	333 33	Engineer of Maintenance.
Fred Condon	Resident Engineer	150 00	Division Engineer.
Hugh Jardine	"	150 00	"
C. W. Archibald	Roadmaster	150 00	"
H. H. Melanson	General Passenger Agent	250 00	Asst. Passenger Agent.
D. M. Condon	District Passenger Agent	150 00	Chief Clerk G.P.A.
Donald McDonald	" "	225 00	District Supt.
W. T. Huggin	" "	166 66	Auditor and Account. P.E.I.
E. Tiffin	General Western Agent	175 00	General Traffic Manager.
S. G. Tiffin	Division Freight Agent	175 00	General Agent.
H. H. Schaeffer	" "	175 00	Division Freight Agent.
A. E. Wilkinson	" "	175 00	Chief Clerk G.F.A.
A. McDonald	" "	140 00	" Supt.
Geo. Fernley	Commercial Agent	135 00	Freight Solicitor.
R. Colclough	Superintendent	233 33	Assistant to General Supt.
E. L. Desjardins	Assistant Superintendent	175 00	Chief Despatcher.
W. R. Fitzmaurice	" "	175 00	Station Master.
R. S. Richardson	" "	175 00	Yard Master.
L. S. Brown	Superintendent	225 00	Assistant Supt.
W. A. Fitch	Assistant Superintendent	175 00	Chief Train Despatcher.
W. B. Fleming	" "	175 00	" "
F. X. Halle	B. and B. Master	130 00	Foreman Carpenter.
E. Savage	"	130 00	"
D. A. Seaman	"	130 00	"
W. P. Mills	"	130 00	Roadmaster.
A. B. Gorham	Roadmaster	130 00	Foreman.
Jas. Hamilton	"	130 00	"
Geo. Cooper	"	130 00	"
H. Spinney	"	130 00	"
A. E. Wellwood	"	130 00	Inspector.
J. C. Fullmore	"	130 00	Foreman.
W. E. Barees	Master Mechanic	160 00	Master Mechanic.
W. U. Appleton	General Master Mechanic	300 00	Asst. to Supt. M. P.
H. W. Sharpe	Master Mechanic	160 00	Acting Master Mechanic.
H. W. MacKenzie	"	160 00	Geneal Locomotive Foreman.
T. W. Hennessey	"	160 00	Engineman.
Jos. Graham	Locomotive Shops Supt	150 00	Foreman Erecting Shop.
A. B. MacDonald	Car Shop Supt	150 00	General Car Foreman.

HORSE BREEDING.

Mr. ROBB:

Is it the intention of the Government to continue this year the bonus to thoroughbred horses?

Mr. BURRELL: The Government has under consideration the question of the form by which it is advisable to assist the horse breeding industry, including thoroughbreds.

BASSANO POST OFFICE SITE.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has any land been donated to the Government for a post office site in the town of Bassano, Alberta? If so, by whom, and where is it situated?

2. What was the reason for the Government failing, as alleged, to carry out its promise to build this post office last year?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to commence construction of this building this spring?

[Mr. Boulay.]

Mr. REID.

1. (a) Yes; (b) by the town, on the corner of Third avenue and Third street.

2. It took time to complete the title; obtain information as to space required by different departments; prepare plans and specification, and call for tenders to award contract.

3. Yes.

SHIPMENTS OF GRAIN.

Mr. DEVLIN:

What was the quantity of grain shipped by lake from Fort William and Port Arthur in 1911, 1912 and 1913?

Mr. FOSTER: 1911, 95,182,011 bushels; 1912, 135,545,946 bushels; 1913, 187,168,088 bushels.

MONTREAL COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

Mr. PROULX:

1. What is the amount of the grant made by the Government to the Montreal Society of Colonization?

2. When was the money paid?
3. Was any part of this money employed in travelling expenses of the members of the above society?
4. How was this money spent?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. La Société Genèrale de Colonization et de Rapatriement de la province de Québec, Montreal. province of Quebec, received a grant from the Government of $4,000 for 1913-14.
2. August 12, 1913.
3. Yes.
4. Sending officials to France and Belgium in the interests of immigration to Canada.

THE FENIAN RAID.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. What was the total number of men, women and children in Canada at the time of the Fenian raid?
2. What was the total number, by provinces, at that time, capable of bearing arms?

Mr. FOSTER:

1. 3,288,161. This estimate for 1866 is based on the ratio of increase established by the figures of 1871 over those of 1861, for the four provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.
2. 861,164, as follows: Ontario, 404,179; Quebec, 293,082; Nova Scotia, 92,871; New Brunswick, 71,032.

CUSTOMS APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. KYTE:

1. How many persons have been appointed to the outside customs service since September, 1911?
2. Of such persons, how many have since been transferred to the inside customs service without passing the Civil Service examination?
3. What are their names, and what salaries do they enjoy respectively?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. 768.
2. None.
3. None.

ST. ESPRIT LIGHTKEEPER.

Mr. KYTE:

1. When did Alex. W. Finlayson, keeper of light on St. Esprit island, Richmond county, N.S., resign?
2. Has another lightkeeper been appointed?
3. Who is in charge of the light at the present time?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. By letter dated November 21, 1913.
2. No.
3. Mr. Alex. Ferguson.

ALBERTA INTERNAL ELEVATORS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. How many internal storage elevators will be located in Alberta?
2. At what points will they be located?
3. When will they be placed under construction?

Mr. FOSTER:

1. During the year 1914, one elevator will be erected in Alberta.
2. At Calgary.
3. As soon as matters in reference to site are adjusted preparations for construction will begin.

HULL INLAND REVENUE RECEIPTS.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. What are the receipts, if any, from Inland Revenue at Hull?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to erect a building for Inland Revenue at Hull?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. For the fiscal year ended March 31, 1913, $1,098.12; for the nine months ended December 31, 1913, $786.63; total, $1,884.75.
2. The Department of Inland Revenue has no knowledge of a building to be erected in Hull and has received no request to that effect.

MAIL BAG LOCKS.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many new mail locks, patented under No. 151043, have been purchased by the Post Office Department since 19th March, 1913?
2. What is the price paid for each lock?
3. What is the name of the firm from whom purchased?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. None.
2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

THREE RIVERS PREVENTIVE OFFICER.

Mr. BUREAU:

1. Have instructions been given by the Minister of Customs or his officers, to notify Isai Dufresne, Preventive officer at the port of Three Rivers, that his services would not be required after February 1, 1914, but that if he should give his resignation on or before the 15th of January, 1914, he would be allowed three months gratuity to May 1, 1914, under leave of absence?
2. Were such instructions in writing? If so, by whom were they signed and at whose request?
3. Has any recommendation been made by anyone concerning Mr. Dufresne's successor? If so, who is or was recommended, and by whom?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. No instructions were given to notify Isai Dufresne, preventive officer of customs

at the port of Three Rivers, that his services would not be required after February 1, 1914. The collector of customs at Three Rivers intimated to Mr. Dufresne that if he tendered his resignation the question of granting him three months leave of absence to May 1, 1914, with pay, would be considered.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. There is no official correspondence on file regarding a successor to Mr. Dufresne.

TRADE AND COMMERCE BULLETIN.

Mr. McCRANEY:

What persons in the electoral district of Saskatoon receive the bulletin of the Department of Trade and Commerce?

Mr. FOSTER: Cahill & Telford: the Commissioner Board of Trade; Prof. H. Culter, University of Saskatoon; Dominion Sales Corporation; Vernon Grant; Kilvert Bros.; the Saskatoon Forwarding and Storage Co.; Dr. Edmund H. Oliver, University of Saskatoon; J. Hollis Yates.

THE STEAMER ALERT.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to a telegram which I have received from a responsible party in Halifax. That telegram reads:

North Sydney despatch says that the Alert sailed again yesterday for North Victoria carrying R. H. Butts and H. D. Maclean and two other political operators.

In view of the discussion of the other night, the assurance given by the minister, and the facts which were made plain to the House that there was no possible excuse for the steamer going north in connection with the customs, will the minister not telegraph to the proper authorities in Sydney directing that she shall not go north again under the circumstances, and ascertain the truth of the statement that these men were on her when she went yesterday.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): I made inquiries from the chief preventive officer as to why this steamer did make the trips to Neil's harbour on the date on which the discussion took place. For your information I shall read the memorandum which has been sent me, showing why the steamer took the first trip to Neil's harbour. The statement is:

On 20th December last Customs Officer Young telegraphed from North Sydney that American fishing schooner Laverna had been fishing within three mile limit at Neil's harbour—that collector of customs had sworn statement signed by five shore fishermen to this effect, and that he despatched cruiser Alert to investigate. Officer Young the same day forwarded two explanatory reports in writing. The contents of said telegram were transferred to the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service for necessary attention.

Meanwhile Officer Young on 22nd December was instructed to forward copies of sworn statements signed by the fishermen.

On 27th December copy of Officer Young's report of 20th December, together with copy of letter from the customs officer at Neil's harbour and copy of the affidavit of the fishermen, was transferred to the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service for his further information.

On the 15th the Deputy Minister of Naval Service wrote enclosing extract and asking for additional details. On the 16th of January, a copy of the extract was forwarded to Mr. Young.

Mr. MACDONALD: This is not in regard to smuggling.

Mr. REID: I want to show why the officer went. On the 20th of January the officer replied that he was despatching the Alert to get all possible information, and on the 23rd of January, officer Young received orders to send the Alert to Neil's harbour, as soon as weather would permit, for the purpose of obtaining all further information possible. On the 23rd of January, when the weather conditions were somewhat unfavourable, the Alert went as far as Ingonish and arrived at Neil's harbour on the 26th of January, but the sea was too rough to permit of the vessel remaining there for the purpose of obtaining the necessary information, and she returned to North Sydney to await more favourable weather. That was the time she took these gentlemen on board, and officer Young has made a report that the vessel took on board two flour barrels and one case. It was not at all likely that there was only whisky in the flour barrels.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. REID: I may say that I had the chief preventive officer wire Mr. Young on the 4th of February as follows:

Where is the Alert now? Do not allow her to take any more passengers or freight at any time without instructions from Ottawa.

I got this telegram in reply to-day:

Alert left here this afternoon for Neil's harbour via Ingonish. Took number passengers with their luggage. Aspy, regular boat on this route laid up. Captain has instructions secure all information possible re Laverna.

I felt that in taking on baggage he was exceeding his authority in view of the in-

structions that had been sent down. Accordingly I gave instructions to the chief preventive officer, and the following messages were sent.

Angus Young,
Customs Officer, North Sydney, N.S.
You are hereby notified that you are suspended from office.
(Sgd.) W. F. Wilson,
Chief Preventive Officer of Customs.

The other telegram sent to Mr. W. N. McDonald read:

The Alert is hereby ordered out of commission from to-day.
(Sgd.) W. F. Wilson,
Chief Preventive Officer of Customs.

I think, therefore, that so far as the Customs Department is concerned, we have done everything we could, as I said before we had no knowledge of the affair from the start.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister ascertained the fact that there was no object in sending the Alert north for the purpose of preventing smuggling. It was not alleged there were any smugglers.

Mr. REID: I mentioned the other day that I supposed that was the reason, but after getting the papers from the chief officer I see the reason was that a vessel had been fishing within the three-mile limit.

Mr. MACDONALD: Not on acount of smuggling on the 20th of December last.

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. FRANK OLIVER: I would like to direct the attention of the Minister of the Interior to a paragraph appearing in the morning papers, stating that instructions had been sent to Winnipeg to enter an action in the courts to annul the sale of St. Peter's Indian Reserve. I would be glad if the minister would give the House a short statement for the reason of the action taken, and the purpose intended to be served.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Superintendent General of Indian Affairs): I may say in answer, that this has been a very much vexed question. As the hon. member knows, it engaged the attention of Parliament when he was minister, and the validity of the surrender was challenged in the House at that time. The Manitoba Government appointed a Royal Commission to investigate the conditions of the surrender and other matters pertaining to the disposal of St. Peter's Indian reserve. The majority report stated that the surrender was not a legal one on several grounds. There was also a minority report by one member, Judge Myers, who did not agree with his colleagues on the commission. As a result of the majority report, the registrar of the province of Manitoba would not register any titles to the lands disposed of. A deputation waited on me prior to the Christmas holidays, urging me to expedite the settlement of this matter, and after consultation with my colleagues, and especially with the Minister of Justice, it was deemed wise to enter action in the courts of Manitoba to test the validity of the surrender. That action is now in the hands of the Minister of Justice. The article the hon. member refers to is substantially correct.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the case of the Government? Against whom does it enter action?

Mr. ROCHE: That is more a question for my colleague the Minister of Justice, but I may say that it is to find out whether the surrender that was taken on that occasion was a legal surrender. As the Royal Commission had pronounced it an illegal surrender, we thought we would test it in the courts of Manitoba and have a final decision.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the department attacking or defending the surrender?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask what is the nature of the action?

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps it would be more regular if the questions were put on the Order Paper. The minister would then have time to formulate his answer.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I have no objection whatever to answering the question. The action seeks to have the surrender declared null for a variety of reasons; partly because it did not comply with the conditions required by law, and partly by reason of the manner in which it was brought about. But the purpose is to have it declared null.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is it an action by the Attorney General of Canada?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In the Supreme Court of Canada?

Mr. DOHERTY: The intention is to bring this action before the courts of Manitoba for adjudication upon the ques-

tion of whether or not the surrender was legal, involving as it does the validity of titles to any lands which may subsequently be transferred.

Mr. MURPHY: Why not take the case to the Exchequer Court?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Or to the Supreme Court?

Mr. DOHERTY: There may be an appeal from the decision of the courts of Manitoba to the Supreme Court, but the Supreme Court is not a court to try a case of this kind.

Mr. OLIVER: Might I ask the Minister of Justice—

Mr. SPEAKER: This procedure of following up question after question is certainly not regular, and I think the better way would be to put the questions on the Order Paper.

Mr. OLIVER: I wanted to ask the Government if they would be good enough to bring down the papers connected with the case without delay and lay them on the table, and whether they would require a motion to that effect.

Mr. ROCHE: Probably the hon. member had better put the motion on the paper, and then we will know exactly what he desires.

INQUIRIES FOR REPORTS AND RETURNS.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. GRAHAM: Might I ask the Minister of Railways if any decision has been given by the Board of Railway Commissioners as to western freight rates, and, if not, has he any idea when such a decision will be given?

Mr. COCHRANE: I could not say. I have consulted with the Chairman, and they are still working at it. I hope it will be down very soon, but I could not give the exact date.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals when he expects the report of the Commission appointed to investigate the Transcontinental railway construction.

Mr. COCHRANE: I thought I would have it this week, but it will be next week before I will be able to bring it down.

Mr. MURPHY: The papers had it last week.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Mr. COCHRANE: I have not seen it yet.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that on the 7th May last I got an Order of the House for a return. The return was brought down the other day, but it is not at all in accordance with the Order of the House. Perhaps I might read the Order:

> For a return showing the total cost of the Elmira branch railway in Prince Edward Island; the total amounts paid the contractors, Whitehead Brothers; the total amount paid by the Government after taking the work off the contractor's hands, and showing the amount paid in wages each month, the names of the men to whom it was paid, the positions they held, and the wages per day to each; also showing what materials were used, each kind and class, with the cost of each, from whom purchased, and when, and the quantities left over, if any.

The return is really of no use in the way in which it is prepared. It is a jumble of figures, which nobody could understand; in fact, even the addition is wrong. I asked for a statement of the quantity of materials supplied after the work was taken off the contractors' hands, from whom obtained, and the prices. In some cases the names are given and the quantities, but in other cases the quantities are given without the names. In some cases an item as small as five cents is mentioned, and then again a large amount is classed under the head of 'sundries.' The return really contains no information that anybody could make use of. The party who prepared it must have known that it was no good. If a clerk in a business office were asked to prepare a statement and submitted anything of that kind to the general manager he would be severely reprimanded, and I think that the parties who prepared this statement should receive a reprimand. This was prepared at Moncton. Is there any one in the department here to whom I could apply who would have power to instruct the parties at Moncton how they should prepare the statements and order them to do so? If there is anybody here who has that power, I will apply to him.

Mr. COCHRANE: I am sorry that the hon. gentleman has been so aggrieved at receiving a return which he alleges not to contain the true facts of the case. I have no knowledge personally of it myself, although I believe it to be prepared according to the question asked. I shall certainly bring it to the attention of those in charge of the matter and convey to them the statement made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The minister says that he believes it is prepared according to the Order of the House. I will submit it to the hon. gentleman himself, and I am sure I will convince him that it is not prepared according to the Order of the House.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I would like to be permitted to call the attention of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) to the fact that somewhere about the middle of last session I asked to have brought down the papers regarding the dismissal of David Shontz, postmaster at Didsbury, Alta. The papers have not, as far as I am aware, come down. I do not think that they can be very difficult to prepare. It is the only dismissal in which I was interested, and I should like if the minister would have the return prepared and brought down.

Mr. PELLETIER: I will inquire about it, and if it has not been brought down I will have it brought down.

HOUSE OF COMMONS POST OFFICE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. SINCLAIR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the necessity of having a post office money order branch in the House of Commons. I understand that the House of Commons is altogether under the control of Your Honour, and that is the reason I mention this to you instead of to the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier). It often happens that members and senators require to send small sums of money through the mail, and it is very inconvenient to have to go to the city post office or to the banks. The messengers are very capable, but it is difficult to make change and also difficult to instruct messengers in regard to these matters. It would be a great convenience to the members of the House if a money order branch were placed within the precincts of the House of Commons.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know how far I have any authority in the premises, but I will endeavour to get information on the subject as far as I can and try to meet the wishes of the members of the House.

Mr. PELLETIER: There has been an understanding that letters could be handled here at the House of Commons, not under the control of the Post Office Department. But the department is very jealous of the money matters. We might come to an understanding by which one of our officials could come here, and thus try to meet the desires of hon. members.

'HANSARD' REPORT.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. OLIVER: I desire to draw attention to a statement with certain comments thereon which have appeared in the Globe recently.

Mr. SPEAKER: It seems to me that this is quite out of order. While under special circumstances it is permissible, when the Orders of the Day are called, for members to ask questions or to refer to papers that are not properly brought down in answer to orders for returns, in my judgment it is not permissible for a member to rise and introduce subject after subject, because that would interfere with the regular work of the House. I am referring to the matter only in the hope that the hon. members will keep a little closer within what is a well understood rule of the House, and thereby facilitate the transaction of business.

Mr. OLIVER: I desire to keep within the rules of the House, but this matter is one concerning the House, and I think it would be in order almost at any time. The comment is in regard to the correctness of the 'Hansard' report, and the allegation is that certain words, expressing a very definite idea and used by one of the members for Prince Edward Island, have
4 p.m. been omitted from the unrevised 'Hansard.' This is surely a matter of sufficient importance to bring before the attention of the House. It is thoroughly understood that 'Hansard,' particularly the unrevised 'Hansard' shall be a verbatim report of what has occurred in the House. If undesirable expressions have been used, it is possible that they may be corrected in the revised 'Hansard.' As I am not on the Debates Committee, I do not know what latitude is allowed in that direction. But, unless 'Hansard' is to be an accurate report of statements made in the House by members when ostensibly expressing their views on behalf of their constituents, it certainly has not the value that has generally been attributed to it. Therefore I think it is only right that this matter should be brought to the attention of the House for the purpose of having it brought in the most public manner to the attention of whatever authority exists having control of the 'Hansard' report.

Mr. CARVELL: What are the words omitted?

Mr. OLIVER: 'Let us dash away and spend the public money.' It may be that the hon. member from Prince Edward Island did not use these words.

Mr. HAZEN: Who alleges that he did?

Mr. OLIVER: The Globe alleges that he did. Its authority should be sufficient to warrant us in drawing attention to the statement. If the Globe has made a mis-statement, it certainly should be corrected. If the Globe has made a correct statement, then 'Hansard' should be corrected.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not permissible to bring into the House a publication or paper contradicting a statement of any member. In my judgment, however, it would be quite proper to draw attention to the matter so that the 'Hansard' staff might be communicated with to ascertain whether they gave a verbatim report according to what they heard in the House.

Mr. OLIVER: That would be my desire.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have heard it rumoured that the 'Hansard' report was corrected in that regard by the member. If that is so, it is a matter which ought to be brought to the attention of the House, and on which the Debates Committee should take immediate action.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will refer the matter to the Debates Committee.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (Peterborough West) moved second reading of Bill No. 2, to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: This Bill is not at all of a revolutionary character, but proposes to amend the Dominion Elections Act so as to bring it into conformity with the spirit of that Act. It will be noticed that by subsection 2 of section 8 of the Dominion Elections Act, being chapter 6 of the Revised Statutes of Canada of 1906, the lists are based upon the provincial voters' lists; that is to say, the provincial voters' lists are adopted, and they shall be, as far as possible, observed and followed. That is the spirit of the qualification necessary to entitle any person to vote in a Dominion election. Section 96, however, which deals with deposits at elections, does not carry out the spirit of the rest of the Act, but requires that there shall be a deposit, no matter what the law is in any particular province. This Bill proposes to amend that and to bring the Dominion Elections Act automatically into conformity with the provincial Act, as it is or is supposed to be in all other respects. That is to say, in a province where no deposit is required by a parliamentary candidate in a provincial election, there shall be no deposit required in a Dominion election; and in a province where there is a deposit or some modification of it required in a provincial election, the Dominion Act shall automatically conform with that also.

This matter, while apparently not of vast importance, is really of importance, in principle at least, to a great many people. I am speaking by the book when I say that the representatives of 100,000 workmen of Canada have requested that at least this measure of reform should be adopted. I am also able to say that a vast majority of the journals of this country have approved of this amendment. This Bill follows strictly the Dominion Elections Act in this respect, and is advancing by slow degrees into conformity with and not as at present in violation of the Dominion Elections Act.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): The proposition of this Bill is not that this Parliament should determine for itself whether, as qualifying a person to present himself as a candidate for election as a member of this House, he should be required to make a deposit or not; the proposition is that we should legislate that, whatever the provinces desire for their respective elections with regard to this question of making a deposit, shall govern with regard to the Dominion election. If I understand the hon. member rightly, he says that that is in accordance with the spirit of the Dominion Elections Act generally, because we under the present system accept the voters' lists as prepared under provincial legislation. I think that the two matters are perfectly distinct. I am prepared to concede that there might be a good deal to be said in favour of the idea of this Government undertaking to determine the matter of the franchise or right to vote but I am not concerned with that for the moment. I would point out that it does not necessarily follow that, because our legislation accepts for use in Dominion elections the voters' lists as prepared by the different provinces, in order to be consistent we should also determine that the qualifica-

tions that the legislatures fix for persons presenting themselves as candidates to become members of such legislatures should determine what are the qualifications candidates should have in order to present themselves for election as members of this House. I think, that for us to leave that to be determined in the different provinces according to the views that these legislatures may entertain as to what requirements they should impose on a candidate for election to the legislature, is highly undesirable. Whether it is or is not desirable that we should require a deposit, it seems to me undesirable that we should leave that question so far as the qualification for this House is concerned, to be determined one way in one province and another way in another province according as the members of the legislatures of these provinces may or may not think a deposit should be required of a candidate for election to the provincial legislature. For my own part, I should be disposed to think the House would act wisely in rejecting the measure that is now proposed.

Motion for second reading of the Bill negatived.

TITLES OF HONOUR.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (Peterborough, West) moved the second reading of Bill No. 3, to abolish titles of honour in Canada. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, seconded by Mr. Lapointe of Kamouraska, I should like to say that there are really two aspects to this question. The first is necessarily the constitutional aspect. Todd, in his Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies says that grants of honours and titles of distinction, like the prerogative of mercy, are extraordinary prerogatives and of exceptional nature, but 'nevertheless this prerogative, like any other function of royalty, must be exercised with the concurrence and upon the responsibility of ministers.' Whatever the Crown may wish to retain or exercise of this prerogative is not in any sense within the purview of this Bill. This Bill deals wholly with the actions of the people and their representatives. The general aspect of this Bill may be referred to somewhat in this way: Modern titles spring from names that were originally names of the occupants of actual offices or those actually following certain occupations. In the course of time, the occupants and the occupations disappeared, leaving their bare names behind. These names have been appropriated by others for ornamental purposes, and have gradually developed into names for the establishment of classes. They are class names. Now, for a democracy to utilize names for the establishment of classes or orders in the democracy is in itself a contradiction in terms and is, I maintain, entirely contrary both to the wish and the spirit of democracy. Moreover, it is unscientific. In this scientific age—and we may refer to it perhaps in that way—it is entirely crude to label an object, 'homo sapiens,' when—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BURNHAM: I knew that a little learned reference would call forth a response from the members of the Opposition, and I am glad their Latin goes so far. I say it is entirely crude to label an object Homo Sapiens when the one so named may be merely a greedy feeder at the public trough, or in fact a member of the protozoa order, the most absolutely undeveloped order of all. That, Sir, I say, is unscientific and objectionable. I do not for one moment pretend that there are not people who have received titles, such as—if I may be allowed the reference—the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who are worthy of any title and who are superior to any title; but that does not make the action less a violation of the principle, nor does it make it less likely for democracy to incur the grave and serious danger of drifting into a possible—not under this Government—sale and purchase of honours. We have lately seen, as history will show, that there has been an alarming condition developed in England. And not merely is it the cable report, but it is the established fact—established by members of parliament—that there have been sales of honours by the people's representatives in England. That is, of course, most detrimental both to the honours and to the people at large. We know from the facts of everyday life that these things are quite possible and indeed probable. In any event, I still adhere strictly to the principle that democracy in itself does not contemplate class honours, and therefore it is a violation of the principle of democracy and of the will of the people that they should be established.

It being universally admitted that virtue is its own reward, it logically follows that all those who desire further reward must, by so much, lack the requisite qualification. It should be open, I maintain to every man and woman, to reach the highest

standard of excellence and esteem without let or hindrance from established customs or the exigencies of government. We know perfectly well that titular honours cannot fittingly be bestowed on people who are too poor to receive them. The consequence is that for the simple virtues of everyday life there have been exchanged what we may euphoniously call the more splendid and showy virtues. I do not think that that is at all desirable, because if there is any class of life that we ought to wish to raise to a high level it is that class which in itself and in its immediate surroundings is deprived of wealth and opportunity. From those who have great means, great wealth, great abilities and good health, much is to be expected, and accordingly to them not much should be awarded. But those people who have poor health, little or no wealth, who live in squalor; who are in a condition, perhaps, of semi-starvation; those people, as I myself know to be the case in many instances, are willing to conform to a lofty standard of virtue, and they demand our recognition. These, we should not pass by.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I have only to say that whatever may be the desirability of the people's representatives bestowing honours upon themselves or recommending themselves for honours; when we see men contemplating their own distinction with such equanimity as to enable them to pin upon their breasts the orders typifying that distinction, we must come to the conclusion that they have gone far past the realization of the basic virtue which should be at the bottom of all our actions.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I was waiting for my hon. friend the Minister of Justice to take up the constitutional side of this matter, upon which I am possibly not so strong as I might be. Aside from the constitutional aspect of the question, there is, I suppose, what we may call the common sense aspect, as well as the theoretic aspect of it. So far as the theory is concerned, I do not quite see what my hon. friend aims at in the first section of the Bill, in which I find these words:

> All titles of honour or honorary titles heretofore created by the Parliament or Government of Canada.

Until I noticed these words, I did not have the idea that the Government of Canada or the Parliament of Canada had ever created any such honorary titles as are probably aimed at by my hon. friend in the Bill. He did not mention those to which he referred.

Mr. BURNHAM: They can be created under the Militia Act for example.

Mr. FOSTER: I had the idea that nowadays those were so common that they were no longer considered so distinctly honorary that they could be aimed at by my hon. friend in this Bill. I am quite aware that for a defenceless layman like myself, surrounded by military men on all sides, to make an assertion like that in this House, is a piece of hardihood which, if I had thought it over a little while longer, I possibly would not have committed. However, we cannot withdraw what goes on 'Hansard'; we had to-day a little lesson with reference to that.

I have not very much to say upon this question except that I think the bestowment of honours comes from the source of all honour, that is, the King; and that we must allow the King to have unrestricted scope as to the selection of persons upon whom to bestow these titles of honour. I do not know that this Parliament, not having the power of originating or controlling; not being the supreme source of power so far as the bestowment of honours is concerned, has anything particular to say about it, or should pass legislation with reference to it. That is my first objection to the passage of a Bill of this kind in this Parliament. With respect to democracy and its demands, and, incidentally, with respect to the old adage which has come to us from early times, 'Virtue is its own reward,' however much veneer or outside appearance of democracy a man or a people may take on, those of us who do not make such open pretensions to democracy are probably quite as really and truly democratic as they are. I am not quite sure that there is not innate in every person an ever-present recognition of the fact that men do differ one from the other, and that there are grades in excellence, and whether an honour is indicated by the aggregate public opinion as expressed by the society in which a man may live, or whether that expression is embodied in the bestowment of a well-earned honour by the King himself, I do not think it is at all a bad thing that a man should be so rated according to his excellence. I believe that that is the spur of all best endeavour. Virtue may be its own reward to one's self in one's own heart and conscience, but the reward is better

applied and more effective when it is read into the conviction and thought of his neighbours—those who know him—and assumes the quality of conferment of an estimate of him. I feel that a man who is trying to live right and do right is helped in every way if he has the consciousness, whether written or unwritten, of being held in esteem by those who know him, and consequently of having a mark of appreciation placed upon him. In the same way, if a man serves the State and serves it well, I do not think the State is injured, and I do no think the man himself is injured if a recognition of his services is made by the bestowment of an honour upon him. Whilst we stand upon that ground, we all have to admit that it is possible that even kings may err in the bestowment of honours, but I hold that that does not militate against the general principle, and it is on the general principle that I am basing this argument. The exception is present everywhere, and is said generally to prove the rule; in this case I think it does. I also have some little objection to this Bill being passed at this time because I have some very worthy friends on the other side of the House, who, I know, may very well aspire to have the eye of the bestower of these gifts pass benignly and rest for a time upon themselves. I should not be so ungenerous as to vote that in the opinion of this Parliament these honours should not be bestowed; it would not be quite fair to these deserving friends of mine on the other side. For myself and for hon. gentlemen on this side, we are so democratic that we have no aspirations in that line and therefore we could afford to let the Bill go. While I have in part treated this subject lightly, I do not wish to have it understood that I do not feel perfectly convinced in my own mind that is it not a radical evil that the eye of those in the highest position may be directed towards the subjects of the King; and where there are deeds that are for the benefit of the country, that are patriotic and that are performed in that public way that they may be recognized, I do not think it is a bad thing to have in a country some means of giving recognition; and, democrat as I am, I yet feel that a tempered democracy in this respect might not be a bad thing to perpetuate in this country and in this empire of ours.

With reference to public service I do not think that I will strike much of a note of opposition when I say that a great deal of the best public work and public service in our empire is not paid for, is not the subject of emolument and of reward as we count the rewards either of position or in a financial way. I go further, and say that public service which is done without the hope of rewards and emolument in that way, is probably the cleanest and purest and most efficient that we have in the empire; and I do not think it takes away from either the merit of what has been done or from the recognition of it, to have the sense present that after all there is one high superior power which when there comes up a striking case of public service can mark it, label it by the bestowal of the honour, and hold up to the people of the whole empire the deed that was done, for that is what the honour is supposed to do. If one could say that the bestowal of honour had been done unworthily, upon unworthy persons, none of us, of course, would for a moment give such a practice our approval. But the principle itself, I hold, is not wrong in our empire. It has in the past resulted in great good and will, I believe, in the future result in great good. In that regard I am sorry to say to my hon. friend that I am not yet convinced that I should support his Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I also am sorry to have to say to my hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) that I cannot support his Bill, and I do it with all the more regret because he has been very kind to me in his remarks in presenting it to the House. I am all the more sorry because, in a large measure, I am very much disposed to agree with him in principle. I do not think that the intention which he had in mind when drafting his Bill is well expressed in the manner in which the Bill has been brought forward. If we are ever to take the position in this House that we should have no more titles in Canada, the question should not be approached in the way of a Bill but by a recommendation or address to His Majesty the King, because the King alone does bestow honour. And, if we were to object to the exercise of the prerogative in this respect I do not think it would be respectful to do it in the form of an Act of Parliament. My hon. friend says that the titles we have at the present time are not at all in consonance with our democratic spirit.

For my part I am largely disposed to agree with him. The titles that we have at present in this country and in the motherland are all relics of the feudal state of Great Britain. If I may be pardoned, the title which I myself bear is a relic of this old state, and I do not think that in a democracy like Canada such titles can ever take root. I agree with my hon. friend, they are not in consonance with the spirit of the age. That is one view and consideration which I think is well worthy of our attention. But at the same time the prerogative of the Crown has been followed for so many centuries and is yet bestowed with such acceptance generally that I do not believe that, even in such a democracy as we are, very serious objection can be taken to the manner in which the prerogative has been exercised.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): In the bestowal of these honours in England, the Prime Minister assumes the responsibility, as I understand it. There have been honours bestowed in Canada. Do they go on the responsibility of the advice of the Prime Minister of this country, or, who assumes the responsibility?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have no objection whatever to answer the question of my hon. friend. In England there are certain honours which are bestowed every year and which, I understand, are simply a matter of course, and go to the Sovereign upon the imprimatur both of the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition. That takes place as a matter of course every year. We have not come up to this here. I have no hesitation in saying that in my humble judgment—and this is the position which I always took when I was Prime Minister—it is a prerogative of the Crown and not a matter to be covered by ministerial responsibility. I believe that on a matter of this kind the Governor, for the time being, whoever he may be, is the representative of the Crown, and he would not make any recommendation to his Sovereign unless he had previously consulted his Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister also would probably consult his colleagues. That is the manner in which it should be done, but I would not follow the doctrine so far as to say that this is a case in which the ministerial responsibility should be exercised. The matter, in my humble judgment is not of the importance that should be covered by ministerial responsibility. It is altogether a matter for the prerogative of the Crown.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: It is not so in England. There is a responsibility assumed by the Prime Minister in England, and apparently by what the right hon. gentleman says, there is no responsibility assumed by the ministry for honours given in this country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I believe in England also, as a matter of present development, the Prime Minister is generally consulted by the Sovereign, but I believe there are circumstances in which the Sovereign would think himself justified in exercising his own prerogative and I doubt if any prime minister would make it a matter of ministerial responsibility or ministerial crisis.

The question which the hon. member puts to me is an evidence that these titles have become antiquated; they are no longer suited to the spirit of the age. There was a time when the prerogative of the Crown in these matters was exercised upon the sole responsibility of the Crown; and when a minister would not think of interfering. As democratic institutions developed even in England, the Sovereign has been in the habit of consulting his ministers, but I do not think it has come to the point of being covered by ministerial responsibility. In the present age there is always, we know, even in democracies, the tendency to confer these honours and distinctions. We have only to go to the other side of the line where we know that titles are given not by the Government but by the popular will. I understand that in the French republic the Legion of Honour, instituted by Napoleon in 1804, is more sought after than it ever was in the Napoleonic regime, so that as my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has said, this is a little concession to human weakness. Men will be men to the end of time, I suppose. My hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, was very kind in stating that he would not deprive us on this side of the House of these rewards. I am sorry I cannot return the compliment, because my hon. friends opposite do not deserve any reward. At all events, for the time being, we are content, as he said, that virtue should be its own reward, and we claim nothing else.

Motion of second reading of Bill negatived.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence) moved the second reading of Bill No. 4, to amend the Criminal Code. He

said: The object of this Bill is to do away entirely with the death penalty in this country and to substitute therefor a life sentence; and, in addition, to provide for the use of the lash in certain cases. I think the time has come when we should deal with this question, and deal with it fairly and honestly. The death penalty, as I said when I introduced the Bill, is a blot on Christendom, a blight on religion, and a reproach to the civilized nation that allowed it on its statute books. If we look for a moment at the results of capital punishment as administered, not only here but the world over, we find that if a man commits murder and he is very wealthy, he is adjudged insane, and saves his neck. If he is fairly wealthy, he can employ sufficient counsel to get commutation of sentence, but if he is a poor man with no friends and with no influence, he goes to the gallows. To me, it seems a terrible thing that the poor man should get the the full effect of the law, and be hanged by the neck until he is dead and his soul ushered into eternity. It is true the State says the man is not fit to live, but I say this, Mr. Speaker, if he is not fit to live, is the State prepared to say that he is fit to die? The State says: Away with him, hang him, he is not fit for this world; but I ask the State: Are you quite sure he is fit for the next. I say that a man who is not fit for earth is not fit for heaven. Furthermore, capital punishment is against the law of God. The great Geometrician of the Universe says in the Ten Commandments: Thou shalt not kill, and I claim that that commandment applies to the State just as much as to the individual. But the State says: Oh probably; He did not mean that, and so, we will legislate the word 'not' out of that commandment. To me, Sir, capital punishment becomes then nothing short of legalized murder. Quite a number of people, as hon. gentlemen in this House know, say that capital punishment is a deterrent of crime, but I have some of the best authorities, I think, in the world, including the best statesmen that England ever produced, among others John Bright, to prove that the death penalty is not a deterrent, and never was, to even murderously disposed criminals. To my mind, nothing is more degrading to society at large in a Christian land than the death penalty, and let it not be forgotten that we in degrading become degraded, and that society in degrading becomes degraded. I claim that the Lord gives life and the Lord alone has the right to take it. We have no moral right to destroy that which we cannot restore. We do not punish the criminals alone but we brand his children to the fourth and fifth generation with the brand of Cain. I might say that in my opinion no man commits murder in his sane moments; in fact, a great many of the very best medical authorities state emphatically, that a person perpetrating murder is insane at the moment that he commits the deed. The old and barbarous death penalty is fast dying out in all Christian lands. No hon. member of this House who believes in the Creator, will dare to vote in favour of this legalized murder by the State. What does the State do? This Government, and I do not blame this Government any more than its predecessors, makes a compact with the legalized, licensed, executioner, for a money consideration, to drag our fellowman to the scaffold, to send his body to the grave and his soul into eternity. Think of it—that a Government could descend to the depth that it would make a contract to have a fellow creature ushered into eternity in consideration of a bonus of thirty pieces of silver.

Mr. HENDERSON: What about the judge who sentences him?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: There are, I know, differences of opinion in different countries, as to crime. In England, the greatest crime is murder, for which hanging is the penalty. In Russia, they do not hang for murder, but for political reasons. I think there are men in Canada to-day who can remember certain young men who were hanged here for so-called political crimes. If any hon. members of this House will take the trouble when in Montreal, to go to the Catholic cemetery, they will see engraved on a splendid monument the names of many young Canadians who were legally murdered after the events of the Rebellion of 1837. It was not confined entirely to Montreal or to Quebec; the same thing happened in Toronto where, Matthews and Lount, two of the finest young men Ontario ever produced, supporters of Lyon Mackenzie, were condemned to death and hanged. There is no question in my mind but that that, more especially in view of our present enlightment, was declared murder. It created such a revulsion of feeling, in Upper and Lower Canada, a feeling which spread across the water, to the throne of Queen Victoria, that for twenty years, from 1838 to 1858, no Government of Canada would allow a man to be hanged. There

was not a single case of capital punishment in Canada during those twenty years, and we are told it was largely due to the feelings of Queen Victoria which were respected by the Governors of this country. If we could get along without capital punishment for twenty years in this country, why not for all time? There never was a time when Canada was more peaceful than during these twenty years. I ask the Parliament of Canada to give this a trial; it is not very long from one session to another, and we do not run any risk in trying the experiment. I am going to point out twelve or eighteen different countries and states in which capital punishment was abolished many years ago. In not a single case do the figures show that crime has increased, and in most cases the fact is that crime has actually decreased. I know that there are probably men who do not believe that there is a Creator; men who do not believe in the eternity of the soul, and who will say: Well, it is best to get rid of the murderer. From a purely earthly point of view that may be so, but I believe in the eternity of the soul, and I believe there is a Creator, and I, for one, will never permit, if I can prevent it, having a man's soul thrust into eternity by process of law. There may be some who have such a thirst for human blood that they would resent the suggestion I offer, but if there be such a man in this House, I say to him: let him who is without sin cast the first stone.

(1) Capital punishment brutalizes the public, as well as the officials who have to carry it out, thus tending to destroy all notions of the sanctity of human life. (2) Capital punishment is not deterrent, and by some criminals is less feared than penal servitude for life. A large proportion of the murders committed are due to influences over which no deterrent can avail, such as drink, jealousy, etc. (3) Capital punishment being irrevocable, is too extreme a measure; with a wrong verdict and the sentence carried out, the mistake cannot be rectified. (4) Since it is largely accidental whether the victim of a murderous assault dies or recovers, the sentence depends upon chance. It is illogical that identical crimes should incur different penalties. (5) Capital punishment, being irrevocable, induces juries to decline to convict, and leads on the slightest pretexts to petitions for mercy to the Minister of Justice, and to pleas of insanity, neither of which are desirable in the interests of justice. (6) Punishment ought to be reformatory, not vindictive. (7) Capital punishment has already been abolished in several foreign countries without ill-effect.

Towards the convicted murderer the State acts as though he were not fit to live. Then, let me ask: Is the Justice Department of Canada quite sure that he is fit to die? Having been condemned to death, he is apparently a fit subject for any kind of outrage. On the day of execution the wretched man is led out towards the gallows, and with revolting hypocrisy the burial service is read over him. One must not overlook the degrading effect of such scenes upon all who take part in them and receive payment for doing so. Take, for instance, the chaplain, the warders, and, above all, the hangman, who earns his living solely by taking other peoples' lives.

In many European countries, though still at times in force, capital punishment has been practically abrogated through the marked growth of humanitarian sentiments. In Austria, between 1870 and 1879, eight hundred were sentenced to death, and of these only sixteen were executed. In Sweden, during the same period, out of thirty-two sentenced only three were executed; in Denmark one out of ninety-four; in Bulgaria seven out of two hundred and forty-nine, and I am safe in saying that with the advance of civilization and christianity, there is a tendency all over the world to look upon the death penalty as unwarrantable.

We all believe in a future state, better in every way than the present one, yet we pay that future state the sorry compliment of hurling into it, in the most degrading manner, the souls of those whom we consider unfit to live, and we thrust that soul into eternity before the appointed time. The very phase, 'May God have mercy on your soul,' is a flagrant abuse of words; it implies that the mercy which is lacking on this side may or may not be granted on the other. It repudiates human responsibility, and implies that one who is not fit to live in man's world is to be sent into God's world, as though the refuse of this world was good enough to be ushered into the next. How many men have been hanged on circumstantial evidence which has afterwards been disproved?—but life is gone and no redress is possible. We almost had just such a case in the city of Montreal a few weeks ago, when a poor Italian was found to be innocent and was let out after having spent five years in the peni-

tentiary. That man might have been hanged at the time of his conviction. There is no question about it that there have been a great many hanged who were innocent. The matter is therefore quickly hushed up and forgotten. Is it not better and wiser that ninety-nine guilty people should go free than that one innocent man should be hanged?

One argument in favour of capital punishment is that it acts as a deterrent. Against this we have the fact that murders do not as a rule increase where capital punishment is abolished. Capital punishment is a legal crime, and is morally indefensible. All who take part in it are tainted with bloodguiltiness, from the judge down to the hangman, as well as the nation that passively allows such things to be. For crime does not increase in other countries in consequence of abolition. Why should it in Canada? Canadians as a rule are a most law-abiding people.

Viewing the question of the death penalty in its broadest sense, we are led to look at it from many aspects. What effect, for instance, has it upon a murder already committed? It certainly does not cure the crime. That is past cure. The deed is done and the victim is beyond help. We cannot remedy one murder by committing another. Whether this is under the sanction of law or not does not alter the principle upon which this so-called justice is founded. Retribution in this sense is but another name for revenge. When we stigmatize it thus, we approach the real point at issue. Society has no more moral right to take this punishment upon itself than has an individual who is the nearest of kin to the victim. The law holds the matter in its own hands on the plea that the murderer shall have a fair trial. So far there is a show of justice in the proceedings; but if found to be guilty, the result to the culprit is the same. Society then simply revenges the death, instead of allowing any single individual to do so. So far as the criminal is concerned, we have done nothing more than kill him. It has been an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a life for a life. The account in this respect is squared up, blood for blood. The crime of murder is expiated—technically and judicially speaking, remedied.

I shall direct the attention of the House to a few of the different countries and states where the death penalty has been abolished and in every case with good results. It was abolished in Holland in 1870; in Belgium, in 1863; in Roumania, in 1864; in Portugal, in 1865. In most of the Swiss Cantons it has been abolished since 1874. In the state of Michigan it was abolished in 1846; in Rhode Island, in 1852; in Wisconsin in 1853; in Maine, in 1876, and in Kansas, in 1908. The death penalty has been abolished in the state of Michigan, which borders on the province of Ontario. I claim that the people of Ontario are of as good character as the people of Michigan, and they should abolish the death penalty also.

5 p.m.

The following are extracts from letters which I have received from secretaries of state of the different states:

> In the state of Michigan the death penalty was abolished in the year 1846, and the law was amended so that life imprisonment was substituted for same. The state of Michigan is so contented with the law as it stands to-day that no person would even think of suggesting that capital punishment should be re-enacted, and I am very proud to say that there has not been a case where any person has suffered the death penalty in that state during the last eighty-three years.

Rhode Island is just in the same position as the state of Michigan. Here is what the secretary says:

> After a great deal of trouble and time given to it by what was known over in that district as the 'Society of Friends,' better known in Canada as 'Quakers,' the experiment was tried, and capital punishment was abolished in Rhode Island on February 11, 1852, and the experiment has worked out so satisfactorily that no one would suggest going back to the old days of capital punishment, and there has not been a case of the death penalty enforced in this state for sixty-one years.

I read portion of a letter received from the Secretary of State of Wisconsin:

> Capital punishment was abolished in 1853, largely at the request of the religious bodies of that state headed by the Quakers. We do not believe that the number of capital offences has been increased; in fact, we are sure they have not been increased since the abolition of capital punishment, because we do not believe that the infliction of capital punishment is a preventive for the commission of capital crimes. Since the abolition of capital punishment in this state there has never been, nor is there at the present time, any sentiment in favour of restoring it; in fact, we do not believe that any Bill has ever been introduced into the legislature to have capital punishment restored. The people of the state of Wisconsin do not believe that the state should legalize the taking of a human life, nor do we believe that the mere legalizing of the taking of a human life relieves the person, who acts in a justice department or as executioner, of the moral responsibility of the taking of such a life, and further believe that, whenever an execution takes place, it has a very demoralizing effect upon the community in which it takes place, and that

it has a demoralizing effect upon the State generally.

Permit me to give you the history of capital punishment in the state of Maine, which borders on New Brunswick. Capital punishment in Maine was abolished in 1876. This was largely due to the influence of the religious bodies, again headed by the Quakers of that state. The secretary of that state says:

The strong minority opposed to the death penalty, had much to do with its non-enforcement from 1837 to 1867, and the enforcement of the law from the latter date until 1876 had more to do with its abolition; since the executions during this period awakened discussion and debate upon the subject, and brought the people face to face with their responsibility and duty in the matter. Prof. Upham, of Bowdoin College, and Rev. Sylvester Judd, of Augusta, Me., by their speeches and written arguments against capital punishment, created a deep seated and widespread sentiment in the minds of the people against this mode of punishment. The Society of Friends within our state, were ever urgent in their petitions to the legislature, for the abolition of the death penalty. The sentiment of our people is now so strongly against capital punishment, that it may be safely assumed that it will never again be enacted in Maine.

The Secretary of State of Kansas writes:

Capital punishment in the State of Kansas was abolished between five and six years ago by the action of the legislature of that state. Prior to that time, when a man was convicted of murder in the first degree and sentenced to death, he was sent to the penitentiary to be held at hard labour one year, and after that to be hanged, upon the order of the Governor. No Governor in the history of that state has ever ordered a hanging, with one exception. Public sentiment has always been against it, and it would not have permitted the execution of criminals. It required no force or argument to induce the legislature to repeal the capital punishment law. I know of no one who thinks that the repeal of the capital punishment law has increased crime.

These twelve states and countries all admit that, from the time that capital punishment has been abolished, capital crime has not increased, and that in most of them it has decreased. It is a fact that all over the world, wherever capital punishment has been abolished, capital crime has decreased.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER: My hon. friend has read instances of twelve different countries in which capital punishment has been abolished. Are we to infer that in all other countries capital punishment is still the rule?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: It is still the rule, I believe, but it is not so popular as it was in the days of our ancestors. After all, capital punishment is neither more nor less than an off-shoot of the dark ages. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce well knows that capital punishment is a relic of barbarism, may I say a relic of Neroism, a relic of the dark and pestilential days of Nero's misrule in Rome. I believe that the day is coming when in every country where the people believe in a Creator, capital punishment will and must be abolished. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is well aware that in England this was a burning question during the middle and latter years of the last century. A commission was appointed to inquire into the result of the abolition of capital punishment in other countries. A report was made, signed by Stephen Lushington, John Bright, Charles Neate and William Ewart.

Mr. LANCASTER: What year was that?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: On the 8th of January, 1866. The report stated:

The undersigned, Members of Your Majesty's Commission are of opinion that Capital Punishment might safely, and with advantage to the community, be at once abolished.

This was signed by these four gentlemen, amongst them the Rt. Hon. John Bright.

There is another case here cited by the Rt. Hon. Mr. Justice O'Hagan, probably one of the most eminent jurists of that day. He says:

I am of opinion—with much deference for the great authority of those who think otherwise—that the great weight of evidence and reason is in favour of the abolition of capital punishment.

One of the most revered saints, St. Augustin, deplores the fact that capital punishment was in existence in his day. The proposal to abolish capital punishment was brought up on several occasions in the House of Commons and was always supported by John Bright. The first occasion was March 18, 1848, when Mr. Ewart moved for leave to bring in a Bill repealing the punishment of death. It was defeated by 152 nays to 66 yeas. Mr. Ewart brought forward his Bill in the ensuing session and the motion was lost by a majority, this time, of only 24. Mr. Bright again supported the measure, and of this address his biographer says:

Mr. Bright again supported the proposition. He said it was unnecessary to to go into what was called the Scripture argument, but he

reminded members that for some centuries after the commencement of the Christian era, no person holding, or professing to hold, the Christian religion, was known to interfere in capital punishments.

I will now cite a few of the authorities I have before me, and I think the House will be convinced—if they are not too prejudiced in this matter—that the time has come when capital punishment should be abolished. And let me say that if the Union Jack is to continue to float over this young nation in the future as in the past—and it will—as the emblem of freedom, fairplay, justice and mercy, this Parliament can no longer shirk its duty in this matter. Let me give brief summaries of statements made before the Capital Punishment Commission in Great Britain in 1866:

Hon. George Denman, M.P., thinks that on the whole more is done by capital punishment as it at present exists, to induce murders than to prevent them.

Q. You think that the infliction of capital punishment for murder prevents the certainty of punishment?—A. I think so, most decidedly.

William Tallack said:

From documents received from governors of several of the American States it appears that the abolition of capital punishment there has not rendered life less secure.

Mr. Tallack referred to a letter he had received from a gentleman in Montreal whom, I have no doubt, some who are here present will remember—Mr. Louis Payette. The name is not properly spelled in the report, but it is quite clear who is referred to. I knew Mr. Payette well. Mr. Tallack says:

I will first read an extract from a letter addressed to me by M. Louis Payette, jailor of the provincial jail at Montreal, dated 27th September, 1864. . . . He says, 'Capital punishment was virtually suspended here (in Canada) from 1838 to 1858, a period of 20 years. The sentences to capital punishment passed during that time were, by the exercise of the Royal prerogative, commuted to imprisonment for life in the provincial penitentiary at Kingston, and the executions since the beginning of 1358 (five in number) have all been public.' I submit that if in Canada they could do without executions for 20 years, although they have appeared since to have returned to capital punishment, there could not have been any great public inconvenience felt, more particularly when we find that there were only five executions in the years which have since elapsed.

Lord Hobart:

Capital punishment is not a deterrent. . . . With secondary punishment there might possibly be a gain of a deterrent force. . . . Thinks that if capital punishment ever could be carried out with the same certainty and rigour as secondary punishment, it would be a more powerful preventive of crime, but the case is very far from being so. . . Thinks that the deterrent advantages of capital punishment are more than counterbalanced by its accompanying disadvantages, namely, its uncertainty. . . Objects to capital punishment because it alone is, of all punishments, both irrevocable and irreparable. Other punishments also were irrevocable, but no other punishment is irreparable. . . Argues that innocent persons must frequently be convicted and thinks it quite possible that such are occasionally executed.

Q. What has been the result of the attention which you have given to the subject? A. conclusion at which I have arrived is that capital punishment ought to be abolished.

Hilary Nicholas Nissen:

Public punishments have no deterrent effect upon the people. Nor has capital punishment any deterring influence upon the criminal class.

Leone Levi:

Capital punishment is not much of a deterrent to criminals as is proved by the murder of suicides.

Rev. John Jessop:

Capital punishment has not the deterrent effect it is supposed to have. Does not think that when persons commit murder they think of detection. When persons commit a murder or plan it, they do not think they will be found out. In the case of murder for sordid purposes, or murder by poison where property is involved in the result, if persons imagined that they would be found out, they would not commit them. If persons imagined they would be found out, they would not commit murder, unless they were maniacs. As to cases of murder through jealousy, hatred, or any strong impulse, the consequences are never taken into consideration.

John Humphreys Perry, Sergeant-at-Law:

Capital punishment is not a deterrent. When Muller murdered Mr. Briggs the idea of capital punishment never entered his mind. The majority of murderers do not belong to the criminal class. The punishment of death has a terror for certain minds when they come face to face with it.

Q. Will you favour the commission with your views generally on the subject of capital punishment? A. I am strongly opposed to capital punishment, first on the ground that a government coolly and without passion taking away the life of a human being sets a bad example, and weakens that sense of the sacredness of human life which I believe to be a great social safeguard.

Captain Cartwright:

The punishment of death is not deterrent to the reckless class. The convict class dread perpetual imprisonment more than death. Penal servitude for life has also greater terrors than hanging.

Q. Upon the general question of the abolition of capital punishment are you of the opinion that it should be retained or abolished? A. I think that it should certainly be abolished.

Sir Lawrence Peel:

In India capital punishment would be no deterrent, as death is feared very little.

Rt. Hon. James A. Lawson, Attorney General for Ireland:

The substitution of secondary punishment would be equally as deterrent as the capital penalty. The fear of death has no effect in agrarian murders, from its uncertainty of infliction. In Ireland juries have a strong feeling against capital punishment. What operates upon juries is the taking away of human life, and doing an act which, if wrong, will be doing an irreparable injury. Such liability to irreparable mistakes would not exist in the case of any other form of punishment, or at least it would be much less probable.

M. Chedieu:

The penalty of death is not a deterrent.

Rev. W. C. Osborn:

Juries naturally incline to find excuse to return the verdict of manslaughter; this also causes some uncertainty as to the operation of the law. It is doubtful whether the general opinion as to the deterrent effect of capital punishment is well founded. Mankind set a high value on life, yet forever risk it for a little gain for the prospect of a little present enjoyment. Capital punishment admits of no remission or alleviation, and that it can only be just where it is carried out upon evidence which must be infallible. The practice, he says, of administering capital punishment negatives the principle that no human evidence can be secure from error; even if the evidence on which the prisoner is convicted be correct, it is possible that evidence which could have given it a different complexion did exist, although it was not adduced. Capital punishment shuts out from all future remedy any of the mischances to which all human justices must be liable. No state would make any other sentence irrevocable, laying it down as law that if it afterwards appeared that the prisoner had been improperly convicted, he would still be compelled to suffer his entire sentence. Admitting all human law must in execution be subject to occasional error, there is the greater reason to take care that no sentence of the law should be of an irrevocable nature. The Christian religion leaves open hope of pardon through repentance to the worst of men; when a man is hung you cut him off from power to repent.

Lord Osborn:

Capital punishment is not a deterrent. It has no effect upon the individuals on whom it would be desirable to have an effect.

Lord Cranworth:

The absolute possibility of hanging an innocent man by mistake cannot be denied, but such a possibility would only arise from not properly distinguishing between murder and manslaughter. . . The common saying is perhaps a true one, that it is better for ninety-nine guilty persons to escape than that one innocent man be hanged.

[Mr. Bickerdike.]

Sir Fitzroy Kelly:

After careful consideration and examination I have come to the conclusion that it is not in any way reasonably to be doubted that in many cases innocent men have been capitally convicted, and in a certain number of instances, few of course, but yet formidable in numbers, have been actually executed.

Sir Fitzroy Kelly goes on to cite a number of cases where innocent men have been hanged, and deplores the fact that they can never return. He was asked a question and gave his answer as follows:

Q. Will you give the commission the opinion which you have formed generally on the subject of capital punishment?

A. I have for a long time been of opinion that capital punishment ought to cease, and time and observation and experience have only strengthened my opinions, I might say my convictions, upon that subject.

Hon. George Denman:

Capital punishment leads to the acquittal of many men who would otherwise most certainly be convicted; that juries are indisposed to convict in capital cases. He goes on to cite a number of cases where it is well known that the parties were guilty, but the jury refused to convict. In these cases if the accused had been tried for manslaughter, they would assuredly have been convicted .

Sir George Grey:

Juries generally yield to the opinion of the judge. He mentions a case where the jury asked the judge whether they could bring in a verdict of manslaughter. The judge said; 'No, it is either a verdict of murder or nothing;' and they brought in a verdict of 'not guilty.' They would have found a verdict of manslaughter if they could. There is, he says, less disposition perhaps, on the part of juries to find a woman guilty than there is in the case of a man.

Mr. Sergeant Parry:

Objects to capital punishment as being irrevocable and irremediable and does not think that any human tribunal should place itself in a position of being incapable, even at the last moment, of doing justice to an innocent man.

Mr. Thomas Beggs:

There have been some, though not many capital convictions of innocent men during the last twenty years.

I will not detain the House much longer, but there are a few authorities that I would like to place on record, more especially in view of the fact that I see my good friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) in his seat. From a work on 'The Criminal and the Community,' by J. Devon, I take the following:

Incidentally those who are most insistent on the employment of the executioner show that

they possess a fair share of the same spirit that induced the act which they condemn. They are rightly indignant, but they do not seem to see that justice and bad temper are not the same thing. When a man takes life, in order to show him the sacredness of life the law takes his. It is a lesson to him, and there is this to be said—that it certainly prevents him from offending again. Now, if we are better than those whom we judge and condemn, why do we treat them as they have treated others? For the law to hire a man to kill another is a queer way to teach men to respect life. I have seen a number of rather tough specimens under sentence of death, and have watched the effect on warders of intimate association with them. They have had to be constantly in the company of the condemned, for although a man may be condemned to be killed, he must not be allowed to kill himself. We know too little of the possibilities of life to be justified in condemning any one to death. The infliction of the death penalty has no good effect on those engaged in it. I have never seen any one who had anything to do with it who was not the worse for it, and as for the doctor who must be in attendance, it is an outrage on all his professional as well as his personal feelings. The physician is taught that it is his duty to save life, apart altogether from its personal value.

From 'Aschaffenburg's Crime and its Repression,' I quote:

It is essential that we should decide whether capital punishment acts as a deterrent. I can scarcely believe that it does. German statistics do indeed show that the number of those condemned to death has decreased somewhat, but only a very little. Belgium, on the other hand, where no capital punishment has been carried out for years, has had no increase of the crime for which capital punishment is the penalty. Observations show that the effect of executions is by no means deterrent. Ferri had an opportunity of being present at two executions in Paris. His remarks show that the effect on the population of Paris was the very opposite of what was hoped for. Instead of dull terror, there was curiosity, pleasure in the unusual sensation, betting as to what the demeanor of the condemned man would be—everything, in fact, rather than the solemnity suitable to the solemn occasion. It can positively be asserted that the peculiar role played by a person condemned to death, the attention that his deeds, his life, his behaviour at the time of the execution, arouse, thanks to the public love of sensation to which the press caters, are an actual attraction to a number of psycho-pathological individuals. The fear of lifelong imprisonment would probably have a more wholesome effect on the peculiar individualities of assassins and their ilk than does the martyr's halo of glory, the imaginary fame of a sensational execution. Whatever our opinion of capital punishment may be, its retention will have just as little material influence on criminality as its abolition.

Havelock Ellis says:

A writer in Elizabeth's reign says that in Henry VIII's time seventy-two thousand thieves were hanged.

Think of that in dear old England! The statement is set down on hearsay evidence only, but it is sufficient to show that the number must have been very large. About a century ago, more criminals, it is said, were put to death in England than in any other part of Europe. The writer says that many persons still living remember the days of wholesale hanging, and even the execution of a child of twelve for rioting. He claims it is less than half a century since a child of nine was condemned to death for stealing paint, valued at five cents, and on many occasions since men were hanged for stealing sheep and horses and post office letters. There can be little doubt that capital punishment is dying out. On the whole we may perhaps be well satisfied that the shameful practice of capital punishment, and of hiring for a few dollars a black-hearted assassin to accomplish a sentence which the judge would not have the courage to carry out, is threatened with extinction in civilized countries. To punish murder by lifelong imprisonment, as Sir Robert Rawlinson observed, is a far severer fate than sudden death, but is not so revolting.

I have asked the Government and I have asked Parliament to give this a trial, to make the experiment, as has been done in these other places. I believe, honestly, before God, that after it has been tried we will never return to the present system. I do not believe that any hon. member of this House who believes in a Creator, who believes in eternity, will vote for this legalized murder of a fellow-citizen. Why should a Government stoop to engage a man, under contract for so many dollars per head, to drive poor criminals into eternity. What is there to be gained by it? If it is not a deterrent, then why do it? If it is not a deterrent it becomes simply revenge. If it is not a deterrent, no country in the world, no Christian land at least, will continue it. I call upon the members of the House on both sides who believe in a Creator to rise in their places now and stamp out this legalized murder that has been so long existent in this country.

Mr. LANCASTER: The hon. member apparently proposes to make no distinction between murder and manslaughter. The section as drawn would make manslaughter and murder punishable in the same way. Is that the intention?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Exactly; I intend that.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I have listened with a great deal of interest to the address of my hon. friend on this question. I have my own ideas with regard to the matter, but I do not hold them so strongly, speaking for myself alone, that I am not open to argument. My hon. friend has traversed a great deal of ground; he has brought up a great many arguments, and has buttressed them by the opinions of a great many individuals. But there are an infinitely greater number of people who have made arguments and given opinions that he has not cited. While a fair array has been presented as supporting the case made by my hon. friend, the world is so large and there are so many people in it that it is a little difficult to argue that the best has been advocated by those few who have been mentioned, or that a policy should be established upon what the hon. gentleman has cited. I do not think this House is disposed on so slight a discussion as we have had to-day to affirm the principle that capital punishment should be abolished, and thereby change what has been the law and the policy in this country for so many years. I had hoped that enough interest would have been taken in this subject by this House—that is if there is an interest taken in it by the House—to have provoked an expression of opinion for and against by members on both sides. I have no doubt at all that my hon. friend is convinced himself that he is right. But because he is himself convinced that he is right he is not justified in maintaining that everybody who does not agree with him is wrong. I know my hon. friend used two or three expressions that would read us out of decent society on earth and out of any quarter at all in the world to come if we voted against what he considers to be right. But I suppose that is more a matter of argument than of conviction. It is very arguable, I think, that we must not necessarily perpetuate for all time to come modes of punishment which are of very old date and came to be established when the conditions of human life in the world were quite different from what they are to-day. But it is also not allowable, I think, to argue that because a thing dates far back, either as a custom or a precept of law or a method of administration, that it is therefore not entitled to hold its place at the present time. We hope that the world has not always been wrong in every conclusion that it has come to. Some of us, I think, hold and may well hold that there are certain modes and expressions of thought in the activities of life that are pretty nearly as old as the world, and they hold as well to-day as in early times. It is no doubt a gruesome thing to take a man up and hang him by the neck until he is dead and usher his soul into the other world, but society is compact, it aggregates its units and it formulates its methods of procedure for its own protection, and there is something still to be said for a means of punishment in extreme cases which has been at one time adopted by all nations, and which is to-day carried out and adhered to by the greater number of what we may call the civilized nations of the world. My hon. friend has cited twelve cases. Amongst these are a number of different states of the United States, so that even in the United States itself, to which he has appealed and which is a great and progressive country, a very large proportion of the states have not yet adopted my hon. friend's views. I have not given special attention to the matter, but it is an impression I have had that there have been Christian and civilized countries that have abolished capital punishment and after an experience of what has followed upon its abolition, have reverted to capital punishment. I think there are cases of that on record. I am quite certain that I have read very strong arguments from states and countries where capital punishment has been abolished on the line that the abolition of capital punishment has lessened, as it were, the respect for the execution of law in extreme cases and has not had a salutary effect upon the general morals as relating to the criminal acts of the community at large.

A man might be extreme enough to say that no individual man has a right to deprive another individual man of the liberty of physical or mental action. He has not, in a sense, and he might argue from that, that a collection of men had no right to do it. But society would be impossible, unless the better sentiment for law and order in society had some physical means of deterring those who would flout it and put it to scorn. It might, perhaps, be pushing it to an extreme to say, that if you argue that men in a civilized community compacted together to preserve what is best amongst them and to keep law and order, have not a right to take a criminal of the first-class and put him out of the possibility of ever plaguing society again; that it

follows they have not the right to keep him from the exercise of his physical liberty and various other things which belong to a man, naturally, so long as he conducts himself properly in his relations with his fellow men. That may be an extreme putting of the argument. My hon. friend, has this answer to that: that you may deprive a man of his liberty, and you may deprive him of his life, but if you simply deprive him of his liberty, and it so happens that wrongful evidence has been given and therefore a faulty judgment rendered, some reparation can be made if he is still in the land of the living, whereas in the other case, he has gone to his Judge and he is outside of our jurisdiction entirely. I am not going to say that our methods in the administration of justice have been in the past what they might be, or are to-day what they might be, but I think we are making continual improvement, and the time may come where it will be unnecessary to have such extreme punishment as capital punishment is, and administered as it has been for the deterrence of great criminals. That time may come, but all that I have to say now is, that whilst expressing my own opinion that the time has not yet come—which I am not holding obstinately, and with regard to which I am quite open to conviction—I do not think it is proper for us in this House, after the short discussion we have had of this matter this afternoon, to affirm as a principle, that this House agrees on the second reading of this Bill, that capital punishment should be abolished. If we are not ready for the full discussion of it with a view to ultimate action, I think it would be unfortunate for us, by a vote of silence, as it appears at the present time this would be, to change our policy in this drastic way. The matter is entirely open for the members of the House to discuss, but rather than a vote should be taken and the principle affirmed I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.): I agree to some extent with my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, not so much that I would like to see the debate adjourned, but I would like the matter to be discussed as thoroughly as it possibly can be, and a vote taken upon this very important matter. I do not agree with the Minister of Trade and Commerce that this House is disposed to let this Bill pass by a silent vote, without giving expression to their opinions. I have certain opinions, perhaps not very strong, yet opinions which I have gained from nearly a quarter of a century's practice at law, and I must say that my opinion from that long experience is rather opposed to the principle sought for by my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike). I cannot bring myself to believe as society and conditions exist in Canada to-day, that it would be in the best interests of the public to have capital punishment abolished, although I must congratulate my hon. friend from Montreal on the very able presentment of his case. It shows great reading, great learning, deep thinking, a big mind and a big heart; nevertheless, a lawyer might be equally sincere and arrive at different conclusions from my hon. friend. I suppose we are all liable to arrive at our conclusions in this world from our personal surroundings, and what we have met with personally in our affairs.

Mr. FOSTER: I understand then, that my hon. friend would like to discuss the question?

Mr. CARVELL: I would.

Mr. FOSTER: I merely made my motion on the assumption that the House did not wish to discuss the question any longer, and as I think under my motion my hon. friend would be out of order, in discussing this, I withdraw my motion for adjournment, since I learn that my hon. friend and others wish to carry on the discussion.

Motion for adjournment of debate withdrawn.

Mr. CARVELL: Following up the line of thought which I was trying to give the House, I repeat that we probably all draw our conclusions from our own experience of life. I have had the experience of having to prosecute in two or three cases of capital crime, and I have defended more than half a dozen, and I think that my hon. friend the member for Montreal, (Mr. Bickerdike) has proceeded in the first place upon wrong premises. His idea seems to be that the underlying principle behind capital punishment is revenge or as he put it: the man is not fit to live, therefore hang him. I cannot agree with that. I do not think that was the original intention of the law, and I know it is not the present intention of the law of Canada. I do not believe it is the law which operates with judges and jurors and the public generally in enforcing this law.

The idea of enforcing capital punishment is that it may deter other people from committing the same crime. My hon. friend (Mr. Bikerdike) gave us a number of countries and states in which capital punishment had been abolished, and he read statements from different officials that in their opinion it had not increased the number of capital crimes. I am very sorry that my hon. friend did not give the statistics. I happen to live alongside one of the states of the Union where capital punishment has been abolished, and while I have not the statistics, yet I am satisfied that there are a great many more cases of capital crime in the state of Maine than in the two provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, which have practically the same population. I live near enough to the border to know what is going on in their courts, and in my opinion there are at least three or four cases of capital crime committed in the state of Maine to one case in the Maritime provinces. I do not know if it is the result of the abolishment of capital punishment, and I am sorry to say I have not the statistics. I am only giving the House my own opinion, gained through a pretty intimate knowledge of what is going on on both sides of the line. I have also had experience in my own home, which convinces me that capital punishment is a deterrent. I do not want to go into parochial affairs, but I may say that one parish in New Brunswick furnished more criminal cases for twenty or thirty years, I believe, than any other part of Canada. About five or six years ago the death penalty was imposed in two cases of capital crime from that parish, and from that time up to the present day, there has not been a solitary criminal sent to the penitentiary from that portion of the province. Crime has practically ceased to exist in that portion of New Brunswick which was almost infamous as a result of the condition of affairs that existed prior to that time. You may say that that is only an incident, but yet it is that which I have observed and it is from our personal observations that we possibly form our conclusions.

I can agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike), when he states that the carrying out of a sentence is always attended with gruesome scenes. He referred to the case in Paris where revolting scenes occurred and where men were betting on what the prisoner would do. I dare say that that may be true of Paris and it may be true of certain portions of England. I do not know that it is an ennobling sight when we see a public execution in any town in Canada. The original idea was that these hangings should take place in the most public manner possible in order that the whole world might see them and benefit by the experience. In later days there has been some attempt made to conceal the actual carrying out of the sentence. It must be done in the jail yard and, I think, in every case, the actual scene is surrounded by a screen. I know that in my own town an execution took place six or seven years ago in which, I am sorry to say, a greater amount of interest was shown than I would like to have seen shown. I would be very sorry to see public executions take place in my own constituency and I do not want to see them in any other constituency in Canada. For that reason I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that he might very well take into consideration the advisability of having these unfortunate people put to death not by hanging until they are dead, but by electrocution in some central prison where these revolting scenes would not be witnessed.

Mr. BRODER: Was it a public execution?

Mr. CARVELL: Practically so. These executions are held in the jail yard, there is usually, I believe, a screen of some kind built around, but they are pretty nearly public and many more people go to see them than I think ought to be allowed to go. There are newspaper men, jurors and physicians, and I think that if these executions, or the putting to death, took place in a public institution like our penitentiaries, and that by electricity, it would be a much more humane way of carrying out the sentence of the court than this method of hanging.

I cannot bring myself to agree with my hon. friend from Montreal, that the time has come when we should abolish capital punishment. My principal reason for that, as I said before, is that capital punishment is a deterrent of crime and not a retributive measure. In a young country like Canada we are bringing in hundreds of thousands of people from every corner of the habitable globe. You may say: Well, your immigration officers ought to keep out undesirable immigrants. It is impossible to do that. In many cases men come in who may appear to be all right. They possess the necessary qualifications, they possess the necessary amount of currency, and therefore they become citizens

of the country. But we do not know what their real, inside motives may be. Then again, we have to bring in a large number of ordinary labourers to carry on the great works which are proceeding in this country. They have been coming in the past and they will continue to come in the future; in fact, we could not continue to carry on the great public works of the country if we did not have foreign labourers in large numbers. During the construction of the Transcontinental railway, not two years ago, there were three of the most brutal murders committed by foreign labourers in the northern portion of New Brunswick which the annals of this country can show. In one case a peddler called Paddy Green, well known to the railway construction camps east of the Great Lakes, was starting out on a Sunday morning travelling towards the wilderness when he was shot from ambush by two Italians. His companion was shot and wounded but he succeeded in getting away. These men were captured and sentenced to be hanged, and, as a matter of fact, were hanged. But it developed in the course of time that these men stated that they understood that no man was ever hanged for murder in Canada, but was only sentenced to the penitentiary for from two to five years. These are the conditions which have existed in the province of New Brunswick for the last five or six years, and these are the facts which stare us in the face. With a large number of foreign labourers coming in here possessed of such ideals of the sanctity of life and the rights of citizens as these two men possessed, I think we would be going a long way towards throwing society into a state of chaos if we were to abolish capital punishment in Canada at the present time.

That is only an illustration, but there is another. These same two men who were afterwards sentenced to death claimed there were three other men who were accessories before the fact and who had incited them to commit the murder. They further expressed the belief that if the relatives of one of these men had furnished sufficient money he could have saved their lives. With people of this class in the country holding views of that description, I do not think the time is ripe when this Parliament should declare in favour of the Bill introduced by my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike). I give him all credit for sincerity in the matter. I respect his humanity, I respect his sincere interest in the welfare of the public, but I am afraid that it is a case of misguided sympathy with a class of people who, perhaps are not very much entitled to sympathy. This goes very much along the line of the women of all grades of society who will flock to the jail yard, who will flock to the prison, and who will smother prisoners with flowers and edibles of every kind that can appeal to them. There seems to be a certain maudlin sympathy for a man who has made himself notorious by committing a crime. As long as these things go on, until society reaches the point at which people do not need such a deterrent, until the time comes when no man feels that he can take life with impunity, I think we had better leave the law as it is.

My hon. friend has given citations from ancient reports to show that fifty years ago a child could be hanged for stealing a five cent loaf of bread and if such were the condition of the law to-day, we in the interests of humanity, would agree with him that the law should be changed. But there are practically to-day only two cases in which capital punishment is inflicted in Canada. There is high treason and it will have to be a pretty serious case before a court will allow that penalty provided by the law to be carried into effect; the second is murder, and the third is rape. The third, I think, we have almost dismissed from the category, which brings it down practically to one case, and that is murder. The jury can always bring in a verdict of manslaughter if it chooses to do so instead of murder, although, if the indictment is for murder alone, the verdict cannot be for a less offence than that of manslaughter. The citations which my hon. friend has furnished refer to a time when the matter was in a very different position from that in which it is at the present time. In fact our law permits capital punishment only in cases of treason and murder. I think my hon. friend, while he has given the matter a great deal of study, will be convinced when he gives the matter a little further consideration and understands better the actual conditions of the enforcement of the criminal law in this country, that, while his ideas are humanitarian, yet they are hardly practical under the present state of society in Canada. Therefore, his ideas should not be carried into effect.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, I have not, during the present session, made very many speeches, but on this occasion I feel that

I should not be doing myself justice if I allowed the opportunity to pass without voicing my views on this question. I am glad of this opportunity to speak, for this is a question that lays bare the inmost thoughts of men on the subject of their fellowmen in a way that is not called for in most of the debates of a legislature. It is a question the discussion of which need bear no tinge of party, a question higher than party, a question of more real import to the well-being of the nation and the advancement of humanity than even the highest type of partyism. Most of our legislation of necessity deals with things that are material—the resources of the country, our increasing population, our financial situation, our exports, imports, etc. These are highly important, undoubtedly, all of them of vast interest to our native born people and also to those who are induced either by conditions here or by conditions in their home countries to come and make themselves citizens of the land which we think the best country in the world. This theme opens up broader considerations than even our prosperity in a material way; it enables one to view the situation from the sociological standpoint and to deal in a matter somewhat new to legislatures with a question that vitally affects the whole social and moral fabric. No matter what views we may hold on these other public questions, there is a ground on which all men, whether in public or in private life, can stand as one, and that is on the uplifting of the people, of whom they themselves are a part. I have had my name connected, since coming into public life, with a good many measures which I thought were for the benefit of the people of Canada, but I wish to say, Sir, and I say it conscientiously, that I do not believe I have ever had my name connected with a measure that has been of more far reaching importance than the one introduced by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike). I congratulate him on his courage in bringing this Bill before the House—courage, I say, because I believe the majority of this House do not view the matter as he views it and as I view it. Still, no great advance has ever been made along these lines till some man has had the courage to take one step in advance. And I believe that in the years to come the name of Robert Bickerdike will stand out large on the pages of Canadian history. He has dealt with this question in an exhaustive manner, calling to his aid some of the highest authorities, and supporting his case with the record of experiences of other countries and the results that have been obtained in those countries by this advanced measure. It is true that many years have elapsed since this form of putting men to death—or any form of putting men to death—became a part of the statutes of the various countries. I might go further than my hon. friend has gone and say that in the broader field I am opposed, generally speaking, to the sacrifice of life by war. There are cases, of course, when war is necessary, but those cases are few at the present day as compared with those of days gone by when the arbitrament of the sword seemed to be the only solution of international difficulties. In those days—and we are perhaps too much inclined to imitate them—a man's greatness was measured by the number of men he had slain during his lifetime. Those were the days when the sword was drawn on the slightest provocation, and it is strange to say—or rather it is not strange to say—that the death penalty by law was equally liberally meted out. These are not the days which we in our day should imitate. It is true, we have had rapid advances, and to-day life is held more sacred than it was a century ago. But still, Sir, I am firmly of the opinion that the people of this country do not hold human life as sacred as they ought. If I might be permitted a word of criticism, I believe that our educational system lacks in that it does not impress on the young of our land the sacredness of human life. In our histories, in our fiction, and in the textbooks of our schools as well, we find glorification of the men who have won victories by the slaughter of their fellowmen. In our fiction sometimes men are glorified not for having taken the lives of men in battle, but for slaying them on the least provocation as private citizens. I believe a benefit would be conferred upon the State if in our textbooks chapters were given pointing out to the youth the very great sacredness of human life, and conveying the lesson that the shedding of blood is perhaps the greatest crime of which man can be guilty. In my reading —and I may say that I was brought up in a family where theology was discussed a great deal—I have never found anything from the divine standpoint that has changed the Ten Commandments. I have never yet found anything to convince me that human law ought to be proposed as an amendment to the Ten Commandments.

The Commandment: 'Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour' is just as strong to-day as on the day it was written, and our legislation upholds that Commandment by enactments which mete out punishment to the man who bears false witness against his neighbour. But when we come to the Commandment 'Thou shalt not kill,' we have moved an amendment to the effect that the individual shall not kill but the State may kill if it wants to. I have never heard any argument, though I have studied this question a good deal, that convinces me that any man or body of men have the right, or have ever had the right, to enact legislation which will give them the legal right to kill one of their fellowmen. I believe that only He who gave life has the right to take it away. You will say to me at once: what of the man who takes life—should he go unpunished? The man who takes the life of a fellow creature has committed a crime against the human law as well as the Divine law, and, of course, punishment should be meted out to him. But I am arguing on the ground that capital puishment has no divine authority, and I question the right of any man, from the moral standpoint, to enact legislation which enables him to contravene that commandment which is old, yet ever new: 'Thou shalt not kill.' Are we not in legislation of this kind adhering strictly to the old law which was enacted and enforced by our forefathers in the time when they were, as we, at least, contend, not up to our standard of civilization and education? The world moves, and we should move with it. In applying capital punishment to a fellow-being I cannot see that we are applying to him any law different from that which we apply to the lower animals. In the various provinces we have legislative enactments providing that certain animals can be slaughtered if they commit certain depredations, and it cannot be said that we are not applying the same law to our fellow-beings when we say: If a man commits a certain depredation, kill him. I challenge any one to submit any divine authority for such an action. I feel very strongly on this matter; my convictions are not of the moment, I have held them all my life, and have given the matter some study. Some years ago when I was in the legislature of the province of Ontario, I had occasion to look into the statistics, some of which have been submitted by my hon. friend the member for Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) to-day. I convinced myself then—I cannot bring the figures to my mind at the present time—that in every State of the Union wherein capital punishment had been abolished, the benefits were clearly evident, and crime of murder had not increased. A comparison has been made here to-day of crime in the Maritime provinces and crime in the state of Maine. I submit that that is not a fair comparison. In the state of Maine the law is not recent, but if you take any of the States of the Union wherein capital punishment has been abolished in recent years, and compare the criminal conditions during a term of years before capital punishment was abolished with conditions during a period of years afterward, and the benefit that has resulted will be readily observed.

Mr. PELLETIER: How does the hon. gentleman explain that?

Mr. GRAHAM: Men are improving every day, and although we have the old enactment, if I may so call it, of 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,' and 'whosoever sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed,' these principles are giving way to the new thought of a new era. The men of to-day are inclined to be influenced by the Sermon on the Mount, rather than by the old ethics of many centuries ago. The improved condition is brought about by the education and treatment of the man, by his being uplifted through moral influences, and by that which to my mind is fully as strong—the human touch and the human sympathy of his fellow beings, which enables every man, in a measure at least, to look upon his fellow man as a friend and not as an enemy. In years gone by the entire world was much interested in the erection of great monuments to men whose valour had been proven on fields of battle—and great men they were. But that age is rapidly passing away, and in the years to come monuments will be erected to men, not because of deeds of valour they performed in slaying their fellow men, but because of their deeds of kindness and the good they did to their fellow beings as they went through life. I am fully convinced —and hon. gentlemen will, I am sure, all agree with me in this—that the supreme duty of every human being—particularly those in this House, in the legislative halls of the world, and in the highest walks of life, ought to be to leave the world somewhat better because of their having lived in it, and anything that tends to that end

should have our heartiest support. Does capital punishment reduce crime? I think not. I am opposed to it because I believe the object of punishment is overlooked in its infliction. We can argue all we like, but if capital punishment is being inflicted on some man, we are inclined to say: 'It serves him right.' That is not the spirit, I believe, in which legislation is enacted. If in this present age we were to go back to the old time of 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,' there would be very few hon. gentlemen in this House who would not, metaphorically speaking, be blind and toothless. None of us want that law applied to ourselves; we are always ready to throw ourselves into the great sea of humanity, trusting to the guidance and kind heartedness of our fellow beings to treat us just as they themslves would be treated.

I do not believe that anything is gained by capital punishment. What is the object of punishment? It is not retribution, although I fear that is the view held by many persons. Punishment for crime has two objects. One object is the protection of society, and the other ought to be the reformation of the individual. If society is to be protected, it can be protected just as well by shutting the criminal up during the remainder of his life, and making him contribute to the welfare of the family which he has, perhaps, deprived of its head, or by his labour contribute to the state if circumstances are otherwise. Society is just as well protected in that way as it would be if the man were hanged, and the spectacle given to the world of an entire nation taking hold of one defenceless man and putting him to death in the name of the law. Perhaps you will not agree with me, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that there is in every man an inherent good which can be cultivated if that man has the proper surroundings and the proper instruction. I myself take the ground emphatically that there are few criminals in the world who cannot by proper treatment be largely reclaimed to themselves at least, if not to the community. It might not, and possibly would not in all cases be safe to allow these men their freedom, but I believe that if an examination of four-fifths of the criminals of the Dominion of Canada to-day were made it would be found that by the influence of proper surroundings and proper teaching many of these persons could be reclaimed and made good citizens, better for this world, and surely better for the world to come. On the ground that I belive it wrong for even the State to take life, I am in favour of my hon. friend's motion. I am in favour of it on the second ground that I believe capital punishment does not add any protection that society would not have, equally strong, by incarceration for life; and on the third ground that I believe it would be possible, in many instances, to reclaim and bring back to manhood the men who otherwise lose their lives and bring disgrace on their families and those connected with them for all time to come. I have spoken strongly on this subject, it is a thing that has been next my heart all my life and I am delighted to have this opportunity to speak a word in favour of this measure. Without giving away any secrets I might say—and members of the Government will realize more fully what I mean—that one of the most trying things I had in my life as a member of a government was the dealing with these cases, believing in my heart that the State had no right, morally, to inflict capital punishment, believing it was not in the interests of society and certainly deprives individuals of all chance to be reclaimed. You can readily understand the position I was often placed in in having to express an opinion on questions of this kind. I speak strongly, I believe what I have said and I believe that the House could not better spend an hour or two than in discussing this great question which will have to be settled within a few years and I hope that what will be said will tend to what I believe is the right solution, the abolition of capital punishment in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) and the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), both of whom have spoken calmly on a subject that must be of interest in this country, both of whom have based their remarks on their inmost convictions. As I understand their positions, each of these hon. gentlemen believes that capital punishment is wrong and that the infliction of capital punishment is not a deterrent. I feel satisfied that if I were to enter into a verbal conflict with the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) with reference to the Scriptures and knowledge of them, I would surely suffer; but I am a little surprised that the

hon. member for South Renfrew, in justifying the immorality, if I might use the term, of capital punishment, relies wholly on one of the Mosaic laws. The hon. member for South Renfrew draws the attention of the House to the fact that one of the ten commandments is: 'Thou shalt not kill.' But does he not overlook another fundamental principle both of the Mosaic laws and of the Scripture? Not being entirely sure of my ground, I took the precaution of sending to the library for a Bible and I find that when Noah left the ark the Almighty entered into a compact with him, and this was part of that compact: 'Whoso sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed, for in the image of God made He man.' I therefore say that if one is to take refuge in the Scriptures for a justification of a belief in capital punishment, that verse would in my opinion be a justification. And there are other passages from the Scriptures that justify a similar belief, one of which my good friend referred to, and the second is that 'he who sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed,'—he that killeth a man shall surely be put to death.' That certainly proves that by the Mosaic law there was justification for capital punishment. My good friend from South Renfrew then steps from the Old Testament to the New Testament as a justification for his position. He turns from what one might call the justice of the Scriptures to the mercy of the Scriptures, from Moses as a judge to Christ as a Saviour, and tries to justify by the use of the New Testament a belief that he believes to be right. But are we to-night not bound to consider this subject more from the point of justice than from the point of mercy? If we consider the sparing of the life of the criminal, must we not consider the effect of the sparing of that life upon society? I therefore come to the second point of my argument, that for social reasons, capital punishment is justifiable as a deterrent.

The hon. member for Montreal spoke this afternoon in reference to the ridiculous enactments and laws of the eighteenth century. To-night I do not feel called upon to justify or attempt to explain away these laws. The House well knows, and the House must agree, and those who have read must have come to the conclusion that in the eighteenth century there were many ridiculous things, many things that none of us to-day would attempt to justify and would not believe; and I therefore say that in regard to that point I am at one with the hon. member for Montreal in saying that I think society has made a radical advance. But if society has made an advance, if innovations have been to improve, it does not necessarily follow that we should altogether leave the old methods that were most satisfactory and seek entirely after the new. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) spoke to-day, and quoted statements of what various men have said in reference to capital punishment. On a subject of this character it is only reasonable to suppose that as there are many men there would be many minds; but I would like to call his attention to a quotation from Boswell's Life of Johnson to show how radically public opinion has changed on a subject of this character. At one time it was customary in England for a procession to be held from Newgate to Tyburn where the criminal was executed; and when this procession was abandoned and when the criminal was executed at Newgate instead of being led through the streets, this is what Johnson is alleged to have said:

> The age is running mad after innovation; and all the business of the world is to be done in a new way: Tyburn itself is not safe from the fury of innovation. . . No, sir (said he eagerly), it is not an improvement; they object that the old method drew together a number of spectators. Sir, executions are intended to draw spectators. If they do not draw spectators, they don't answer their purpose. The old method was satisfactory to all parties; the public was gratified by a procession, and the criminal was supported by it.

I do not believe that there is a man in this House who could square himself with that idea to-day. There is not one of us who would attempt to justify the horrible orgies that took place at a hanging of the old days, when men bet on the number of minutes a man would live and whether or not an execution would be successfully performed. But as a lawyer I have been impressed as I read with the necessity and effect of capital punishment. It is all very well for me to rise in this House and say that I would be of the opinion that capital punishment would lessen the number of murders and for hon. gentlemen to make an opposite statement, but statistics are cruel. I am reading from a work on criminology published in 1914 and here are some statements made by the learned author:

> In Belgium, as a Procurator General of that country has said, the belief that the death penalty was a thing of the past, induced among

the masses by reason of the government's attitude toward capital sentences for some years prior to 1850, was attended by an increase in the number of the more serious crimes dating from that year.

And following the year 1863 which saw a return to the practice of systematic pardoning, the graver crimes multiplied in an alarming manner, as belief in the abolition of the death penalty became more and more fixed in the popular mind. In point of fact, from 1865 to 1880 prosecuting for murder increased from 34 to 120.

In Prussia, where for many years scarcely any executions have taken place, the criminal statistics exhibit a continual growth in the number of homicides during the period beginning with 1854 and ending with 1880: from 242 in the former year, it rose by an uninterrupted progression to 518 in the latter. In Switzerland, as a result of the abolition of the death penalty in 1874, it has been ascertained that there ensued an increase in this crime—estimated at 75 per cent for five years alone—a circumstance which decided many of the cantons to re-establish the punishment in question.

As for France, so long as capital sentences continued to be carried regularly into execution, the more serious forms of crime were on the decrease. But in 1878 President Grévy, apparently desirous of experimenting in armavili' permitted but seven executions, in 1880, but two, while in 1881 he cut the number down to one. As soon as this leniency was noticed by the criminal world, murders became more frequent. As against 31 capital sentences in 1877, there were 35 in 1880. Convictions for parricide, which had been 8 in 1878, increased to 14 in 1882. During this last-mentioned period the number of murders underwent an increase of 36. Since then, the censure of public opinion has caused the pardoning power to be exercised more sparingly. Of the criminals sentenced to death between 1886 and 1900 almost half were executed, with the result of reducing the number of murders from 224 to 175.

A correspondent writes me from Chile that with the practice there prevailing of systematically commuting the death penalty into that of 15 or 20 years of 'presidio' there has kept pace an increase of murders and culpable homicides, these crimes from 1898 to 1902 showing an annual average of 950, that is to say, 35 per 100,000 inhabitants. This extraordinary frequency of offences against human life, adds my informant, renders colonization almost impossible. The peasants are kept in a continued state of fright and their chief concern is to get away from the country districts. Yet in spite of these conditions the newspapers and politicians still make it a point to preach 'assassinophily.'

In Italy, where, except in the army, no executions have taken place since 1876, the more serious forms of crime have attained almost incredible proportions. Whereas in England the annual average of homicides is only 300, Italy, with an almost equal population, has an annual average of 3,814, of which nearly one-third are true cases of murder. Since 1892 there has been little change in the figures, the number in 1899 being 3,586.

[Mr. Nickle.]

Turning from that to the average of homicidal crimes throughout the world, we find—and I am now quoting from Modern Theories of Criminality—as follows:

Statistics show that criminality of blood leads all other forms in intensity. Below is a table giving the ratio of homicides of all degrees for every million inhabitants:

United States of America	120
Italy	95 to 98
Spain	74 to 77
Hungary	74 to 77
Austria	23 to 26
France	14 to 17
Belgium	14 to 17
Switzerland	14 to 17
Denmark	14 to 17
Sweden	11 to 14
Germany	3 to 11
England and Scotland	5 to 3
Holland	5 to 3

I think, Sir, that that amply demonstrates that capital punishment is a deterrent. England has always stood steadfast by capital punishment. She has been careful in her courts to protect the insane by the use of alienists and expert evidence, but she has manifestedly declared to her underworld that he who takes man's life, if proven guilty, shall have his life taken; and I attribute to the fearless carrying out of her laws, and the justice of her sentences, the righteousness of her people, and respect for law, and I believe that if the same steps are followed in Canada the effect will be the same. I think if we were further to regard this question from the point of view of present expediency, it would be most unwise at this time to try the experiment which the member from Montreal suggests. There never was a time in the history of this country when our shores were being flooded, as they are to-day, with the foreign element. Many of them are immigrants from Southern Europe, whose ideas of citizenship, and right, and wrong, are totally different from ours. They come from a people who believe that justice lies within the power of the individual, that 'might is right, and justice is the interest of the stronger,' that each man has a right to avenge personally the wrong he may have suffered. I think it would be a most unfortunate thing for this country, more especially for Western Canada, if those from Southern Europe should be allowed to feel that if they take the life of a fellow man they will be free from that responsibility which has prevailed in this country for so many years. I shall not take up the time of the House in explaining and enlarging

my views on this question, but as the hon. member from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) said he was in favour of the resolution because he thought it was right, and because he thought that capital punishment was not a deterrent, I say I am in favour of capital punishment because I think it is right, and I think the figures conclusively prove that it is a deterrent.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): While I must disagree with some of the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) and the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), I agree with these gentlemen on the main conclusion, that is, I do not think it is wise that we at this stage of the country's history should allow the infliction of capital punishment. My hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) has dealt with one of the propositions with which I cannot agree, because I think it was given too wide an interpretation. I refer to the commandment, Thou shalt not kill. My hon friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) has erred on the other side, for he wants to give too wide an interpretation to the Mosaic text: if man shed the blood of another, by man shall his blood be shed. If the hon. member who introduced this Bill has erred, certainly the hon. member for Kingston has also erred. It is quite true the law of Moses did allow capital punishment in certain cases. Will the hon. member for Kingston undertake to say that we should allow capital punishment in every case where the law of Moses allowed it? Will any man in this House say that? No. And why not? They appreciate the fact, which they hide in their speeches, that the laws which suited the time of Moses are not suited to to-day. If I understood the hon. member from Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) correctly, he seemed to approve of the theory that every murderer is insane. I cannot agree with that, but I will try to show that although that theory is not based on fact, there is still something in it. Another thing that seems to trouble him is that judges, prosecutors and hangmen, whom he seems to put all in the same class, must have a very uneasy conscience. I have never acted as a hangman or judge, but I have acted as prosecutor, and my conscience has never troubled me in the least, although I have prosecuted some men who have been put to death on account of their crimes. I do not think that argument has any bearing on the case at all. I do not think the conscience of any judge, or any prosecutor, troubles him either. I repeat that although I do not approve of all the arguments the hon. member advanced, I want him to understand that I approve of the main conclusion: that we have advanced to a stage in this country's development where we can afford to do away with the death penalty. It is true that my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) seems to disagree with that. He seems to think that, at this particular stage of our history we should not think of such a thing. If the hon. member for Kingston had produced any statistics to show that we are having more murders at this present stage of our history than we have had in the past, there might be something in what he has said. But, I do not think he can do so. I have no authority before me, I have not prepared myself with any authorities at all, but I think he would be wrong in claiming that crime of this kind has increased. It is claimed on the one hand, by those who are advocating this Bill, that in countries where capital punishment has been abolished there is less crime of this description than there is in similar countries where capital punishment is still in force. The hon. member for Kingston quotes figures to show the opposite. They say that statistics cannot lie, but they can mislead very often and generally you can quote figures to prove the other side of almost any proposition. I have no doubt in the least that figures could be quoted to prove the opposite of the contention put forward by the hon. member for Kingston.

My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell), has said, and fairly said, that we are very apt to be influenced by our own personal observations and experience. I have had some experience in dealing with matters of this kind, and possibly, to some extent, I have been influenced by what I have seen. Although, I admit, I have never made any special study of this particular subject, I have tried to study the subject generally and to find out as much as I can, not only from my own experience, but from my reading. My reading in connection with criminal cases brings me pretty much to the same conclusion as that at which I have arrived as a result of my personal experience in watching cases with which I have had to do myself.

It is admitted, apparently, on all hands, that the infliction of the death penalty for this or any other crime is horrible and repulsive. I think we all agree to that. It is a horrible idea that the State shall gather its forces together and put one defenceless man to death. It is against the better feelings of any right thinking man. I do

not think there will be any question at all as to that. Agreeing then with what I have said, as I think we must agree, I go further and say that we must also agree to the proposition that capital punishment should not be allowed unless absolutely necessary. The question is: Is it absolutely necessary?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. THOMSON: Perhaps that is too strong a term to use; we will say 'reasonably necessary,' and that will perhaps please our friends opposite better. I think all will agree that unless it is necessary we should not think of any such thing. All will agree, I think, that the infliction of the death penalty by the State should not be permitted unless it is really necessary, and we will also agree that the system is horrible and repulsive to the minds of all right thinking persons. If that is admitted, then the onus rests entirely on those who would retain that system. It is for them to show that it is necessary in the interests of the State, and that it would be unsafe to do away with it. Some advocates of the Bill have stated that in none of the countries where capital punishment has been abolished has it been reinstated. I believe that my hon. friend from Kingston says that in some of the cantons of Switzerland it has been reinstated.

An hon. MEMBER: Also in France.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: It was never abolished in France.

Mr. THOMSON: I will leave these gentlemen to settle that dispute themselves. I think it will be agreed that in almost all of the lands in which capital punishment has been abolished it has not been revived. If there had been a general complaint that crimes of this nature had increased where capital punishment had been abolished, there is no doubt that the people would very soon have reinstated capital punishment. The fact that generally they have not reinstated that system shows clearly that they are better satisfied with the present method of dealing with these crimes than with the old system. Whatever fault their present system may have, they have not gone back to the former system, which shows that, in their opinion, the present system is the better one.

I just want to deal with one particular phase of this question, otherwise I would not have risen to my feet. I want to deal with the state of mind of the man who commits a crime of this kind. I said that I could not entirely agree with my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Lawrence, in assuming, as I believe he assumed, that these men were insane in every case. I do not think they are insane, that is that they would be adjudged by our courts to be legally insane. But I think that a study of the state of mind of the man who commits a crime of this kind is worthy of consideration, and I will admit, with my hon. friend from Carleton, that I am perhaps influenced a little by what I have seen myself. Cases have come under my personal experience and my reading does not change my mind, but it rather bears out the conclusion that I have come to from those cases that have come under my personal observation. I find that there are two different states of mind, that you can divide the state of mind a person who commits a crime of that kind under two heads. Generally, each will have something to do with his condition, but either one or the other certainly will. Either the man who commits the crime is in an excited state of mind or there is some particular provocation or something which has done its work upon his passion with the result that he does not think for one moment of the consequences. That is the general thing. I have prosecuted in four cases where the parties have been found guilty—in three cases of murder and one of manslaughter, and in three out of those four cases I believe that was the absolute state of the minds of the persons who had committed those crimes. I am satisfied that not one of these three men had the slightest notion of the results to himself. It did not make one straw's worth of difference to these men whether the penalty was hanging, or life imprisonment, or a fine of one dollar. That is the general state of mind of the man who commits murder. You may call that insanity if you like; he is not in his right mind, but he is not insane. He is in that condition of mind where it does not make a bit of difference what the consequences of his act may be.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the man who premeditates murder?

Mr. THOMSON: The man to whom my hon. friend refers, and who has been referred to by one of the speakers before, is the man who from the bottom of his heart thinks there is no possible chance of his being found out. I do not think that any hon. member of this House will contradict me in that. Unless he is in the state I have just described in which he does not

think for a moment what the consequences will be, he is in the state of mind in which he has satisfied himself that he will not be found out.

Let us consider that for a moment. If he had not been in that state of mind, would he have committed the crime? Take the case of the Italians, to which my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) referred. Perhaps the idea was in my hon. friend's mind that those men would not have committed the crime had they known that the penalty was hanging.

9 p.m. I have a great respect for my hon. friend's opinion, but I do not think he has given the matter very careful study. Had those Italians had any idea that they were going to be found out, would they have committed the crime for the paltry sum they obtained? What good would the money be to them if they were imprisoned for life, supposing that was the penalty? It is quite possible that those Italians would rather be imprisoned for life than be hanged, whereas many other men would rather be hung than be imprisoned for life. My point is that they would not have committed the crime but for the fact that they were satisfied that they would never be found out. I do not believe there is one case in ten thousand, in a civilized country, that will not come under one of these rules: Either that a man is in a state of mind where he has not the slightest thought as to the consequences that may result from his action, owing to his being worked up by passion or otherwise, or else he is thoroughly satisfied that he will never be found out.

Mr. WILCOX: To what extent does the hon. member attribute the use of liquor to these crimes?

Mr. THOMSON: That would probably come under the first head, because I notice that men who are drunk have no ideas of consequences to themselves. That is the result of my observations; I have never had any personal experience.

If I am right on those points, that the people who commit these crimes come under one or the other of the heads to which I have referred, what difference does it make as a deterrent whether you punish them by imprisonment for life or by hanging? We are told that it is a deterrent to others. I do not believe it. Will any man be deterred from committing a crime by the fact that he thinks he will be imprisoned for life and not hanged? If there are any such beings in existence, there are so few of them that it is not worth while considering such isolated cases. If hanging is to be used as a deterrent to others, the plan which has been condemned by those who oppose this Bill, that is the plan of public execution, should be revived. If we wish to deter the public from committing these crimes, we should give them an opportunity of seeing the execution, so that they may know what it looks like to be hanged. No man who has seen anyone hanged will want to be hanged himself. While I am not so very strongly impressed by the ideas of the hon. members who have spoken in favour of the Bill, as they themselves are, I firmly believe that it will be better for humanity, better for the country and better all round if we do away with capital punishment.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I am sure that every one will agree with me that the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) is of sufficient importance to command more than a passing moment of the time of the House. I have listened with attention and earnestness to the arguments advanced both for and against, with a view of informing my mind on this very important matter. The hon. member for Montreal has stated that when the State condemns a man to death, it says by that action that that man is unfit to live on earth. He argues from that, that a man who is unfit to live on earth is certainly unfit for Heaven, and he, therefore, lays the responsibility on the state of prescribing and limiting most unhappily the future of that person.

The hon. members who have spoken in support of this Bill have taken the ground that the worst thing you can possibly do to a man is to take away his life. They argue, no doubt conscientiously and from humanitarian motives, that capital punishment should be abolished. I am not altogether convinced that the worst thing you can do to a man is to take away his life. I do not know whether it is worse for a man to suffer a few moments of anguish, to be followed by oblivion, or to be obliged to spend the rest of his days behind prison walls; to pound ceaselessly upon a piece of limestone, to be driven to his kennel at night, to be let out again in the morning a worse man that when he went in, to return to his kennel at night more like a beast than he was in the morning, to be forced to submit to all sorts of degradation, to mental torture, to torment and to bodily tortures

devised by highly paid officials whose unchecked powers over criminals are greater than the powers of the judges who sentenced them to confinement. I am not sure whether it is worse to snap the brittle thread of life at once, at a time when the man is in a state of mind to make a final plea for mercy to the Almighty, or, to keep him behind prison walls in such a condition that he will rot mentally and morally, and reach his final end unable to make a last plea to God for mercy. I am not certain whether hanging is worse than life imprisonment. If the question were put before the convicts incarcerated in Kingston penitentiary under the administration which has obtained there for years past, I am not sure that the majority of them, if they had to choose between life imprisonment and hanging, would not say: Bring on your rope.

Hanging is not considered such a very serious matter after all. An Irishman once said it was not so bad when you got used to it. There are some people, holding high positions in this country and drawing big salaries, who regard the winding of a clock as of more importance than the hanging of a man, or the saving of a man from hanging. It is more than two years ago since I made the charge, which has been amply proved and which may be referred to to-night, that a certain official once reprimanded very seriously a night-watchman for stopping in his rounds in order to cut down a convict who was hanging in his cell. He reprimanded the night-watchman for being late in winding his clock and said to him, 'Let him hang, but wind your clock.'

This instance I gave to the Minister of Justice some two years ago. That man is still receiving pay from the Dominion of Canada as an official. So, I say, in some quarters the mere act of hanging is not considered so serious as my hon. friend from Montreal and the hon. member from South Renfrew seem to think it. Now, it would undoubtedly be a very serious offence if any hon. gentleman leaving this House to-night and going to his home should retire without winding the clock. If one of the family happened to be taken sick, even so sick as to be in danger of dying in a short time, he might be excused for not calling medical assistance, but he could not be excused for neglecting to wind the family clock. I hope to have something more to say in regard to this matter of prison conditions at a later stage of the session.

[Mr. Edwards.]

There is one thing further, however, in regard to capital punishment that has not been touched upon as yet. We must all admit, I think, who have followed the papers and watched matters from day to day, that there seems to be a tendency among people as soon as a man is convicted of any offence and placed behind prison bars at once to circulate petitions or get people interested in trying to get that man paroled and released from prison. Petitions are an everyday occurrence no matter what the man's sentence may be. If he has influential friends, political or clerical, or if he has friends who belong to any particular society, they at once get busy on his behalf and circulate petitions asking for his release. It is suddenly found out that the man's health is going all to pieces. I was amused in the last prison investigation in Kingston, with the gentleman who was instrumental in wrecking the Farmers' Bank and thereby imposing loss and suffering on thousands of people. He was called upon to give evidence. He declared that everything was lovely; the food was all right, the sanitary condition was perfect, there was plenty of opportunity for exercise, the officials were so angelically perfect that the wings had almost sprouted on their shoulders, everything was delightful. But his health was going to pieces under this splendid treatment. True, he was engaged in clerical work which did not impose any hardship upon him. But he declared that he should be taken out, because his health was being affected, and he gave his evidence as he did for the purpose of influencing men who possibly could give him a parole. We have had instances in this country that illustrate the tendency on the part of the people of which I have spoken. Not so long ago a man was sentenced to life imprisonment for taking the life of another. He was in prison for a short time when the prison surgeon found that his health was going to pieces. Another doctor was brought in to corroborate his finding; and within a few months this man, who had deliberately taken the life of another, was let out of prison and he is a free man to-day. So, in considering the matter of the abolition of capital punishment, one must take into account the tendency of the people to circulate these petitions to have men liberated no matter what crime they may have committed. If a man who commits a murder is to be sentenced to prison, and his friends are to be encouraged to think that in a

short time they will be able by petition to get his sentence shortened and the man liberated, it is not going to be very long in this country until men will regard murder about the same way as, I believe, they regard it in some states to the south of the line. I believe that in the state of Michigan, where capital punishment has been abolished, men who have committed murder have been sentenced to prison, firmly believing—and being justified in believing from the experience of others—that a few years would see them at liberty through the influence of their friends.

I will not take up more time, but I want to say in conclusion that I think this a very important subject. I think the House is possibly not in posssesion of all the information and details that it should reasonably be possessed of to pass judgment upon this question. Speaking for myself, I know I would like to have more information on the subject before I cast my vote. For that reason I should be sorry to see this matter carried to a division here to-night. I have an open mind in regard to the matter. I have been very greatly impressed by the speech of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), in fact I do not think I ever heard him speak when he impressed me so much as he did to-night. I should like more information before being asked to vote, and I trust the question will not be pressed to a division.

Mr. CHARLES A. WILSON (Laval): Mr. Speaker, on the Orders of the Day you will find Motion No. 62 to be as follows:

Mr. Wilson (Laval)—Order of the House—For a return showing all persons, male or female, who have been capitally convicted in Canada, and each province, for each year, from the 1st of July, 1867, to the 2nd of February, 1914, specifying the offences and whether and how the sentences were carried into effect by execution, or otherwise, with the name of convicts; dates of conviction; crime of which committed; sentences passed; judges by whom sentenced; and how dealt with.

2. For a return showing all convicts, male and female, who have been reprieved from the execution of capital sentences passed upon them during the above-mentioned period, with the name of convicts; dates of conviction; crime of which committed; sentences passed; by whom sentenced; sentences commuted, and if so, to what.

3. For a return showing all persons in Canada, and each province, convicted during the above-mentioned period, of murder or manslaughter, whose sentences have been mitigated, or who have received a free pardon, together with a statement of the offences of which they were severally convicted, with the name of convicts; dates of conviction; nature of offence; sentences; and extent of mitigation of sentences and dates.

4. For a return of instances, during the above-mentioned period, in which appeal has been made on behalf of the persons convicted of capital offences to His Excellency the Governor in Council, for the exercise of the Royal prerogative of pardon, or mitigation of sentences, with the name of convicts; dates of conviction and place; crime of which committed; sentences; dates of appeal; and the result.

Perhaps at first glance hon. members of this House might think that this order called for information designed merely to satisfy curiosity, and morbid curiosity at that. But that is not the idea. This resolution was placed upon the Order Paper because my hon. friend from St. Lawrence division (Mr. Bickerdike) had given notice of this Bill in the House. I thought it in the public interest to find out how many people had been, in the first place accused, in the second place tried, in the third place sentenced, for capital crimes, and also what had become of these people—from Confederation up to the present time. Some hon. members might ask me why I seek to cover by this return the whole period from the time of Confederation. It is because the law under the Union, from 1840—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is rather dealing with a resolution which has not yet been reached.

Mr. WILSON: I am not discussing this resolution. I am simply stating that this notice of motion was given, because of the Bill we are now discussing. I gave notice of this resolution because I desired information that would enable us better to discuss this Bill of my hon. friend in the light of facts concerning our own country. We are not here to legislate for Austria, Germany, France or even the British Empire. Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that if we had a return of all these cases from 1867—and that is why I agree with my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards)—we should be in a better position to discuss this great and important question?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the rule. If, the House had reached that order and he was prepared to make a motion, I assume it would be followed by just such an argument as he is now making and if that be correct he is anticipating an order on the paper.

Mr. WILSON: I withdraw all I have said, and I shall not refer any more to order No. 62. There is no more obedient

servant of yours, Mr. Speaker, in the House than the hon. member for Laval, even though he is not allowed to read his notes. Fortunately for everybody to-night, I have no notes; I have not the privileges enjoyed by the Prime Minister. I am very sorry that on such an important subject I have no notes, because, as I was going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I expected that the Bill would be discussed later. The object I had in view was to have obtained a little more information. However, I have some information on the subject. The other day in Montreal a coloured man named Campbell was executed. I am delighted to see here now the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) who was the crown prosecutor in Montreal. There was a current report in the newspapers that this man Campbell had committed nine murders before the last one for which he paid the penalty of his life. I ask hon. members of this House, especially my hon. friend the member for St. Lawrence, what they would do with such a specimen of humanity, or such a—no, I will not use the other word, but any hon. gentleman in this House can supply it for me. Supposing this man had been sentenced to jail for life, would he be deprived of his mania for committing murder, and refrain from killing the guards? Reference has been made to the fact that in Edmonton, I think it was, one of the deputy wardens had his throat cut by a convict. If there is good reason for having erected a monument to the Chevalier d'Assas it seems to me that one should be erected to Dr. Laviolette of St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, who, being wounded by convicts, gave the command: 'Shoot, shoot, never mind me.' Dr. Laviolette did his duty, and did it well. I have had considerable experience during nineteen years of practice; I have defended fifteen cases of murder, and have prosecuted in two instances. If I were asked: 'Are you in favour of the abolition of capital punishment or are you against it?' I would admit very sincerely that when I was defending I was quite in favour of the abolition of capital punishment, but when I was prosecuting it took all the majesty of the law to keep me within bounds. Fortunately, this is not a political question; every member on this side and on the other side of the House is free to express his opinion. A professor came to me once and asked me: 'How do you stand with your conscience when you are defending a murderer who has confessed to you his guilt? How can you defend such a case?' I said I never took a bad case in my life and I do not know of any bad cases so far as criminality is concerned. This assertion may appear to be a very broad one, and perhaps hon. gentlemen will come to the conclusion that my conscience is a most elastic one. I cannot blame those of my friends who have a smile on their faces now, as there is reason for it, and if it is a consolation to them I am willing that they should have that consolation. If I am sick, I go to a doctor; if I have some sins to confess, I go to the priest; if any hon. gentlemen have trouble about law, I would advise them to go to a lawyer—he is not the worst adviser after all. There is one thing we must not forget. After all, what is a verdict? It is a conclusion which the judge and jury have got to draw from the facts and from the law, and that is the reason why jurisprudence, so far as criminal law is concerned, is so particular about the admissions and confessions of criminals. I have seen some men under the strain of the charge that was laid against them make an admission of guilt when they were not guilty at all. Should we apply to those men the principle that punishment is a deterrent of their actions? The actions of the criminal may have been brought about by passion, by drugs, by liquor, by jealousy, by temper. The hon. member for St. Lawrence said that society would be more adequately protected against criminals by imprisonment for life. I know that imprisonment for life is a severe punishment. Are we going to leave to the murderers themselves the choice as to whether they prefer to hang or to be imprisoned for life? I think we have to take a saner view than this. I heard the hon. member for South Renfrew say that when he was a minister of the Cabinet he found it one of the most trying things to decide a question of life or death. I cannot blame him for that. I have said that during the course of my practice I have defended fifteen cases of murder. A remark of the hon. member for Frontenac to which I take exception was his assertion that some men were safe because they had wealthy or political friends. On one occasion I addressed a petition to His Excellency, the Governor General in Council, but I was not successful. However, there is one thing which must be considered. How can a Cabinet composed of fourteen or fifteen members, receiving a report from a judge and reading dry depositions written in cold red or black ink on white paper, appreciate the evidence of a witness when they do not see the witness? This is what

I have always been afraid of. How can an executive Cabinet manipulate—if I may use the word; I know it is improper, but no better word comes to my mind just now—or appreciate or thresh out the evidence in connection with any particular case when it is a case of life or death? How can they weigh the evidence of witness A or witness B or witness C and say that they believe this witness and disbelieve the other, when they have not the witness before them? But the Government has to take the responsibility, because the law is theirs. Is this justice? If I were proposing an amendment to the Criminal Code I would suggest that where a verdict of guilty is found the jury pronounce the verdict of guilty of murder, with or without capital punishment. Let society take the whole responsibility. Let these twelve men good and true—twelve such men as superintended the signing of the Magna Charta at Runnymede—take the responsibility of their own actions. Do not put the responsibility on fourteen or fifteen men in Ottawa, and compel them to study the dry record of a criminal case; then it will be known whether the evidence of witness A or witness B or witness C is or is not worthy of being believed. I know this is a disagreeable subject to discuss, but we are here to do our duty, and I think I am performing mine to the best of my ability. I have the statistics at hand and I could discuss some particular cases one after the other and be in a better position to support my contention. The question is not a new one. I know how many times it has been raised in this House, but I am sure of one thing; the matter has not been brought up in Parliament since 1908, when I first came into this House. It has been taken up and studied in England. I have here the report of all Bills in this matter presented in the House of Commons from 1853 to 1881; it is entitled 'Reports of Capital Punishment from 1853 to 1881.' A commission has been appointed, and many learned men have been called upon to give evidence. I shall not take up the time of the House to read six or seven hundred pages of evidence; I will dispense with that—I am sure hon. gentlemen will give me that privilege. I am sure that even if I were to read this I would not be capable of convincing some hon. gentlemen in this House who have already formed opinions on the subject. As I have said, I will vote against the Bill presented by the hon. member for St. Lawrence division. When considering this subject sometimes I have been in favour of the abolition of capital punishment, and sometimes I have favoured the other side of the question, but after considering it thoroughly; after studying the statistics not only of the different countries where capital punishment has been in force and is still in existence, but also of those wherein capital punishment has been abolished, I came to the conclusion that there are just as many crimes, having regard to murder, in countries where capital punishment has been abolished as there are in countries where it is still in existence. I am told that capital punishment has been abolished in Italy and Austria, but one day I was told by an Italian: 'I am in favour of the abolition of capital punishment for one reason.' His reason convinced me: 'If you kill my brother, you still live; I will kill you, and I will live also.'

Mr. EDMOND PROULX (Prescott): I am strongly inclined to support the Bill presented by my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike). The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said that there is not much agitation in this country to suppress capital punishment, and that is true in respect to recent years that which is probably due to the mitigation of the laws in regard to punishment. It is not many years since capital punishment was imposed in England for numerous offences, while to-day, it is restricted to cases of treason and murder. It is also imposed under martial law for certain offences in the army and navy. In this country, it is now restricted to treason, murder, and cases of rape. In cases of rape the death penalty is very seldom imposed, and it is not obligatory on the judge to impose capital punishment, but optional. I once defended a person charged with this offence, and the judge came very near to imposing sentence of death. I must admit it was a very bad case and the prisoner got a life sentence. It was probably a just sentence considering the class from which the criminal came, but I think it would have been going to the extreme to impose the death penalty. Some English writers and associations advocate the total abolition of the death penalty, their argument being that society has no right to take the life of any one of its members for any cause. For my part, I find it hard to admit that society has any right to take the life of one of its members on any

ground. My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) has cited the Bible and the Mosaic law, but I prefer the more humane law laid down in the New Testament, the law of forgiveness. I think the tendency of humanity to-day is towards forgiveness rather than towards revenge. We may object to capital punishment on many grounds. First on religious grounds, because it may deprive the sinner of the full time for repentance. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) said that a man who was hanged was just as well prepared to meet his Saviour as a man who was left to rot, mentally and morally, in prison. It is true that the courts of justice give more time now between the trial and the day of execution than formerly; it is not many years since the accused in England was executed on the same day he was found guilty. Even now, the time is comparatively short, and if a person is allowed to live to the end of his natural life, he would have more time for full repentance and full reparation.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: Or to get worse.

Mr. PROULX: Some may get worse, but as a general rule I think the prisoners would be better prepared at the end of their natural life to meet their Saviour. Again, we may take objection to capital punishment on medical grounds, on the ground of mental irresponsibility. I do not think it can be denied that there are many cases of homicide committed through irresponsibility, through a person losing control of his senses. I have not had a very large experience in criminology, but I defended two persons charged with murder. The first year I was at the Bar, I had charge of the defence of a man who had committed a double murder. I never had any doubt that this man was not morally guilty, although he was legally guilty. I put up a special plea of insanity, but as members of the Bar in this House know, legal insanity is very hard to prove. Not every kind of insanity will be admitted in a court of justice. This man, as soon as he had recovered his senses was really repentant. In fact he wanted to plead guilty, and it was against his will that I entered a plea of not guilty. Two medical experts were called, Dr. Clarke, now of the Toronto Asylum, and then Superintendent of the Rockwood Asylum and Dr. Beemer of the Mimico Asylum. They examined the accused a few months after the offence was committed: he had recovered his full senses at that time. They could not find him insane according to the definition in the Code. I certainly thought it was a case of cerebral insanity. I think there are quite a few medical men who believe in this species of insanity. Dr. Clarke himself had given a lecture some months before at Peterborough before the Medical Association on this very subject, but he would not admit that my client came within the definition. His insanity was brought on by heavy drinking, and I always feel that in cases of that kind the man is not morally guilty. Another ground on which we can object to capital punishment is that it is not really a deterrent. It is inflicted in so few instances that criminals discount the risks of undergoing it. As my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) said a few moments ago, those who commit murder, do so because they feel practically sure they will not be detected and punished. There are very few cases in which the person who commits the crime thinks or even dreams that he may undergo sentence of death. If we take the legal ground that the sentence being irrevocable and the evidence often circumstantial only, there is a great risk of gross injustice in executing the person convicted of murder. There are many cases in which there is only circumstantial evidence. My legal friends may say that in many cases circumstantial evidence may be stronger than direct evidence. That may be true, but as when an innocent man is hanged the damage is irreparable, we should be very cautious before executing any man convicted of murder.

Even when the evidence is direct, persons may perjure themselves or may be mistaken and although it has seldom been proven that innocent persons have been hanged, it still is a fact that in almost every country there has been a strong conviction amongst the people that some persons who have been hanged might have been innocent. Only the other day we discussed the case of a poor Italian sent up for fifteen years' imprisonment for attempted murder. He has passed five years of his life in prison. I will not say that he was actually innocent but still there was a strong presumption that he was by the fact of some of the persons giving evidence against him being of the criminal class. And lastly I am opposed to capital punishment on moral grounds because capital punishment does not fit the case or effect the reformation of the offender. We cannot repair the loss of a life by the loss of another one and it certainly does not effect the reformation of the offender, be-

cause in many cases, when the offender has done the act under strong impulse or under the influence of liquor, he did not intend to commit the act and if he had a chance to reform he could become again a good member of society. The tendency in England has been to restrict the imposition of capital punishment. In 1908 an Act was passed, called the Children Act, which expressly forbids the pronouncement or recording of the sentence of death against any person under the age of sixteen years. We have not this law yet in this country. I think that this is a good position because most of the murders committed by children are not deliberately committed and they should not be subject to capital punishment. Capital punishment is probably retained partly from ingrained habit and partly from a sense of its appropriateness for certain crimes; also that the ultimate ratio may be available in cases of sufficient gravity to the common weal. In cases of high treason, in the United Kingdom or other countries, of the murder of a king or of any member of the imperial family, capital punishment might be retained. But I think that it should be restricted only to this class of crime. It may perhaps be retained on account of the medical doctrine and that of Lombroso in respect to criminal atavism and irresponsibility. That probably tended to incline the public mind in favour of capital punishment. Sir James Stephen, another eminent jurist, has even thereby been tempted to advocate the execution of habitual criminals. It certainly seems strange that the community should feel impelled to preserve a class of dangerous lunatics and give them the finest air in the country and the right to kill two jailers a week, as seems to be the fear of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Wilson) when he said that if a criminal was committed to pass his life in prison he might preserve his criminal instincts and might exercise them on his guards. I think that such instances would be rather the exception than the rule. I think the general rule would be that those confined in the jail will try to earn their pardon by good conduct.

The whole question of capital punishment was investigated in the United Kingdom in 1864. It was considered by a Royal Commission appointed in that year, which reported in 1866. The commission took the opinion of all the judges of the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom and of many other eminent persons, and collected the laws of other countries so far as this was ascertainable. The commissioners differed on the question of the expediency of the abolition or retaining of capital punishment and did not report thereon, but they recommended that it should be restricted in the United Kingdom to high treason and murder. Secondly, they reported in favour of an alteration of the law of homicide so as to classify homicides according to their gravity and to confine capital punishment to murder in the first degree. We have not in this country a classification. In the United States they have homicide in the first degree and in the second degree. Here we have homicide, which is divided into two kinds, murder and manslaughter. I speak now of capital or punishable homicide, because, of course, there might also be justifiable homicide. But in some cases where the jury might be justified in reducing murder to manslaughter, they may be directed by the judge to bring in a verdict of murder or of nothing, according to the evidence presented to the court. I remember in one case I was engaged for the defence. The accused was charged with murdering his brother and I wanted the offence to be reduced to manslaughter. I could not prove that there was provocation by blows, by physical force, but I considered I had probably proven sufficient provocation by words and also by showing the precedent conduct of the person killed toward the accused, because the person killed was the elder brother of the accused and was acting in a kind of parental relationship to him. I thought that the jury would have been justified in bringing in a verdict of manslaughter instead of one of murder. The learned judge, in giving the definition of the offence and appreciating the evidence, led the minds of the jury to the offence of murder. The jury brought in a verdict of murder with a strong recommendation to mercy, and I afterwards learned from some of the jury that they thought that by bringing in this recommendation they would save the man from the scaffold. The learned judge told me afterwards that he would have preferred that the verdict had been for manslaughter. His report to the Minister of Justice led to the commutation of the sentence but, unfortunately, the man executed the sentence upon himself which the jury had rendered. After the sentence had been commuted he told me he preferred to die. I doubted his declaration at the time, but after he had been five or six months in the penitentiary he hanged

himself with his bed sheets. He may have been one of those of whom the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) spoke when he said that most of those condemned to the death penalty would probably prefer to be hanged than to pass their life in the penitentiary. But, I think those are very few in number. Most of those found guilty, if they were given the option between life imprisonment and the scaffold, would choose life imprisonment. I do not propose to take up any more time. The ground has been very well covered by my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Lawrence, who proposed this Bill, and if the Bill goes to a vote I will support it.

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I want to state why I am in favour of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike), proposing the abolition of the death penalty. I claim that, with the present organization of society, capital punishment should be abolished. Whenever a murder is committed in any part of the country we follow the trial in the newspapers and I have noticed for a good many years past that if it happens that the person accused of the crime has very rich relatives, or a great many friends who possess a certain amount of money, he stands a very good chance of receiving a life sentence instead of being hanged. I will cite one case that comes to my mind. It is the Valleyfield affair that occurred some years ago, when, I believe, three men were killed. I do not know that as yet the murderer of those three men has been hanged. If the accused happens to be a poor man with hardly any person to defend him he stands a good chance of getting the full capital punishment. I believe that society itself is largely responsible for a good many of the murders that are committed in the country. I claim further that capital punishment will create more murderers and rogues. I will explain myself. A family supporting the brand of dishonour imposed upon it by the infliction of the death penalty upon its head, or one of its members, cannot be expected to have a very warm spot in its heart for the society that took the life of father or brother under those conditions. The family will entertain a feeling of bitter animosity against the society that has inflicted such a punishment upon its head. This feeling of animosity is likely to be extended through two or three generations, you may have two or three criminals in succeeding generations, and if you go back and trace it to its source you will find that this condition originated with the infliction of capital punishment upon a member of the family. It has been stated that there are more murders amongst those who have come from the old land and are now citizens of this country than amongst other classes of the community. Bear in mind that the social conditions in the countries from which these people have come are also responsible for the mentality of the people. We must bear in mind that the mentality of men is developed with the sphere in which they are found. I am strongly in favour of abolishing capital punishment and of doing all in our power to educate men to become better citizens instead of inviting their ill-will towards society which the infliction of this barbarous punishment must produce in the minds and hearts of the family and descendants of the victims. There a great many other ways of committing murder than those which are commonly regarded as constituting the crime dealt with in this Bill, and which are not generally regarded as calling for the infliction of capital punishment, but probably this is not the time to discuss that subject in its wider aspect. There are people in this country more responsible for the life of men and women than the person who will take a revolver and kill his fellow-man. We are doing very little towards educating that class of people. I repeat that I am against capital punishment because I believe that society is absolutely responsible for the action of those who commit acts of this kind which the law is designed to prevent.

10 p.m.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to disagree with so many of my friends on this side of the House on this question. It is a very important question, and because I believe it to be so important I wish to express my opinion in regard to it. I desire, if I may, to speak for those who believe that capital punishment is a necessity of society as at present constituted. Speaking not only for myself but for those who think as I do, I would say that we have just the same belief in the existence of God, in the eternity of the soul and in the mercy of the Saviour as have those who speak against capital punishment. Let me ask the House to look, as my turn of mind causes me to look, not to the murderer but to the victim. My sympathy is with the

families of those who have been the victims of the murderer. It is as a rule the better people who are the victims. It is the worse who are the murderers. We are dealing with facts as they are, as men in a world of men, as a responsible body charged with the protection of society by means of law and the administration of law. If we believe that the infliction of capital punishment is not a deterrent to murder or capital crime, then certainly it is repulsive that capital punishment should be inflicted. I am one of those who believe that capital punishment is a deterrent; that history and facts prove that it is a deterrent; and so long as man's mind is as it is, so long will it be a deterrent.

It has seemed good to the Creator to implant, as a master instinct in the mind of man, the fear of death. If that is the master instinct, and it is, and of necessity it is, then certainly capital punishment is a deterrent against capital crime and as such is a necessity to present day civilization. At some future date in the history of the world, when swords have been beaten into plough-shares and spears into pruning hooks, when the mind of man has been changed, when the uplift that we are all working for has been obtained, then we can afford to do away with that protection which, as I understand the case, the safety of society imperatively demands to-day.

For the man who occupies a position in life where his safety is assured, not by the law of the land but by the social conditions, who sees crime merely as through a telescope and the consequences of crime as something apart and away from himself, it is easy to discuss the punishment of crime academically. I have had the good or bad fortune to live the larger part of my life under conditions where the primal passions of man were not under the restraint of society as they are in the centres of civilization, and yet where law and order were as well maintained, during the period of my lifetime there, as they are here or anywhere else; but it was because justice was swift and certain and adequate that law and order were maintained and that life and property were safe.

To begin at the further west: The difference in the conditions of law and order prevailing immediately south and immediately north of the 49th parallel in the mining regions of the Pacific coast of the United States and of British Columbia respectively, I think will establish beyond any question the value of the swift, certain and adequate administration of law. There was no difference in natural conditions between the mining fields of California and the mining fields of British Columbia. In both cases it was the same metal that the people were searching for; in both cases it was the same men who were searching for the metal; but in one case was a saturnalia of murder and in the other case there was almost an absolute absence of serious crime.

It is history and not ancient history—my friends from the Pacific coast will perhaps know more about it than I do—that when Judge Begbie was appointed to administer law in the mining regions of British Columbia, he was given to understand that this was a mining country, and that because it was a mining country there had to be a certain latitude in the actions of men, and that their primal passions must have their way. He said: 'I represent British authority and British law; and if there is shooting, there will be hanging.' There was some shooting; there was hanging and there was no more shooting. There did not need to be any more hanging, and the province of British Columbia in those early days stood as an example for the maintenance of law and order, a credit to the empire and to the people of that province.

Let us now cross the mountains on to the great plains. Nobody will deny that in the two prairie provinces where law and order were maintained by the mounted police, there was a maintenance of favourable conditions in the security of life and property such as was better than prevails in the city of Ottawa to-day. There is no natural difference between the province of Alberta and the state of Montana; there is only an imaginary line between the two, yet I have heard passengers on the railway crossing the boundary line saying that, while the train was on the boundary line, they saw men shooting each other on the south side of the line, whereas north of the line such a thing was unknown. I say again, it was because on the Canadian side law was swift, measurably swift, certain, measurably certain adequate, measurably adequate, whereas on the other side of the line it was neither swift, certain nor adequate.

I was a resident of Manitoba in 1873. The population then was small and the country was isolated from the rest of the Dominion. In what are now the states of Minnesota and Dakota railroad work was going on, and there was a very great disregard of law and order and of the rights of life and property in those states. I remember very distinctly

one summer morning that word was scattered through the then little town of Winnipeg that a murder had been committed the night before. It was true. I saw the body myself, stabbed in forty or fifty places. It was thought to be the opening of an era of such conditions as prevailed south of the line. The head of the judiciary of Manitoba of that day was Chief Justice Wood. Certain arrests were made, a trial was held and a man was hanged. And from that time on there was nothing but the maintenance of law and order. I am bound to say that the people of that locality at that time fully believed that the prompt and adequate administration of justice on that occasion did deter an incursion of undesirable characters from south of the line who would have made of Winnipeg what the towns along the Northern Pacific had been made under their control. Having seen what I have seen, believing what I believe, I am for the protection of the settler on the prairie and the safety, security and honour of his wife and family. You cannot put policemen all over the country; you cannot give protection by main force; but you can give protection, I say, by making the administration of the law swift, certain and adequate. As one having had long experience in that country, having more interest in it than in any other part of the country, I want to say to this House that, in the name of that country, I ask that no legislation be passed by this House that shall render the administration of justice less swift, less certain or less adequate. And what is true there is just as true here, although it is not brought so closely home because of the larger mass of population.

Now, as to the point whether the death penalty is a deterrent, it must be remembered it is not the man of high intellectuality, in the large majority of cases that it is necessary to affect, it is the man of low intellectuality, the man whose mind is necessarily affected by the practical result of the act that he may take. The idea must be impressed upon him through a long period, he must be given clearly to understand that killing means hanging, and then he will not take the chances. As to the comparative terror of death and imprisonment, why are all these petitions for clemency sent in when a man is sentenced to death if the death penalty is not more terrible than life imprisonment? If the death penalty is less terrible than imprisonment as my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) suggests, it is within the power, within the reach, of the prisoner to end his imprisonment by accepting death. But does he do it? It is not, reasonable to argue that any idea can affect the mind of man as strongly as the idea of the preservation of his life. If there is no merit in the enforcement of the extreme penalty when circumstances demand it, I ask my hon. friend from St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickedike), how it came that Canada which, from 1837 to 1857 did not enforce the death penalty, then determined to enforce that penalty, and has enforced it ever since? I do not personally remember the conditions before 1857. But information that I gathered from my elders and from the people with whom I associated when I was a young boy—and that is a long time ago now—leads me to believe that the conditions as to the maintenance of law and order, the security of life and property, in the 40's and 50's, in Canada, were not equal to what they are to-day, nor even measurably equal. It has been said that in France the law against capital punishment was never taken off the statute books. That I believe to be true. But the experiment of abolishing capital punishment in effect was tried, was continued for a number of years, and was abandoned within the past year for what seemed to be good reasons to the President of the Republic, and, as far as I have been able to learn, with the full approval of the majority of its citizens. I have every respect for the opinions of those who hold contrary views to my own; I give them credit for wishing to do something in the cause of humanity. But I claim for myself, holding the contrary view, the same right to consideration in holding that view and claiming absolutely that I hold it in the interests of humanity.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I think I may venture, in opening, to say a word of congratulation to the distinguished member for St. Lawrence Division (Mr. Bickerdike), my good friend and my colleague in the representation of the city of Montreal, on the manner in which he has brought to the attention of this House the very important question which is raised by the Bill which he has introduced. He has put before us a view that, I feel, found its source in the impulse of his kindly heart, and has supported that view by an argument strong in reasoning, and backed by authorities the search for which reveals careful study of this question on his part

I think, too, that he is to be congratulated upon the debate that the measure he has so introduced has provoked. We have had views, differing views, views favourable to the measure introduced and views opposed to it, both of them, I think, strongly entertained, amounting to something more than views, to strong convictions; and we have had them put before this House by the different members who have spoken in language that was calm. In the course of their observations they have, I am sure, contributed a great deal in addition to the knowledge that some of us may have possessed in connection with this question at the outset of this debate. I feel quite justified, and I am sure that the House will endorse me in my congratulations to the member for Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) for the manner in which he has introduced this measure and the way in which he has pleaded for the conviction which he so earnestly entertains. I am perfectly free to admit at the outset that the views that I entertained at the opening of this debate have not been changed by anything I have heard in the course of it. Although I regret to differ with the distinguished gentleman who introduced the Bill, I have no hesitation in pronouncing my opinion as adverse to the measure which this House is asked to adopt. The observations which I think it may be proper for me to make in support of the view which I so entertain I trust will not be very lengthy, but they may afford me an opportunity of laying before this House some of that information which several members who have spoken have regretted that this House had not been put in possession of to enable them to discuss as fully and adequately as they would desire this important question. There are also, I think, in the House some hon. gentlemen who desire to speak on one side or the other of this question and to whom the House would listen with pleasure and with profit. It is therefore not to be anticipated that we should close this debate at a very early hour this evening, and I beg, Mr. Speaker, to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Friday, February 6, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Bill No. 51, respecting The Bronson Company—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 52, respecting The Central Railway Company of Canada—Mr. W. H. Bennett.

Bill No. 53, respecting The Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 54, respecting The Niagara-Welland Power Company—Mr. Blain.

Bill No. 55, respecting The Quinze and Blanche River Railway Company—Mr. Fripp.

DUTY ON BASIC FURNACE SLAG.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. EMMERSON: The Minister of Customs—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think it is permissible for one member of the House to get up over and over again, when the Orders of the Day are called, and introduce subjects and ask questions. While it is permissible to ask questions regarding something which is of urgent importance. most of these are questions which could be more intelligently and correctly answered if the questions were placed on the Order Paper and allowed to be answered in that way. To keep a minister rising over and over again to answer these questions is, to my mind, out of order.

Mr. EMMERSON: If Your Honour's remarks had any application to me I would certainly apologize. A moment ago the Minister of Customs, implementing a promise which he made in the House day before yesterday to bring down a copy of an order or ruling of the Customs Board, handed me this document:

Meeting of the Board of Customs held at Ottawa, 9th September, 1913.

Question of duty on basic furnace slag, ground.

Declared to be dutiable under tariff item 663, and in effect from 9th November, 1913.

(Sgd.) John McDougald,
Chairman.

I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Customs whether there are any papers or whether he can give any information as to the application upon which this order was based. Was there a petition? Were there letters? This is a bald statement without any preamble, nor does it in any way show upon whose motion this action is taken. I would ask for some cor-

respondence, petitions or memorials, if there are any.

Mr. REID: I intend, immediately after the Orders of the Day have been passed, to telephone Mr. McDougald to come over here, and I will ask the hon. member for Westmorland to tell the commissioner just what he wants, and to have Mr. McDougald get him all the information and papers he requires.

Mr. EMMERSON: That is very satisfactory.

CANADIANS AT BISLEY.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): I desire to ask leave to move the adjournment of this House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the action of the War Office and National Rifle Association in limiting certain competitions at Bisley to rifles which are not equipped with the aperture sight, which may have the effect of excluding Canadian riflemen from competing at Bisley.

Mr. FOSTER: I do not wish to intervene so that my hon. friend shall not have his discussion, but the next motion will be one to go into Supply, and could he not take it then equally well?

Mr. SPEAKER: I might say that to-day the House goes into Supply without a motion; the Speaker leaves the Chair without motion.

Mr. FOSTER: I am a little at a disadvantage since the revised rules have been instituted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not think my hon. friend is in error, although he was not here last year. I put a question to the Prime Minister just a week ago as to whether or not the rule would apply, and I understood from what the Prime Minister said that on that day the matter was by consent, and therefore the rule would not apply.

Mr. FOSTER: My right hon. friend is correct; I remember the conversation. The Prime Minister said that he did not intend that the rule should apply. We are going into the discussion now of the Estimates of the Minister of Labour. It is a new department and it requires a motion. My hon. friend will be able to come in then.

[Mr. Emmerson.]

Mr. MACDONALD: It is what the Speaker says.

Mr. FOSTER: It is for the Speaker to decide.

Mr. SPEAKER: In regard to Rule 17, if I correctly heard the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, as well as the right hon. the Prime Minister, they are not quite correct in the interpretation which they place upon it. The rule says:

> On Thursdays and Fridays, when the Order of the Day is called for the House to go into Committee of Supply, or of Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker shall leave the Chair without putting any question, provided that, except by the consent of the House, the Estimates of each department shall be first taken up on a day other than Thursday or Friday.

That is the exception, but that does not apply to the question of the Speaker leaving the Chair.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Speaker automatically leaves the Chair if the subject which is coming up for discussion has already been before the House, but in order to confer on the House the power to discuss that matter, a motion must be made whether it is Thursday or Friday or any other day. The other day I wanted to have the matter discussed and settled and the Prime Minister said: You are too generous to the Government; to-day we will proceed by consent because the rule would not apply.

Mr. SPEAKER: That would not be my interpretation of it at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I need not remind you, Mr. Speaker, that by consent of the House we can do almost anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am quite convinced of the correctness of that. The House can suspend any of its rules by unanimous consent, but I am only endeavouring to give the House what I regard to be the proper interpretation of the rule so that the House may understand it and govern itself accordingly. If it be the express wish of the House that this interpretation of the rule be not followed, of course, I cannot object to it.

Mr. MACDONALD: I assume that under your ruling, Mr. Speaker, we shall discuss the question now, or is it understood that we shall have the consent of the House on the motion to go into Supply?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member would be more in order to discuss it now.

Mr. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I might premise by saying that the rules, of which we heard so much last year, apparently need to be conned over by the men who made them, and somewhat carefully, because it is rather difficult for ordinary members to know how they can bring matters before the House which they have a right to do.

I have brought this particular subject to the attention of the House by reason of the fact that there has appeared in the press of the country, at various times during the last three weeks, statements to the effect that, owing to certain new regulations that have been imposed by the National Rifle Association, the men who won their places last year at the Dominion rifle competition in Ottawa which entitled them to go to Bisley to represent Canada in this competition were not likely to be able to go this year. I regard that as a matter of very great importance. The interest which has been evoked in Canada generaly during the past eight or nine years in rifle shooting has been very great, and I am sure that every one who is interested in the development of that particular line of work or sport, whichever view may be taken of it, would like to see the successes which have been achieved by Canadian riflemen at Bisley during the past few years repeated. Anything which would interfere with our riflemen being represented at this national British meeting would be a matter of very great importance.

In looking into this question I find that the constitution of the National Rifle Association of Great Britain involves the recognition of the fact that it is not an association purely for Great Britain and Ireland, but that it is a national one in the true sense, that it is an association where the Dominions over the seas which form a part of this empire to-day have as much right in all respects in reference to the membership of that association and in all the competitions that take place under it as the men who happen to reside within the narrow bounds of the island of Great Britain.

That being so, we recall that on various occasions during the past five or six years there have been objections of a technical character emanating from different sources which might be said to be pin pricks and intended to harass the men from this country who happened to use a rifle which you may say both Governments in Canada have adopted and ratified as being the national arm of Canada. I refer to the Ross rifle. Some years ago, when our men went over there and with the use of that arm won the greatest prizes that are offered in competition, there followed immediately afterwards technical objections of the narrowest kind, and an attempt was made to introduce into the regulations conditions which were annoying and peculiar and evidently emanated from some source which was deliberate in its character, intended to interfere with the use of that arm by the Canadian riflemen. The action which was taken by the Government of that day, and the action which was taken afterwards by the present Government, when another question arose a little later, was of a vigorous character, and resulted in the recognition by the rifle authorities of the mother country of the Ross rifle as being the arm, which, in the hands of our riflemen, had a perfect right to be used in the competitions there.

A few years ago a great question arose in this country, and in England as well, in all military circles, as to the adoption of the aperture sight in connection with the rifle that was used in rifle shooting. The Small Arms Commission, which sat here in the Dominion of Canada as the result of their appointment by the Militia Department, went into that question with the greatest possible care and decided upon a certain sight which was adopted by the department. This sight was attached to the rifle which is now the national arm. In England the same question was taken up, and the War Office came to the conclusion that on another new rifle, which has not yet been issued but the technique of which has been decided upon, this aperture sight should also be used. In the United States, where rifle development has gone a long way for a great number of years, this aperture sight has been ratified by the military authorities and has become of permanent adoption in their military system.

As I am advised in regard to this matter, a sudden development takes place in England. The new rifle has not yet been issued, but the War Office has intimated that in certain competitions, the best competitions that take place at Bisley, such as the competition for the King's prize, which is the premier prize of all that riflemen from all parts of the empire are anxious to win as a matter of special distinction, no rifle shall be used that is provided with this aperture sight. The question is: What is to be the attitude of the Department of Militia and Defence in regard to this subject at this time? All our

men in Canada have been trained in rifle shooting during the last two years with the aperture sight. All the competitions at the various ranges have been with the use of that sight. Is all that training to be of no avail? Are our riflemen who have been trained in that way to go home to England and not be permitted to compete with their own rifle and with that sight attached to it, and must they be compelled to compete under entirely adverse conditions with a rifle and a sight in the use of which they have not been trained? I notice it is stated in the press that the minister has declared that the result of this action would be that no Canadian team could go to Bisley this year. The selection of the Bisley team, and its superintendence, I understand, as a matter of form, if not in reality, have always been under the control of the Dominion Rifle Association. But the department occupies a controlling position towards it, because we have to find the funds which enable these prizes to be offered and these expeditions to the competitions to be taken. I brought this matter up with a view of ascertaining what is the opinion of the minister, and what action he intends to take with reference to this pin-prick, to use words which were used some years ago in a somewhat similar matter under different circumstances. Is this arm, which has been recognized by both political parties as the national arm of Canada, to be discredited by these continual attacks from some interested source in the mother country, or, is the minister to stand by the weapon which Canadian riflemen use, and which every one recognizes to-day to be complete and satisfactory in every particular? I trust we shall hear from the minister on the subject.

Hon. SAM. HUGHES (Minister of Militia): The subject which the hon. member has brought to the attention of the House, has been receiving careful consideration by my officers and myself for some time past. It will be well to place before the House the condition of matters as they stand. The National Rifle Association of Great Britain was formed in 1860 at the direct request of Her late Majesty, Queen Victoria, and its charter states that it was formed for the purpose of giving permanence to volunteer corps, naval and military, and to encourage rifle shooting throughout our dominions. Canada being one of these dominions, our militia are absolutely eligible to compete at these matches. The management of the National Rifle Association in Great Britain is handed over to a general council, which in turn elects an executive council to manage the matches. For a number of years there was very little progress made, and it was only when Canadian militiamen came to use the weapon which is now universally adopted in our country that any objection was made on the part of those across the water, on the ground that Canadians were not armed with the same rifle as were the British.

Let me state emphatically that we are supplied with what is recognized by volunteers and soldiers throughout the world as the obsolete ammunition of Great Britain. Great Britain uses a cartridge, which in many respects is regarded as not being up to date. Nevertheless, in order that there might be no confusion of ammunition, if Canadian troops ever have to again fight side by side with the British, we use the same ammunition as they do. In other words, their cartridge fits our rifle and our cartridge fits their rifle, so that there may be no trouble in presence of the enemy. But we will not use their obsolete rifle.

It is held by the best rifle experts in the world that the Lee-Enfield is no longer a first-class weapon to place in the hands of soldiers in the field. We have insisted on the Ross rifle, a rifle which is universally regarded by every fighting force in the world as the best weapon for the soldier to be armed with in time of war. The Ross rifle, of course, has passed the experimental stage.

Canada has made progress in rifle sighting. Formerly we had a forward sight, and then we had a back sight in the middle of the rifle, and there was a long space between the eye of the soldier and the back sight, so that in order to line on the target he had to line through the back sight and the fore sight on the bull's eye. A letter has been published recently by Major McHarg, of Vancouver, one of the most distinguished Canadian riflemen—an officer who has been on the Bisley team several times, and who had the honour last year of making the highest score ever known in the history of rifle shooting—in which he points out the impossibility of a man's eye seeing three objects in alignment at the same time. Consequently, on account of its superiority, the United States and other nations, as well as Canada, have adopted the aperture sight. By placing the aperture sight as near to the eye as possible, and leaving as great a distance between the rear sight and the forward

sight as possible, a better alignment is obtained, and consequently more excellent results follow. At the time of the Palma matches here, when the American team used the aperture sight and the British and other teams used the open sight and they were badly beaten, it was subsequently urged by some British riflemen that the sighting of the aperture sight was very slow. Those of us who had used it felt that this was untrue, and experience and observation since have proven that the aperture sight is the more rapid.

On that occasion the American fired much more rapidly, practically two shots for other teams one. This caused them to be finished earlier and thus avoid a very tricky wind which threw the other teams off the bulls-eye.

I shall quote to the House the view of Major Richardson, one of the best known shots in England, who has for many years taken an active interest in the Bisley matches, and who is an earnest advocate of the Canadian rifle being used at Bisley. Major Richardson, speaking of the Olympic contest in Sweden last year, in which soldiers from the United States, Great Britain, and other countries competed, points out why the American team won, in these words:

> The day was hot and the light very glaring, which placed us at the greatest possible disadvantage when compared with the United States of America, who used aperture sights. They shot twice as fast as we did, and the shot for shot record showed that all our men's eyes became tired with defining their sights Every one lost 'angle' during each series.
>
> The total number of rounds fired by each man in the Olympic match was 50. The British team made a good start, especially Ommundsen, who scored 149 points out of a possible 150 at the two first distances, but their was a marked falling off in the subsequent stages of the contest.

This shows that the aperture sight is the natural sight, and that by using it a soldier can fire twice as many shots and make a far greater percentage of hits than by using the open sight.

The National Rifle Association is not part and parcel of the War Office, except to the extent that it receives support from the Government. It is more or less at the mercy of the War Office, which has for a number of years been adopting fads in rifle shooting. They have now adopted a fad, the object of which I never could discover, that is, what they call a field service target; firing at a blank target. This, however, is a fad that is fast dying out, and it never gave any direct benefit in the way of teaching men how to shoot. The War Office wish, for some unknown reason, to coerce the National Rifle Association into using this target. In the field service target they are doing away as far as possible with the system of accurate scoring that is possible with the bull's-eye target, and they are making the regulations such that in certain matches, especially the King's prize match, which is the match that the Canadian volunteer aspires to take part in above all others, no rifle can be used unless it has the open sight.

The National Rifle Association, with the full consent of the British War Office, has used the aperture sight since 1909. There is nothing new about it whatever. There is not a rifleman in Great Britain but has the aperture sight at his disposal, and would have the right to use it, were it not for the rule recently imposed by the British War Office. There would be no hardship in allowing it to be used. The British rifle has the middle sight, the aperture sight being an attachment at the rear; whereas the Canadian rifle has no middle sight and there is no place where a middle sight can be attached, and therefore, the Canadian riflemen cannot compete. The gentlemen who are enforcing this regulation must know this fact just as clearly as we do here, and they must know that we must either abandon our rifle and use the obsolete Lee-Enfield rifle or else retire from the contest.

We have used the aperture sight since 1909; the British riflemen have used it. Our rifles are not fitted with the middle sight. As far as I am concerned, I do not intend to interfere with the Dominion Rifle Association; but we control the funds and the volunteers, and no volunteer will be allowed to leave the shores of the Dominion of Canada with any such handicap upon him as is placed upon him by that regulation. It is violating the rule laid down by Her Majesty in the constitution of the association whereby it was designed to encourage rifle shooting in our dominions beyond the sea as well as in Great Britain.

For the last number of years, the British War Office have been endeavouring to build up a model war rifle. I heard about it four years ago. I happened to be at Washington and, from the war authorities there, I learned the full details of the new British rifle. During the following year I was in Germany, and from the German officers I learned the full details of the new British rifle. I went to the British War Office, but could learn nothing from them. I was informed that, if I went to Enfield and poked

around a bit and got on the right side of some subordinate official, I could get the information in that way. If an officer in the British service was not entitled to see the new rifle, I was not going to poke around any back door at Enfield to obtain the information. The year before last the rifle was in an experimental stage. The British War Office have been experimenting with it ever since, and it is a failure as a war rifle.

This is the opinion of the British War Office in regard to the aperture sight:

> The aperture sight possesses two main advantages: (a) As the eye looks through, and not at, the backsight, it is not strained by the constant effort to focus itself on an object very near to it, as is the case with the open backsight. (b) As the sight can be placed quite close to the firer's eye, the sight radius (that is, the distance between fore and backsight) can be considerably increased. It is much easier to point a long ruler accurately at a distant object than a short one, and the same principle holds good in the case of a rifle. It is thus much easier to align a rifle which has a long sight radius.

It goes on to show how this will check wild firing. There are a dozen other advantages of the aperture sight over the open sight to which it is not necessary for me to refer to here, other than this. Those of us who are getting on in years, find considerable difficulty on account of the blur in aligning with the open sight. With the aperture sight, the old eye can pick up the target just as accurately and just as clearly as the young eye can.

The action is not that of the National Rifle Association; it is the arbitrary action of the British War Office. The only people who can possibly be hurt by it are the riflemen of the Dominion of Canada. So far as I am concerned, for a great many years, we have made every concession in regard to the rifle trouble, and in every instance our contention has been upheld by the riflemen of Great Britain, as distinct from the War Office. The former are standing by us in demanding that the aperture sight be used. After discussing the matter, we have come to the decision that Canada is to-day prepared to lend to the British riflemen sufficient rifles for this season, in the hope that by next year they will have got what the British War Office frankly admits is the only sight that should be used. In that way the British riflemen will not be taken at a disadvantage for this season, and they can return the rifles later. There is no need, however, to lend these rifles, as the Birmingham Small Arms Company can supply the British War Office with any aperture sights for every rifle in Great Britain. Therefore, in enacting this arbitrary rule, the British War Office can have only one possible object in view, and that is to exclude the Canadian team from competing at Bisley or to force the Canadian team to use the obsolete Lee-Enfield rifle with the open sight. Why should the British War Office force an arbitrary rule upon the National Rifle Association to the detriment of the Canadian team, and why should the Canadian team and Canadian volunteer bow to such a ruling without resenting it and standing to his weapon? We intend to stand by our rifle. We have used the aperture sight since 1909, and it is now part and parcel of our rifle. The British War Office know that we have no open sight on our rifle; and, so far as I am concerned, I do not propose to change it.

[Mr. S. Hughes.]

Mr. F. B. CARVELL: It is so seldom that I can entirely agree with the hon. Minister of Militia that I feel I would not be doing myself justice, let alone the hon. minister, if I were to remain silent in such a case as this. I heartily congratulate the hon. minister on the manly stand which he has taken in this matter. It is a well known matter of history to hon. members who have been for some years in this House that the Minister of Militia has made no change of front in connection with the rifle now under discussion, but is now in exactly the same position in which he was at the beginning. He stood by the Ross rifle when it required some courage on the part of a gentleman in his position to do so. He has stood by it since he has been in power. I am glad to know that he is standing by it now, and I am sure he will win, not because of his courage in standing by it, but because he is right.

I am entirely out of harmony with my hon. friend in regard to the large amount of money he is going to spend in Canada on the militia. I am entirely in harmony with him so far as the encouragement of rifle shooting is concerned. In my opinion, the only reason, in the final analysis, for spending money on the militia of Canada is to teach men to handle a rifle or a piece of artillery. We all hope the time will not come when he will need to use it, but a soldier who does not know how to use a rifle is about the most useless piece of humanity, when it comes to time of trouble, that one could imagine. You want a little drill, of course, a little training, perhaps a good deal of organization, but above all you want to have your men trained to handle a rifle.

As I understand it, the National Rifle Association was formed in order to perfect not only the mother country, but the outlying dominions as well in the art of rifle shooting. I have never been able to understand why the National Rifle Association, or the War Office either, should object to the use of the best rifle that the empire could afford, and let the best man win. I should have thought they would be glad to have a better rifle shown them than their own, and that they would adopt it. I think they must be convinced that ours is the best rifle, otherwise they would not try to bar it from the competitions. The very fact that they do bar it is an admission that it is a better arm than the one they themselves have. As I have said, I shall not discuss this matter at length. I wish only, in this public manner, to congratulate the Minister of Militia (Mr. Hughes) on standing up for the rights of Canada, because it is Canada and because it is right; because we have the best rifle in the world to-day—or in the empire at least, I will go that far. I think the hon. gentleman is a little over-magnanimous, when he offers to loan the British Government the Ross rifle. We should go there with our own weapon and try out this contest on our merits. I do not understand that this is simply a sport. I do not understand that there is any good reason for barring would-be competitors because they have a better weapon than others have. I understand that this National Rifle Association competition is the acme of rifle practice all over the empire, the place to which the selected shots of the empire go to show their prowess, and let the best man win. I hope that the hon. minister will stand by his manly course and not contribute a dollar to send men to England unless those men are to enter the contest with the national arm of Canada, free to win in an open field.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE (North Ontario): I would like to ask the hon. minister if the regulations of the National Rifle Association bar out the Ross rifle or merely the aperture sight. As I understand it, the aperture sight is not usable under service conditions,—that is, if a rifle is equipped with the aperture sight it becomes a rifle that is incapable of being used in actual service. It is apparent that there is no unanimity of feeling among the marksmen who have gone to Bisley, because some of them feel that using the Lee-Enfield or other arm with the open sight they could compete on equal terms with others. It would be unfortunate if our claim could be construed as a demand to be allowed to use a rifle that cannot be used in regular service. The whole object of the competition is to increase the efficiency of rifle shooting with a view to efficiency in the field. Now, as I understand the matter, the regulations of the National Rifle Association are for a rifle that can be used in regular service. For years we had a discussion in this House about certain rifles being manufactured by the Ross Rifle Company that did not comply with the conditions, weapons that were not the rifles used as the national arm of Canada. I understand that the National Rifle Association do not wish to do injustice to the national arm of Canada, but that they are against having the aperture sight which cannot be used in actual service. The Americans, as I understand, have an aperture sight which can be used in actual service, and so the objection that is raised against our rifle does not stand against theirs. I noticed an interview given by Sergeant G. W. Russell, a marksman of note, who does not quite agree with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Hughes) and the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell). Sergeant Russell says:

> I would be quite prepared to go to Bisley and use the Lee-Enfield rifle. The National Rifle Association has always enough extra rifles available to provide a team such as the Canadian team, and I have no objection to using any sight that the others use. In fact I would prefer using the Lee-Enfield rifle. I believe that the Long Ross rifle is the better match rifle and would prefer not having the advantages over men using the Lee-Enfield, even if the association did allow it.

4 p.m. According to this experienced rifleman, who has gone to Bisley several times and distinguished himself in the use of the Ross rifle, the aperture sight affords an undue advantage over those who use the national arm of England which has an open sight. He would prefer to use the Lee-Enfield, such as they are using. He goes on:

> As far as the peep sight on the Ross rifle is concerned—

I have spoken of it as the 'aperture sight,' but I understand that it is the same thing.

> —I would not say that it is a practical sight for active service purpose. I have no doubt that a peep sight will be devised that will be practical for all purposes, but the present one is not. However, I have never shot over ranges where I did not prefer the peep sight. I used it in rapid firing and it worked well. The present peep sight, however, is too far back.

Speaking of the American rifle, he says:

A prominent expert on military rifles stated that the Americans claim their peep sight is practicable for active service conditions. They have the peep and the open sight and either can be used. Their sight is also placed much farther from the eye than in the case of the Ross.

The object of the regulations of the National Rifle Association is not to discriminate against the Ross rifle, as one would be led to believe from what has been said, but merely to prevent a peep sight being used which could not be used in actual service. These competitions are carried on under actual service conditions with a view to increasing the efficiency in service—that is the object of the whole expenditure. If the Ross rifle has a sight attached with which that rifle cannot be used, in service, the regulations are not unreasonable. I do not think members should get excited about this matter. For one, as a humble member of this House and a humble member of the militia, I should be very sorry—if that the purpose of these regulations be what I have indicated—to see it result in the abandonment of the annual event which every militiaman and every Canadian follows with a great deal of interest, that of having our volunteers go over to the old country to take part in this great rifle shooting contest.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Before the hon. Minister of Militia answers those who have spoken, I should like to put to him directly a couple of questions. I need hardly say that I am far from being an expert on this matter; it is out of my latitude altogether. But I may say that I have not unlimited faith in Government departments, even in Great Britain. Last winter, we were afraid the ministers had too much faith in Government departments in Great Britain. We had a great deal of discussion along that line.

Mr. S. HUGHES: Does the hon. gentleman refer to me?

Mr. CLARK: No, I refer to the fighting department on water; my hon. friend the Minister of Militia has charge of the fighting department on land. The danger of the Government this year appears to be that they are going to the other extreme, and are breaking off from British connection altogether.

The first question I want to put quite clearly to my hon. friend is based upon an assertion which he has made very confidently, but not more confidently than it has been repeated by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B.—that the Ross rifle is a better arm than the Lee-Enfield. I should like to ask the hon. minister if the War Office admits that the Ross rifle is a better rifle? I should like to ask a second question. Does the War Office issue this regulation, which is complained of, in an arbitrary manner—which is, perhaps, a manner easy to acquire in military matters—or does it give any reason for the regulation?

Mr. S. HUGHES: I will answer the question of the hon. member for Red Deer first. As to whether the War Office admits that the Ross rifle is better than the Lee-Enfield, I would point out that they recognize that the Ross rifle has won its way to the front in all matches and in all places where it has been tried throughout the world. Although they do not officially admit its superiority—it is a difficult thing to get the War Office to recognize that the colony has a better rifle than the motherland—they recognize it by doing away with their own rifle and attempting to bring out a new one based to a certain extent on our new rifle, the Ross. As to whether or not the War Office issued its regulations in an arbitrary manner, I may say that they have notified the National Rifle Association that if certain regulations are not complied with they will absolutely withhold all assistance. Their assistance, which is given in the way of concessions of ammunition, officers to control matches, and so on, is the life of the association, and therefore it must bow to the will of the British War Office. I do not know that they give a reason, unless it is to train the riflemen in the system of musketry laid down in their regulations. It is only in very recent years that the British soldier has been trained in musketry at all, but the authorities are recognizing now that it does count for something in time of war to know whether a soldier can hit the enemy or merely bang off shots in the air and scare him away.

With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe), I am of the opinion that if he had left out the word 'if' there would have been nothing left of his speech. The only definite assertion he made was that the aperture sight rifle was not fit to be used in active service. If the hon. gentleman had been listening to me, he would have observed that I quoted the opinion of the best British expert on the subject, Major Richardson, who said that at Stockholm last year the Yankees, with the aperture sight rifle, fired twice as rapidly as the British soldiers. At the

Palma matches in Ottawa the Yankee soldiers popped in two bull's-eyes to our one every time, and the United States soldiers were enabled to dodge the tricky winds which put our men out of the match, because they were able to fire twice as rapidly as we could. The aperture sight is the only one of any efficiency in active service.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE: Is the aperture sight as used on the Ross rifle capable of being used in active service?

Mr. HUGHES: Certainly, that is what we are making them for.

Mr. SHARPE: Are they used in active service?

Mr. HUGHES: We have never had a chance to have a crack at anybody since they were adopted.

Mr. SHARPE: Are they used in the Militia corps?

Mr. HUGHES: Certainly. The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) last year went down to Halifax with his team and won all before him; on that occasion the aperture sight was used. Rifles fitted with this sight have not been used in active service, as I have said, because we have never had a chance of so demonstrating them. I can assure my hon. friend that if a time of trouble comes he will have an opportunity of putting this sight to the test in active service, and then he will see the efficiency of it, and be enabled to realize the benefits of the aperture sight when firing at an enemy as compared with the open sight. The hon. gentleman tried to pop at a target one day through an aperture sight, and he did very well for a novice, but when he tackled an old and experienced rifleman he fell far short of the mark.

The soldiers of Canada have thirty-five thousand of these rifles with aperture sights; we have them all over the Dominion, they are being attached to mark 2 and mark 3 rifles. As to the United States rifle, I do not wish to depreciate its value, but their aperture sight is not in it with ours for active service. Our aperture sight is part and parcel of the rifle; it is not a detachment, and in this we differ from the British people. As I have said, the British people have an opportunity of using the aperture sight, but the War Office will not let them.

Mr. MACDONALD: How does the minister account for this action on the part of the War Office?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know; I am not running the War Office; I am endeavouring to struggle along with the Canadian Militia Department.

Mr. GRAHAM: We believe, I suppose, in autonomy in rifles, anyway.

Mr. HUGHES: If the British Government would adopt a rifle which is equal to the Ross rifle, I would be delighted to conform with their practice and use it, but they have not yet done so.

Mr. EMMERSON: My hon. friend is taking the same exceptions to the instructions of the War Office that we took to the advice of the First Lord of the Admiralty last winter.

Mr. MACDONALD: I should like to say a word or two on this subject.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think this motion permits of a second speech on the part of any hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACDONALD: As a matter of preserving my own right, perhaps, more than from any desire to inflict a speech upon the House, I would not care to give any assent to the proposition that an hon. gentleman moving a motion of this kind has not a right to close the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I understand the matter correctly, a motion to adjourn the House does not permit the hon. gentleman who moved that motion to speak again.

Hon. SAM. HUGHES: So far as I am personally concerned, I should be very glad if the House would permit the hon. member to speak.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would direct your attention, Mr. Speaker, to paragraph 2 of Rule 21:

> A reply shall be allowed to a member who has moved a substantive motion or the second reading of a Bill, but not to any member who has moved an order of the day, not being the second reading of a Bill, an amendment, the previous question, an adjournment during a debate, or an instruction to a committee.

Clearly my hon. friend is entitled to a reply on this motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have always understood that in the case of a substantive motion the privilege was granted to the mover in order that he might answer the arguments that had been brought up after his first speech. It may be that the House regards this as a purely substantive motion. If that be so, the hon. member would have a right to reply. I have always understood

that when a motion to adjourn the House was made, the party making it had no right to reply.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That was a new rule passed in 1909.

Mr. MACDONALD: I was quite sure that this was a substantive motion, and I felt that it was only right, in the interest of other members who might make motions on other occasions, that the rule of practice might be settled so that we might know what the rights of hon. gentlemen were. I wish, first, to congratulate the minister upon the robust Canadianism which he apparently has developed in regard to this question. Perhaps developed is not the right word, because he has given indications at various times of possessing Canadianism of a robust character, and when I heard my hon. friend tell us as he did today that he had to go to Washington and Berlin in order to get information which he as the Minister of Militia in the greatest of the overseas dominions—

Mr. SAM. HUGHES: No, I was not the Minister of Militia. I said four years ago, and I have been Minister of Militia only a little over two years. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten 1911?

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) says, 'Worse still.' So he was not Minister of Militia, but a man who had seen service in South Africa, and had succeeded in driving out of Canada two or three British generals who had come here at various periods in his career. I think he ought to have been able to obtain from the War Office, without going to Berlin or Washington, the information which he, as a man interested in the question of what was the best arm for the service, desired to get. Perhaps since he has attained the position which he now occupies the means of communication between the British War Office and himself are a little more natural, a little more proper, than they were on the occasion of which he speaks. I agree with him when he says that this action on the part of the War Office in regard to this matter is an arbitrary action. There are some people who happen to hold positions in the Imperial Parliament—fortunately they are growing less—but everybody who studies British history knows that there have been occasions down into very recent years when men holding positions of responsibility connected with the War Office and the Admiralty looked upon those of us who live in these overseas dominions, and the representatives of the people in these parliaments, as belonging to some inferior order of beings who had not the wisdom necessary to legislate on behalf of the people whom we represent. Apparently the opinion of the War Office with regard to my hon. friend as representative of the Canadian people in regard to militia matters is that he was not able and is not competent to represent the judgment of the Canadian people in regard to military matters. Hence their action is an arbitrary one. Last year Hon. Winston Churchill, who happened to be connected with another department of defence over there, showed that he regarded these people as being incompetent to form a judgment—

Mr. HUGHES: I said nothing about Winston Churchill.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister has said a great deal about the War Office, and I am going to say something about Winston Churchill. He belongs to a type of men who regard the Canadian people as incompetent to engage in legislation and regards them, as was clearly shown in his second memorandum which was sent out to Canada, as belonging to an inferior order of beings. Apparently there are some gentlemen belonging to the War Office of the same type of character, and I am glad to say that the minister, with his fiery Canadianism, is making a protest against that kind of parental interference in our affairs by these men who happen to hold a little brief authority on the other side.

The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) spoke in regard to this question and stated that this aperture sight which was used on the rifles was some terrible concern which was not of any value whatever when it came down to actual results. I made the statement in my opening remarks, and I had it on the very best authority, that in the rifle which has been decided upon by the military authorities of Great Britain the aperture sight forms part of its composition.

Mr. SAM HUGHES: Hear, hear, the new rifle. I read their official report on it.

Mr. MACDONALD: Consequently, if this very War Office, which is acting so arbitrarily upon this question, have in their possession the latest development in regard to arms which maintains as part of its composition this aperture sight, on what possible grounds can they complain and say they will not allow Canadian riflemen

to enter that competition simply because they have aperture sights on their rifles? That is the situation and I hope the minister will make a vigorous defence of Canadian rights on this question, and see that the arm of Canada is recognized by the proper authorities at home.

Motion negatived.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

INTERPRETATION OF RULE 17.

On the Order being called for the House to go into Committee of Supply:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I intervene? I see, Mr. Speaker, you are leaving the Chair. Is no motion to be made on Thursday or Friday on any occasion? The rule is as follows:

> On Thursdays and Fridays, when the Order of the Day is called for the House to go into Committee of Supply, or of Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker will leave the Chair without putting any question, provided that, except by the consent of the House, the Estimates of each department shall be first taken up on a day other than Thursday or Friday.

If to-day your Honour can leave the Chair and if you should do so, there are certain Estimates which could not be discussed to-day. We have discussed all the departments with the exception of the Department of the Secretary of State; and, if you were to leave the Chair without any motion, then, if the Government wanted to go into the Estimates of the Department of State, they could not do so. I wanted to have a discussion of this matter the other day, but the Prime Minister said: 'No, the rule would not apply, because we were proceeding by consent.' I would call your attention to what took place a week ago to-day, and particularly to the concluding sentences of the Prime Minister, which are to be found at page 323 of 'Hansard.'

> I would think that every one of the departments which are enumerated, commencing at page 8, would be regarded as a separate department, and not as one department, as the right hon. gentleman suggests. In so far as I understand the construction of the rule, I think there is no difference of opinion between himself and myself. I would further say that we are taking this up practically by consent to-day, as the Government could not reasonably ask hon. gentlemen to go on except by consent, and I would not regard any commencement that we may make to-day as bringing the case within the operation of the rule. We must bring each one of these departments before the House on some other day before we can make use of the rule in regard to Thursday and Friday.

Therefore it is very clear that the Government have no intention of using the rule with regard to Thursday and Friday so as to allow the Speaker to leave the Chair without any motion at all. That is a very valuable privilege. Last Thursday we went on by consent, and we allowed all the departments to be taken up and disposed of except one, which was not called. We were proceeding by consent, and therefore we raised no objection. But if the rule is laid down to-day that because every one of these departments has been taken into consideration we can go into any one of them on Thursday or Friday, we are deprived of the valuable privilege of having a motion made. To-day we do not intend to introduce any motion, but some other day we may desire to do so; and, as the Prime Minister stated in the plainest terms that the rule would not apply, I think we should adhere to that, and that a motion should be made before we proceed with these Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER: I merely wish to say that my understanding was that the Prime Minister, in saying that the rule would not apply, meant that it would not apply that day. To say that it would not apply throughout the session would be quite a different thing. That was my understanding of it. I have no desire to prevent the carrying out of an understanding between the two sides of the House. My interpretation of the rule seems to be different from that of the right hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and of the Premier himself, but I have been endeavouring to follow what I regard as the correct interpretation. I can readily see, however, that if the rule is to be applied as I interpret it, as to the departments that were introduced last Friday, they would be regarded as having been taken up the first time on a day other than Thursday or Friday. It would deprive the Opposition of what is to them, and to every other member of the House as well, a very valuable right, that is, the right to make a motion when a new department is introduced. I must say that I cannot read into the rule the same interpretation that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition places upon it.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER: It may be that the rules prevent the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition from making an arrangement across the table which is in opposition thereto. If the

Speaker holds that ground, I suppose that the Premier and the leader of the Opposition will have to bow to the rule. But what I want to bring to the Speaker's mind is this. If this had been a motion to go into Supply on Estimates that we had not taken up last Friday, none of this present objection would have arisen. The motion of Friday last was to go into Supply to take up civil government for every department. If, therefore, the rule held, we would, in an omnibus way, have been able, by your leaving the Chair, to go into every department that the Government had Estimates in. That would, as has been said, take away a very valuable privilege from the Opposition. The other day, if my right hon. friend had objected, and if he had maintained his objection, we could not have gone into Supply at all except with respect to one single department. The language of the Prime Minister as to his intent, I think, is as plain as can be. I was sitting at his side at the time, and we spoke together about it, and my impression was exactly the same as his, that the rule, if applied absolutely, might be unfair to the Opposition, and might deprive them, and a great many members of the House, of having a discussion on the motion for the Speaker to leave the Chair rather than that the Speaker should simply leave the Chair. If the Speaker can see his way to allow the arrangement, which I think was really made between us, to go into operation by consent, it would be better to move the motion for going into Supply to-day and settle the difficulty, about which I am sure my hon. friends are anxious.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, it can be done with the consent and desire of the House. When the House has unanimously expressed its desire, I do not take it that the Chair has any right to interfere with that desire. But, in regard to the interpretation of the rule, it seems to me that there is a very significant and important difference in saying that the rule shall not apply now and saying that it shall not apply for the whole of the session. Usually, when we suspend the rule, we suspend it in regard to a certain motion, Bill, or action now, and it only applies to now. If I apprehended the explanation of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), the suspension which he understood the Prime Minister to make and the right hon. leader of the Opposition to accept would apply to the whole session.

[Mr. G. E. Foster.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: To-day my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce proposes to take up the Departments of Trade and Commerce and of Labour. If these items are not completed to-day you will leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, next Friday as a matter of course, and they can be taken up again. All the departments have been gone into with the exception of that of the Department of the Secretary of State, and to-day, Mr. Speaker, you can leave the Chair without having a motion made. But, if the Government were to attempt to take up the Department of the Secretary of State, I would have the right to say: No, you cannot take up that department, because those Estimates have not been considered on any other day than to-day. The rule appears to be very clear:

> The Estimates of each department shall be first taken upon a day other than Thursday or Friday.

If the Solicitor General were here, I think he would confirm my view upon this matter. But the estimates of a department, having been submitted on any other day, may be continued on Thursday or Friday without any motion. To-day we are going to consider the Estimates of the Departments of Labour and Trade and Commerce. Next Thursday, if we are called upon again to consider the estimates of these departments, you, Mr. Speaker, can leave the Chair without any motion; but if that is done the Government cannot proceed with anything except that which has already been commenced. The Minister of Trade and Commerce understood that, I understood it in the same way, and therefore we allowed all the departments to be gone into because it was done by consent. The Prime Minister said: I will not interfere with your right and we will not apply the rule with regard to Thursday and Friday, to-day. Therefore, we would still have the privilege of moving, should we have a motion to make. Otherwise, we would simply cut off our arms and we would have no opportunity, except one, of making a motion on going into Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that my right hon. friend will recall to his memory that I said on the occasion that it might pass to-day, but that, at the same time, you were laying up a lot of trouble for the future. That is what was in my mind at the time. This rule contemplated that every department would be considered for the first time on some day other than Thursday or Friday, so as to give

a member of the House who desired to make a motion an opportunity to do so. But, on the other hand, if an efford were made to start the estimates of any department on Thursday or Friday it could only be done by the unanimous consent of the House. That has always been my interpretation of the rule. The unanimous consent did not refer to the fact that the Speaker might or might not leave the Chair, but it referred to the fact that the estimates of a department must be first taken up on some other day than Thursday or Friday unless by the unanimous consent of the House. With the unanimous consent of the House they may be taken up on any day. I understood the leader of the Government to say at that time that at any time the Opposition desired to move a motion on going into Committee of Supply, there would be no objection to their doing so. That is my understanding of the matter. In pursuance of that opinion, if it is the expressed desire of the House that any member of the House should make a motion and discuss it to-day, I would not feel that I would be justified in refusing to receive it.

It is moved by Mr. Foster, seconded by Mr. Reid, that I do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Carried.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would the Minister of Trade and Commerce place on the table a copy of the contract recently made with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company for the West India service?

Mr. FOSTER: I shall do so, before the departmental Estimates are taken up.

Department of Labour—Conciliation and Labour Act, including publication, printing, binding and distribution of the Labour Gazette and allowance to correspondents, and for clerical assistance in preparing tables of statistics, $30,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Would the minister give us some information as to the working of the Conciliation Act?

Mr. CROTHERS: There has not in my time been any proceeding under the Conciliation and Labour Act. On one occasion there was an application made concerning the Intercolonial railway but the difficulty was adjusted and no board was appointed. Speaking generally I find that both parties to these disputes prefer proceedings under the Industrial Disputes Act, which they consider more direct and more satisfactory.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There unfortunately has been a strike on Vancouver Island and a commission was appointed by the Government to make inquiry. Would the minister give us information as to that?

Mr. CROTHERS: The first intimation I had of any difficulty on Vancouver Island was contained in a press despatch which appeared in one of the Ottawa papers on the 19th of September, 1912, stating that at the Cumberland mines some 1,500 miners had gone out on strike. Upon seeing that despatch I at once sent the following telegram:—

Ottawa, September 19, 1912.

Peter McNiven,
Secretary, United Mine Workers' Lodge,
Cumberland, B.C.

My attention has been drawn to newspaper despatches announcing the occurrence of coal miners' strike at Cumberland mines. The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act provides means for possible settlement of all matters in dispute by reference to an impartial board of three members, on which company and workmen concerned may each have a representative of their own selection. Law does not compel acceptance of board findings but forbids strikes or lockouts pending inquiry under severe penalties. In present case requirements of the Act do not appear to have been satisfied, and I am desirous of learning particulars of dispute by telegram without delay. Department will furnish any fuller explanation of Industrial Disputes law which may be required, and is to-day mailing you copies of this law and forms of application thereunder. In the event of proper application being made, everything possible will be done to expedite procedure under Act.

T. W. Crothers,
Minister of Labour.

It appears that Peter McNiven, to whom the telegram was addressed, and whose name we got from the officers of the different unions throughout the country, had been superseded by a man named McAllister, and the telegram was handed to McAllister, as secretary of the lodge. The next day, September 20, I received this reply:—

Cumberland, B.C., September 20.

Hon. T. W. Crothers,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa.

There is no strike declared at Cumberland mines. The company have openly discriminated against men who were taking an active part in union organization. They have also refused

to meet a committee of men. The men decided to take a holiday, after which the company gave orders for men to take their tools out of the mines.

J. J. McAllister.

The men have always contended that they did not go on strike, that they quit work for a holiday, and that the employers locked them out. The employers have always denied that, and they told me personally that the whistle blew every morning for thirty days, calling the men to come back to work, but the men refused. The owners of the mines then proceeded to have the mines operated by others, and they succeeded in getting men to go from different places to Cumberland.

Mr. MACDONALD: Neither party applied for a board?

Mr. CROTHERS: No.

Mr. MURPHY: The men contended that they had not gone out on strike?

Mr. CROTHERS: The men contended that they had not gone out on strike; that they were only taking a holiday. There are seven mines at Cumberland operated by the Canadian Colliery Company, and one at a place called Extension, about sixty miles south of Cumberland. The owners of the mine proceeded to secure other miners to take the places of those who had gone out on strike, as the owners claimed. They got them from different places. They sent a man to England to secure some miners from there; they got some miners from Edmonton and other places. They gradually increased the number of men at work in their mines. Some of those who had quit work returned, and by the first of May, 1913, with these men that they had secured in place of those who had quit work, they were putting out about 60 per cent of the normal output of the mines. The vice-president of the United Mine Workers of America, whose headquarters are at Seattle, gave instructions to the officer of the district to call out all the mine workers in Vancouver Island, not simply those who had been employed in the Canadian Colliery Company, but all the Mine Workers in Vancouver Island.

Mr. MACDONALD: In British Columbia?

Mr. CROTHERS: No, in Vancouver Island. It did not apply to the Crowsnest or to the eastern part of British Columbia.

[Mr. Crothers.]

Mr. CARVELL: Did the Government have notice of the intended strike before it actually occurred?

Mr. CROTHERS: No, the first notice I had of it was in a press despatch in an Ottawa paper saying that fifteen hundred men had gone on strike the day before.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think the hon. minister understands my question. Did the department have notice of the general strike that was called on or about the first of May, before it actually happened?

Mr. CROTHERS: No, we had no notice of that either. On that call all the mine workers in Vancouver Island quit work. At the mines of the Western Coal Company, the Pacific Coast Company and at Jinglepot mines, the men all quit work about the first of May.

We had an officer at Vancouver, and he was instructed to go to Vancouver Island and to do everything possible to induce either the men or the owners to apply for a board. Under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act we have no power to establish a board without application first being made therefor either by the men or by the mine owners. Our officer was instructed, if the union miners or the owners would not apply for a board, to see if he could induce the non-union men to do so, because we were very anxious to have a board established. He was not able to induce any of them, and in that way we are not able to get an investigation by a board under the Industrial Disputes Act.

In order that the facts of the case might be brought to the attention of the public, the Government appointed a commissioner in the person of Mr. Samuel Price of St. Thomas, who had served as Mining Commissioner for the province of Ontario for seven or eight years and who was familiar with such matters.

Mr. CARVELL: What was the date of that appointment?

Mr. CROTHERS: June 27, 1913.

I regarded the matter as a very serious one and was anxious to ascertain the facts at first hand. Therefore I went to Vancouver myself and spent about half the month of July there. I interviewed the different mine owners and the leaders of the mine workers. I was perfectly satisfied that there was no possibility of securing any adjustment between the mine owners and the mine workers. On the one hand, the mine owners seemed unalterably deter-

mined that they would not in any way recognize the United Mine Workers of America or their officials.

Mr. MACDONALD: That was a point at issue?

Mr. CROTHERS: That was a point at issue.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: How long was the minister on the island?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not remember. I think I was there about ten days. I visited all the different mines and interviewed the owners and many of the miners. At Cumberland, I had before me twenty-seven men who were out on strike, and heard what they had to say. Then I had before me exactly forty of those who had taken their places, and heard what they had to say. I heard what the Board of Trade of the town of Cumberland, the mayor and certain of the councillors, had to say about the matter.

I was satisfied that the two parties felt so strongly on the question at issue that there was no probability whatever of bringing them together. The mine workers thought that the whole thing would be settled in a couple of weeks if I would just leave them alone; that the mine owners would have to take them back in order to get any coal out of the mines. On the other hand, the mine owners said: We will not recognize this union, if the mines are closed for forty years. I never saw two parties so determined.

Mr. Samuel Price inquired into conditions in Vancouver Island; saw the owners and miners and the Government at Victoria; interviewed some officials of the miners in Vancouver and made a report.

Hon. gentlemen will understand that, as time goes on in such matters, and things do not turn out as the people expect, when the mine owners do not get sick of the strike and take the men back as quickly as the men thought they would, and the men do not go back as soon as the mine owners thought they would, it usually happens that after a lapse of time, there is a better opportunity of making another effort to see if the dispute cannot be settled.

Mr. MACDONALD: In the meantime how many men had been brought in for the purpose of working the mines?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not think I have any direct information as to that. About a hundred were brought over from England, but only about fifty ever reached the mines.

Mr. MACDONALD: They joined the union?

Mr. CROTHERS: They joined the union, but I do not know the number that was brought in.

Mr. Acland, the deputy minister, has for many years had a great deal of experience in these matters, and I may say that he has been very successful in adjusting them. We thought it would be well to make one more effort to see if anything could be done. Mr. Acland went to Vancouver Island about the first of November and spent the largest part of a month in interviewing the various parties.

He returned—feeling as I did in July when I returned, that it was utterly impossible to bring these people together. Now, that is the last effort that we made—in November last. Things went from bad to worse, and hon. members are all aware of the troubles that arose. A large number of men were arrested, under the authority, as I understand it, of the provincial government. Many of them have already been tried. The process of trying them is going on now in New Westminster, the venue having been changed from Victoria. It is a very bad state of things that exists in Vancouver Island. It is really the only serious labour trouble we have had in the last two years. As every one at all familiar with these matters knows, the most difficult problem between miners and mine-owners is that of the recognition of the union. If it was a matter of wages, you could compromise—

Mr. CARROLL: May I ask if there is only one labour union operating among the miners there?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, the United Mine Workers of America.

Mr. MACDONALD: Was the objection to the recognition of this union or unions generally?

Mr. CROTHERS: This particular union.

Mr. MACDONALD: They would have recognized some other union?

Mr. CROTHERS: They said so. But the men said they would not.

Mr. MACDONALD: The employers said they had no objection to unions generally?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, but the men said that they would not recognize any union. That was their idea, but they had no direct evidence as to that. The mine-owners said they were willing at any time to confer with the men actually working for them,

but they would not recognize men from Indianapolis or Seattle.

Mr. CARVELL: I am sure the House has been almost put to sleep by the careless manner in which my hon. friend (Mr. Crothers) has discussed this serious national problem. One would think to hear the hon. gentleman that it was a matter of no importance, something which happens every once in a while in the course of the day's work, and while it was unfortunate for these people that it did happen, it could not be helped; there was nothing more to do about it; and there is an end of the whole matter. If ever the hon. gentleman convinced the public of Canada that he has well earned the title of 'Minister of Play' instead of 'Minister of Labour' he has done it this afternoon. I am not dubbing him that—it is a name that he himself has coined. Here, Mr. Speaker, we have from the minister a most remarkable statement. A strike involving three or four thousand men took place on the 17th of September, 1912, and outside of sending a telegram to these people pointing out in a very general way the terms of the Conciliation Act, not a finger has been lifted, not an act has been done, not an effort has been made by the Department of Labour to settle these difficulties for some six or seven months until practically the whole island of Vancouver is aflame. Was ever such a contention made by a Minister of Labour in this House or in any other Parliament in any civilized country from the beginning of the world to the present day?

Mr. G. E. FOSTER: That is a long time.

Mr. CARVELL: It is, my friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) realizes the position in which his colleague finds himself this afternoon. Not a finger has been lifted according to the minister's own confession to try to alleviate the terrible condition of affairs—

Mr. CROTHERS: I did not make such a confession.

Mr. CARVELL: No person of ordinary intelligence could listen to the hon. gentleman without coming to the conclusion that that is the only result of the confession he has made. Now, things went on until about the 1st of May, when, as I understand it, practically all the miners of that portion of British Columbia went out on strike. The Minister of Labour says he did not know this was going to happen. Well, again I assume that he is sincere in the matter, but that is only another evidence of the absolute carelessness with which he views the whole subject. For, if he had looked at his own publication, the Labour Gazette, he would have found that he did have notice, or his department had; but I would be prepared to believe that his department might have notice of a great many things and he know nothing of them. At page 1299 of the Labour Gazette, the issue of May, 1913, the following statement appears:—

5 p.m.

The department was informed about the end of April that the United Mine Workers authorities had announced their intention of calling out for May 1, all men employed in and around the mines at Nanaimo, South Wellington and Jinglepot.

So, the hon. gentleman had notice, or his department had, that there was going to be a strike, that on the 1st of May all the men in that industrial centre were to be called out. But the same policy of masterly inactivity was followed as had been followed for six months before and not a finger was lifted to avert the strike. The thing went on, as I understand, for a month or so. Along about the 1st of July, the minister starts out on a junketting tour with his law partner. They left here in a private car on the 1st of July, if the records I have are correct, and went out West to try to settle the difficulty. Now, as the Minister of Labour was going out to settle this trouble, what on earth did he want to take a commissioner with him for? Why was it necessary for him to appoint his law partner as royal commissioner to take him out there? They went in the same car. The country is paying the expenses—and the Lord only knows how much it will be—to give his law partner a pleasant trip to the Pacific coast to accompany the minister who says he was going out to settle the difficulty. He went there and stayed a few days—I do not remember how many. He accomplished nothing and at once returned and made a hurried trip to England. No, it was even worse than that. He came back to Ottawa and yet did nothing. And about the 13th or 14th of August, at a time when the most serious labour conditions existed in Vancouver Island that had ever existed in Canada since Confederation, I believe, when there was almost a condition of civil war, when a thousand troops were called out, when that portion of Vancouver Island became an armed camp, at the very most important and most critical time in the history of this country from the standpoint of the Department of Labour since

it was organized, the minister starts off to England to ' study labour conditions.'

Mr. NEELY: He took his camera.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, he went out and bought a hundred dollar camera and took it with him to ' study labour conditions ' in England, and asks the country to pay for it. It is no wonder he did not want to make a statement this afternoon regarding the Vancouver strike. He spent two months in England, with his camera. Men were being shot in Vancouver Island, women and children starving, the most terrible state of affairs existed that ever existed in Canada; and the Minister of Labour off on a junketting trip to England. If ever the time existed when a department of this Government required to be severely castigated, it is now in view of the action of the Minister of Labour over the Vancouver strike. And after this extremely serious condition of affairs had existed for some three or four months, down to November, the minister sent his deputy, and has made no attempt since then to settle the difficulty. Not only this side of the House, but the other side as well should refuse to give one dollar of Supply to this minister until this matter is settled.

If the Minister of Labour cannot settle this matter, he is not fit to be Minister of Labour; if the Government cannot appoint a man who is fit to be Minister of Labour, they should abolish the office. He says you cannot do anything under the Industrial Disputes Act; you cannot force these parties to arbitrate. But if my hon. friend had followed the example of his predecessor; if he had taken cognizance of the information to be found in his own office, he would have become acquainted with what former ministers of labour were able to do under conditions very similar to these. I believe the Act was first applied in 1903 to a dispute involving coal miners—which, the minister says, are the worst class of people in the world to get along with.

Mr. CROTHERS: I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. CARVELL: Well, the hon. minister says that the troubles between coal miners and their employers are the most difficult in the world to settle.

Mr. CROTHERS: I did not say that either.

Mr. CARVELL: As to the dispute with the coal miners in 1907, I think it was at Crowsnest Pass, the former Minister of Labour did not have any trouble in deciding the matter. As soon as there was any indication of danger of a strike he sent his deputy minister to the mines, and the deputy minister never left the locality until the matter was settled. He finally succeeded in inducing one of the parties to apply for a board, and immediately a commissioner was appointed in the person of Sir William Mulock. When he got there the matter was settled amicably, all through the good offices of the Minister of Labour, and by the very method which my hon. friend the Minister of Labour has simply snapped his fingers at and treated with the utmost contempt. Again, some years afterwards, another dispute arose in the same vicinity, the eastern portion of British Columbia. Again the then Minister of Labour, the Hon. Mr. King, sent his deputy there; they pursued exactly the same course as was followed in the first instance, and again they succeeded in settling the matter. I think that in 1911 there was another dispute—I am speaking from recollection, but hon. gentlemen will correct me if I am wrong. This dispute occurred in connection with the coal mining industry of British Columbia; I think it was in progress during the time of the last election. Efforts were made by the then Minister of Labour and by his deputy to conciliate the disputants, and I think the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) went west shortly after the election. In any case, through the good offices of all parties concerned, these disputes were settled. Here you have three instances of industrial disputes—which my hon. friend ought to be thoroughly familiar with—in which the Minister of Labour, by exercising his good offices and acting as mediator between capital and labour, was enabled to settle, thereby returning the men to work and giving women and children the food and raiment to which they were entitled, and the country the benefit of the work done by these labourers. But by hon. friend the Minister of Labour folds his arms, takes his law partner out west on a pleasant trip, and then turns round and runs off to Europe. No wonder he calls himself minister of play. I think we are entitled to a little more information from the Minister of Labour in respect to this most important matter before a dollar of supply is granted to him. I am not going to say it is possible for the minister to settle every dispute that comes up; I am willing to admit that a very serious condition existed in British Columbia.

Just in passing I may say that it is remarkable that we have heard not a whisper in regard to the matter from the member for that portion of Canada. If I remember rightly—and I was here during all of the last session of Parliament—he did not open his mouth on the subject, or if he did I did not hear him. Of course I am subject to correction if I am wrong. It is somewhat interesting to compare the attitude of this member with that of the former member for the same district, when labour troubles were present in his constituency. However, I suppose the hon. gentleman in question will be able to speak for himself on that point. A member has a perfect right to act or not to act, according to his discretion; not so with the Minister of Labour—it is his duty to attend to these things.

Mr. SHEPHERD: May I suggest to the hon. member that there was no labour dispute in the constituency of Nanaimo during the last session? The labour dispute was in the constituency of Comox-Atlin.

Mr. CARVELL: I must accept my hon. friend's assertion, but Comox-Atlin, I understand, is in the island of Vancouver, and so is Nanaimo, and my hon. friend cannot get away from the responsibility thrown upon him by drawing any such fine line as that. The case is worse than I thought it was. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour is paid to look after these things, and he cannot hide himself behind any such curtains as that behind which the hon. member for Nanaimo seeks to hide himself. The minister must take the responsibility. During a period of six months, when a strike of fifteen hundred men was in progress in British Columbia, he did nothing. Then, after the whole mining industry became involved in the strike, he made a hurried trip to British Columbia, and afterwards, as I have said, went to Europe. If this is all the Minister of Labour is good for, if this is all his department does towards settling these strikes, then the sooner they are out of commission the better. I think the members of this House would do well to refuse the granting of one dollar of Supply until this whole industrial dispute is settled.

Mr. CROTHERS: As usual, my hon. friend draws upon his imagination instead of presenting facts to the House. He speaks of three strikes, and how they were settled. I am not here to find any fault with my predecessor's actions in respect of these labour troubles; I think he did the very best he could under the circumstances. But when my hon. friend tells this House that my predecessor succeeded in settling all these disputes, he shows either that he does not know the facts or that he is very careless in handling the truth.

Mr. CARVELL: Were not the three strikes I refer to settled?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes.

Mr. CARVELL: Then what is the hon. gentleman talking about?

Mr. CROTHERS: I will tell my hon. friend how they were settled. There was a dispute amongst the coal miners in the eastern part of British Columbia, in the course of which seven thousand men went on strike—more than double the number that went on strike in Vancouver Island. They were on strike for eight months, and my predecessor did not go there at all during that time, nor did he send his deputy. In the usual way he appointed a board under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. A few days after that we came into power, and we, not my predecessor, settled that dispute. I am not finding any fault at all with my predecessor, especially in view of the fact that he is not here to answer for himself. I am glad to admit that he did his very best, and the gentleman who was his deputy is now my deputy—a very efficient man in such matters. I am willing to admit also that my predecessor's deputy, Mr. Acland, did everything possible to have the matter settled. However, they did not succeed, nor did they go there.

Mr. CARVELL: Did the minister not send an official of the department there?

Mr. CROTHERS: He sent one of the fair wage officers.

Mr. CARVELL: What was his name?

Mr. CROTHERS: J. D. McNiven—the same man whom I sent to Vancouver Island. My predecessor did not go to Crowsnest Pass neither did he send his deputy; he appointed a board. As I say, I am finding no fault; I am simply pointing out that the minister did not feel it necessary to go or to send his deputy; he did send one of his fair wage officers. That strike continued for eight months, and it was settled a few days after we came into power. I do not say that we were able to go out there and in a few hours

settle that matter. I am quite ready to admit before the House that when we succeeded in settling that matter, about a month after we came into power, conditions had changed; both parties had become pretty well tired of it during the eight months. I do not take credit for being able to settle that strike. I did not go there. My colleague, Hon. Mr. Rogers, went there; we talked the matter over before he went and he succeeded in bringing the parties together and reaching a settlement. I do not take credit for the whole thing, conditions had changed, that is all. The matter was more easily settled a month after we came into power than it was six months before. It could not have been settled then at all. My hon. friend lives down not very far from Nova Scotia, and he must have a very poor memory if he does not remember that there was a strike in Nova Scotia that continued for twenty-two months, while my predecessor was in office. He was not able to settle it. No doubt he did all he could, employed all reasonable means to effect a settlement; but he did not effect it for twenty-two months. My hon. friend speaks of the difficulties in Nanaimo in 1903. The conditions at that time were very different from what they are now. It was not the same question at all, it was a matter capable of settlement and it was settled. Mr. King went there and he succeeded in settling it. My hon. friend speaks about our having notice in the last of April of the strike that commenced on the first of May. There was not very much time between the two dates. We heard on the 30th of April that there was likely to be a strike and it occurred the next day. My hon. friend says we did nothing from the 16th of September until the 1st of May. He is all out in that. I do not say that we did nothing; we were in communication during all that time not only with the miners, but with the mine owners endeavouring to bring about a settlement. To-day all the mines on Vancouver Island are being operated. There are to-day three hundred or four hundred more men working in the Cumberland mine than when the strike occurred on the 16th of September, 1912.

Mr. CARROLL: Chinese, are they not?

Mr. CROTHERS: Not at all, there are some Chinese and some Japanese. The other mines, it is only frank to say, are not being operated to the same extent as the Cumberland mine.

Mr. MACDONALD: How many Chinese and Japanese are there ?

Mr. CROTHERS: Four or five hundred working underground at the Cumberland out of about fifteen hundred. The Chinese receive certificates from the Governmnt of British Columbia to work in the mines. They have to pass an examination before a board of examiners, having passed which examination they get a certificate and are entitled to work underground. If they do not get the certificate they are not entitled to work underground. My hon. friend speaks about a camera costing $100. That is quite true, a camera was got. It was got before I personally knew anything about it. When I came to know about it I had it sent back, and it has not been paid for by this Government. It was got by a man acting at the time as my private secretary, without my knowledge, and when I found out about it I sent it back, so that the country is not paying a cent for the camera. I thought it was improper to buy a camera and charge it to the country.

Mr. NEELY: Did not the minister take it to the old country?

Mr. CROTHERS: My secretary took it, but I did not know about it until I got back, and then I had it returned. That was long before the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) objected, or anybody. I was not waiting for any person to object to it.

The hon. member has referred to the fact that the commissioner appointed by this Government was my partner. I have not felt it necessary to deny all of these things, but I think I should do so now. The fact is that Mr. Price and I practised together as law partners in St. Thomas from 1897 until he was appointed mining commissioner by the Ontario Government in the year 1906. The partnership was then substantially dissolved, but it was not formally dissolved until I was placed in charge of the Labour Department. Then it was formally dissolved before Mr. Price had done an hour's work for this Government or had ever received a single cent from this Government. That is all there is about the law partnership. We dissolved our partnership in 1906, over seven years ago, and formally dissolved it when we came into power and before Mr. Price was asked to do anything for this Government.

Mr. CARVELL: Will the minister tell the House why the commissioner, whom he

claims is not his partner—and I do not intend to insinuate that the minister has any pecuniary interest in Mr. Price's affiairs, when he was making out that report, chose to saw it off on the 14th day of August, just on the very eve of bloodshed on Vancouver island? Why did he not continue it down a few months later? Why did he not give us, in the form of his report, the actual condition of affairs, that bloodshed was going on, that so many men were killed and so many men arrested?

Mr. CROTHERS: Simply because nobody had been killed or injured and there had been no riot up to the time he completed his report.

Mr. CARVELL: The day after. It is a most significant suspicious circumstance that the commissioner's report was dated on the 14th of August, just the very day before the real, critical fight commenced, and no report is made of the real trouble. Any elector in Canada who read his report would think: Oh there was not a very serious condition of affairs after all; Mr. Crothers appointed his former law partner, who went out there, had a nice time, and did not do anything; he investigated and found that there was not very much wrong, nothing to investigate, there was a strike and it was not altogether settled. He sawed his report off right there. The electors, by reading that report, would not know the true condition of affairs in British Columbia nor would he by reading the Labour Gazette. It would be interesting to make a few references to the reports in the Labour Gazette upon this strike. Here are a few of them:

October 12, page 400: Cessation of work occurred on September 17 in the Cumberland coal mines. Work in the Extension mines and at Ladysmith ceased on the same day, the number of men idle being about 3,000. At the close of the month the dispute still existed.

November, page 555: No termination was reported to the department during the month.

December, page 652: The dispute continued throughout the month. It was reported to the department that one of the mines had closed down, but that the men had mostly returned to work to those that are now carrying on operations. About 1,000 miners were still out at the end of November.

Not a very serious condition of affairs.

January 13, page 773: No termination of the dispute which commenced on the 17th of September was reported to the department during December.

April, page 1138: Dispute unsettled at the end of the month. It was reported, however, in the case of the coal miners on Vancouver Island that the output was increasing daily.

People reading the Labour Gazette would get the idea that the strike did not amount to anything. The output of coal is increasing and therefore all is peace, there is no danger ahead, there is no trouble, there is no reason why the department should worry itself, there is no necessity of the department sending an official to the scene; it is working out all right and there is more coal being mined than previously.

May, page 1299: The dispute at the mines of the Canadian collieries at Cumberland and Ladysmith, proclaimed in September, 1912, was still in force at the end of the month, though some of the mines of the company have been worked for some months. The department was informed at about the end of April that the United Mine Workers of America authorities had announced their intention of calling out for May 1 all men employed in and around the mines at Nanaimo, South Wellington and Jinglepot until a joint agreement had been reached between the United Mine Workers of America and the Vancouver mine owners.

June, page 1415: The strike was called on the first of May and about 2,500 men ceased work. Mr. J. D. McNiven, a fair wage officer of the department was in conference with both parties, but at the end of May no settlement of this dispute had been reached. The companies directly affected were in addition to the Canadian Collieries at Cumberland and Ladysmith, the Vancouver and Nanaimo Coal Company, the Western Fuel Company, Nanaimo, and the Pacific Coast Company at South Wellington. At page 1416 the number of miners alleged to be on strike was given at 3,000.

July, page 87: No change in conditions in regard to this dispute was reported to the department during the month.

August, page 197: No change in conditions in regard to these disputes was reported to the department during July.

September, page 354: One of the companies affected by this important dispute, namely, the Vancouver-Nanaimo Coal Company, operating at East Wellington, came to an agreement with its employees during August; otherwise, the strike continued. Considerable disturbances occurred during August within the area of the dispute and several persons were injured in the course of riots at Nanaimo.

Elsewhere, in the same number, on page 305, is a special article dealing with the Vancouver Island coal strike. It contains the following interesting reference:

The Minister of Labour visited the scene of the dispute during the month of July, but the respective colliery proprietors and their former employees could not be persuaded to come to a working arrangement. Mr. Samuel Price, of St. Thomas, Ont., was appointed a Royal Commissioner to inquire into the disputes, and the commissioner visited the ground during July. Considerable disturbances occurred during August within the area of the industrial strike, and in the course of rioting at Nanaimo several persons were injured. Military aid was called in and it was considered necessary to station troops at various points.

Numerous arrests were made as the outcome of these disturbances, and an account of other matters and court proceedings followed.

I want to ask you if any man living in any portion of Canada other than Vancouver could have been informed of the true condition of affairs from reading the Labour Gazette. I make the statement here, and I challenge contradiction, that the facts were deliberately concealed from the public and suppressed, and were not published in the Labour Gazette. Yet my hon. friend says we should vote him $30,000 in order to carry on this Labour Gazette. If there ever was a justification for the absolute cleaning out of the whole proposition, minister, Gazette and everything else, we have it here in the report of these terrible conditions that existed on Vancouver Island on that occasion. I have read here practically every word that appeared in the Gazette as to the condition of affairs. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) laughs too much; he has a true conception of the condition of affairs. They have their knives into him, but he has got back and I do not wonder at it. It had got to be a family affair, and we will have more of it on the other side of the House before this matter is through with, because the labour people and the public generally have some rights, and if we are going to spend $30,000 for this Labour Gazette, we intend that it shall give an honest description of the labour conditions of the country as we go along. If we cannot have an honest description of labour conditions, we had better abolish the whole thing. Now, we are coming to October:

October, page 490: This dispute was unsettled at the end of September. From reports received in the department, however, it would appear that fewer men were out of work as a result than previously. At the Extension mining operations were being resumed with about 150 men at work. Pacific Coast Coal Company had also a force of miners employed at South Wellington. It was estimated that upwards of 60,000 working days were lost during September as a result of this dispute.

November, page 611: No termination of the disputes occurred during October. It was estimated that there were about 2,000 men out of work during October as a result of the dispute.

December, page 726: The dispute remained unsettled at the end of the month. Reports received in the department indicated that in the case of the Canadian Colliery considerably larger forces were at work at Cumberland than at the commencement of the dispute in September, 1912. With regard to other points affected, namely, South Wellington, Extension and Nanaimo, either the men were gradually returning to work or their places were being filled, with the result that the output was being increased from week to week. It was estimated that about 1,000 men were out of work at the end of November as a result of the dispute.

Now we come to 1914:

January, page 825: The dispute was unsettled at the end of the year. The chief point affected was Nanaimo where the number of men working was 1,000 less than before the disupte commenced. In all it was estimated that at the end of the year 1,000 men were out of employment by reason of the disputes in the different areas affected.

There is a complete record of the history of this affair given by the official Labour Gazette.

Now, I come back to the remarks I made a few moments ago. It is a most remarkable thing that this commissioner who was sent up there by the minister to investigate and report and to give the people of Canada a statement of the true condition of affairs, for which we are paying our good money, and lots of it, will report a few unimportant things, because I submit there is nothing in his report that we could not have got from the ordinary newspaper of the country. He simply made a report of the ordinary happenings down to the time the real trouble commenced and he is as mum as an oyster from that date. I do not believe that the report was made up on the 14th August, 1913. I do not believe it was submitted to the minister on the 14th August, 1913. I believe it was made up at a much later date and I believe it was submitted to him at a much later date. I think it calls for serious investigation as to the reasons why a report dealing with such a vital matter as this labour dispute in Vancouver Island should have left out the only real important transaction and made no reference to it whatever. If that is not the case, for heaven's sake, send him back again to finish up his job.

Mr. CROTHERS: The hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), becomes very eloquent over what he describes as some misconduct on the part of Mr. Price.

Mr. CARVELL: No, no misconduct.

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, in not reporting the proceedings that occurred after the finish of his report. He was appointed by the Government in June.

Mr. CARVELL: I said that I did not believe he had finished his report on the 14th day of August.

Mr. CROTHERS: You said that he chopped off his report.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, that is what he did.

Mr. CROTHERS: It would be more to the credit of the hon. member for Carleton if his reputation stood as high in this country as that of Mr. Samuel Price.

Mr. CARVELL: That is not an answer.

Mr. CROTHERS: Mr. Samuel Price published his report and it was completed. He was sent from here to Vancouver by the Government. He did not write his report there but he wrote it here after he came back.

Mr. CARVELL: When did the department receive it?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not remember; I think about the 14th August. I know I received it before I went to England and that I read it over. My hon. friend lashes himself into a paroxysm of eloquence because Mr. Price did not report something that occurred after he had completed his report. Mr. Price went to Vancouver, came back and completed his report on the 14th of August before these disturbances took place at all.

Mr. CARROLL: Did the minister say he received it before he went to England?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, I assume I got it when Mr. Price completed it. I have known Mr. Price for a good many years, and I want to say that his reputation is so high in the province of Ontario that it cannot be affected by anything the hon. member from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) may say about it. I refer to his charge now, that Mr. Price chopped it off, and to the baser charge that Mr. Price sent in a report with a false date upon it. I resent that. There is not a man in the province of Ontario who would believe Mr. Price capable of doing such a thing. I repeat my statement that it would be well for the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) if his reputation stood as high in this country as that of Mr. Samuel Price.

Mr. CARVELL: I will take my chances on that.

Mr. CARROLL: The Minister of Labour, in his defence of his attitude on the British Columbia strike, in attempting to show that his department has done as much, if not more, than the Department of Labour under the late Government, stated that the strike was continued in the coal mines of Nova Scotia for 22 months under the late Government. The strike in Nova Scotia and the strike in British Columbia are absolutely different. The strike in Nova Scotia was started owing to differences between two labour organizations.

Mr. CROTHERS: Was it not a question of the recognition of the union?

Mr. CARROLL: No, and I am going to explain that.

Mr. CROTHERS: That was the same question in Vancouver.

Mr. CARROLL: I shall show that the situation was absolutely different there. We had in Nova Scotia for the last 25 years, in fact ever since coal-mining began to be developed in that province, the Provincial Workman's Association, and practically every miner in Nova Scotia, from the beginning up to 1908 or 1909, belonged to that organization, and it was the only miners' organization in Nova Scotia. I may add that it did much benefit to mine workers in Nova Scotia in very many ways. In 1908 or 1909 internal troubles started in the Provincial Workmen's Association. Let me tell the minister that during all these years the Provincial Workmen's Association was recognized by every coal operator in that province as the labour organization in Nova Scotia, and that during that time all the troubles were settled between the Provincial Workmen's Association and the mine operators. Internal dissentions occurred in 1908 or 1909, and as a result of these dissensions a number of men broke away from the Provincial Workers' Association, and introduced an organization known as the United Mine Workers of America.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER: Had the Provincial Workmen's Association any affiliation with the United States organization?

Mr. CARROLL: None whatever. When the trouble came in 1908, the Provincial Workmen's Association divided practically into two camps. Lawsuit after lawsuit was started in Nova Scotia between the different organizations, as to which should be the custodian and owner of the property of the organization, and the courts in every instance decided that the Provincial Workmen's Association was entitled to the property. The United Mine Workers came in there and they started a strike in 1909; they wanted to be recognized by the different coal companies as a labour organization. I may tell the minister that at that time all the companies (except perhaps the Dominion Steel Company, which did not

recognize any union) recognized and did business with the Provincial Workmen's Association. The Dominion Coal Company recognized it, but the Dominion Coal Company could not recognize two labour organizations, which were most hostile, the one towards the other, because one organization would ask for one thing and the other organization would ask for another thing, and so it would be impossible to get along with the two. I point this out to the minister to show him that there is the greatest difference in the world between the Nova Scotia case and the Vancouver case, because, as the minister has told us, there was only one mine organization in the province of British Columbia.

I am not going to argue that the late Administration did all they could do to settle the dispute in Nova Scotia; I will not give them that credit. They may have done so; but I am not in a position to state that they did. I rather think they did not, but that does not justify the Minister of Labour in the attitude he has taken on this strike question in British Columbia. I tell the Minister of Labour, that had he, and the Prime Minister, and other members of the present Government, who were approached in June, 1912, by representatives of the United Mine Workers of America with reference to the importation of foreign labour into Canada—I will not say foreign labour; I will say immigrant labour—had they listened to the protests and representations made by that delegation as to the importation into British Columbia of strike-breakers, who were induced to come to that province by fraud, perhaps the conditions which have obtained for the last two years in British Columbia would not have been so bad.

In the case of the Nova Scotia strike there were no importations of labour to break the strike. As a matter of fact there was no strike in existence because the mines, with the exception of one, were operated by the Provincial Workmen's Association, and they got good Canadian white labour from Nova Scotia and from the other provinces of the Dominion. The Minister of Labour and the Minister of the Interior of that day saw to it that no company in Nova Scotia was allowed to attempt to induce immigrant labour to come in as strike-breakers in that province, and especially so on fraudulent representations.

The agitation and the unrest increased considerably in British Columbia when it was found that the present Minister of Labour and the Government allowed the coal operators of British Columbia to induce, by fraudulent representations, immigrants to come in and act as strike-breakers in the mines of Vancouver, and other mines in British Columbia.

Mr. CARVELL: Was the Prime Minister notified?

Mr. CARROLL: The Prime Minister was notified. I do not think the Minister of Labour caught the point made by the hon. member (Mr. Carvell) in reference to the date at which this report of Commissioner Price was brought down, and if he did, he did not deal with it. I want to point out that there was no very severe disturbance, in the nature of riots, in British Columbia, until the 13th of August, 1913, and then the rioting began, and began in good earnest. On that day 300 militiamen were called in, and on the day following they came to Nanaimo and Ladysmith. The Conservatives when in opposition blamed the Minister of Labour of that day for being instrumental in calling out the militia in the case of the strike in Nova Scotia, but I will not follow that example and blame the present minister for calling out the militia, because I know the members of the Government have nothing to do with that. I want to be fair in the discussion of this question, and I admit that the militia are called out under a special statute. While I think that statute should be somewhat amended, still the law is there, and if certain persons go before a magistrate or county judge and declare that the civil authorities are not able to cope with the situation, then the militia may be called out. I want to be fair in this matter. It is however a marvellous coincidence that the moment the strike became most serious in those provinces, on the 13th day of August, 1913, and the moment that the militia were introduced there to quell those riotous disturbances, the commissioner's report was brought down. Is it a coincidence? If it is, it is rather a remarkable one. I should rather think that, from the 13th of August, when the riot broke out and matters became very serious, a commissioner on the ground to investigate the matter would have been of more value than a commissioner who had investigated the matter in the first instance, when everything was in a peaceful condition. That was the point made by my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell). While it may be

a coincidence, it is rather a remarkable one.

Mr. MACDONALD: Rather a synchronism.

Mr. NEELY: Then the minister leaves the country.

Mr. CARROLL: Of course the minister leaves the country. There is something else for which I think blame attaches to the hon. Minister of Labour. He has the chance of his life to study the most acute labour conditions that have ever existed in this country, and yet at that very time he goes to the Old Country to study labour conditions. Why did he not stay in British Columbia, where there was a beautiful field for study? There was an open book. There was the most acute labour situation which has ever existed in this country, while there was peace in England at the time. Notwithstanding that fact, the Minister of Labour told this country that British Columbia did not afford him at that time a good field for the study of labour conditions. I fear that the Minister of Labour did not do all that he should have done in reference to this matter.

The labour people are perhaps the most independent, from a political standpoint, of any people in this Dominion. A great many of them are Socialists; and I have not a word to say against the Socialists. Some of their creeds are all right. The leaders of these organizations are non-partisan in politics. They give credit where credit is due, and they criticise adversely where they think adverse criticism is necessary.

On November 9, 1913, Mr. J. C. Watters, who is neither a Liberal nor a Conservative —and my hon. friend will probaly agree with me in that—who is president of the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress, issued a statement to the press that the Minister of Labour was unwilling to carry out the promise which he had previously made to appoint a board to assist in the adjustment of the Nanaimo dispute. There must have been something behind that statement. That statement has not been contradicted up to the present time, either in the public press or in this House. That statement, coming from a source independent from a political standpoint, has considerable weight in my mind.

On December 23, the executive of the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress issued a circular letter complaining that the Minister of Labour had refused to appoint a board of conciliation when asked to do so by members of the congress. I am not sure that the members of the congress were in a position to ask for that board. I am not sufficiently well acquainted with the facts, but I am prepared to say that they could have placed themselves in that position and the probabilities are that they did so, because no doubt some of them belonged to the union in British Columbia. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour knows, better than I do, what action would be necessary in order to ask for a board of conciliation. The Minister of Labour may say that at that particular time the members of that congress had not placed themselves in a position to ask for a board of conciliation. Under the circumstances, that is no defence. If they were not in a position, the Minister of Labour the custodian of the labour interests of this country, should have shown them how to place themselves in such a position.

During one of the labour troubles, previous to the strike of 1909 in the province of Nova Scotia, the labour organization there, the Provincial Workmens' Association, had some trouble with the operators. The leader of that organization undertook to carry out the procedure necessary in order to ask for a board of conciliation. He made some technical mistake, some blunder in procedure; but instead of refusing to grant the board of conciliation, the then Minister of Labour, Mr. Mackenzie King, wrote him a letter explaining how he could put himself in a position, showing him where he had made a mistake in procedure, showing him where he had fallen short in calling a properly constituted meeting of the workmen around the mine in order to ask for this board of conciliation. In a week the labour organization of Nova Scotia placed themselves in that position and the board of conciliation was granted. As a result that labour trouble was averted.

My hon. friend the Minister of Labour has said that he never met two classes of people, the miners of British Columbia who were on strike and the operators, who were more difficult to make an arrangement with. I think that is stating fairly what he said.

Mr. CROTHERS: I said, 'More determined to stand by the position they had taken.'

Mr. CARROLL: I presume that a great majority of the miners who worked those mines in 1912-13 were the same people or

the same class of people who operated them in 1910. Yet when there was a strike in 1910—

Mr. CROTHERS: Not on the island.

Mr. CARROLL: Well, it was in 1907.

Mr. CROTHERS: No.

Mr. CARROLL: 1910 is right.

Mr. CROTHERS: But that was at Crowsnest, not on the Island.

Mr. CARROLL: I am right in saying that they were the same class of people, except the Chinese who were brought in. In 1910 the same people were there as are there at the present time. There was no difficulty then in settling the dispute. The people came together. I do not know whether there was any magic possessed by the then Minister of Labour, Mr. King, or whether it was his knowledge of labour conditions in this country; but as a matter of fact the strike was practically averted.

At six o'clock the House resumed, and then took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 46, respecting the Erie, London and Tillsonburg Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 47, respecting the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Fisher.

Bill No. 48, to incorporate the Peace River Tramway and Navigation Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 49, respecting the Saskatchewan Central Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

Department of Labour—Conciliation and Labour Act, including publication, printing, binding and distribution of the Labour Gazette and allowance to correspondents, and for clerical assistance in preparing tables of statistics, $30,300.

Mr. CARROLL: When the House rose for dinner, I was attempting to show the different methods pursued by the late Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) in the settlement of labour troubles. I mentioned a strike which occurred in British Columbia in 1910. I was pointing out that in this strike, which had been settled, the same people were involved as in the present strike. The Minister of Labour had said that he had never met more headstrong people, both the operators and employees, than those concerned in the present strike.

Mr. CROTHERS: I did not use that language at all.

Mr. CARROLL: The Minister of Labour made a very much stronger statement than that.

Mr. CROTHERS: Better put it as I put it, then.

Mr. NEELY: We have not 'Hansard' here.

Mr. CROTHERS: You have not that in 'Hansard.'

Mr. CARROLL: If I had 'Hansard' I could prove that the minister used far stronger language than I have attributed to him. He said it was impossible to bring these parties together. What does that mean? Has he ever before, during his occupancy of his present position found labour organizations and employees whom he found it impossible to bring together? Therefore, using his own language they must have been very headstrong and very arbitrary.

Now, I want to refer to another strike in the very district in which this strike is taking place. In 1905, there was a strike at Nanaimo, and the principle which is involved in the present strike was involved there, namely, the refusal on the part of the companies to recognize American labour organizations. At that time Mr. Mackenzie King was sent to Nanaimo. He made a settlement, and the employees and the operators came to a satisfactory agreement which existed up to May, 1913. The people then were as headstrong and as arbitrary as to-day; still, it was not impossible for the late Minister of Labour—who, I believe, at the time of which I speak was deputy minister—to settle the dispute. Again, in 1903, there was a dispute in which both the railway and mine operators in British Columbia were involved, and the Government of that day appointed a commission consisting of Chief Justice Hunter, Mr. G. F. Lowe, and Mr. Mackenzie King. These gentlemen went fully into the matter and brought the difficulty to a speedy settlement. The gentleman whom the present Minister of Labour appointed as a commissioner to look into the existing labour troubles in British Columbia recognized in his report

the valuable assistance that Mr. Mackenzie King gave to miners and operators alike in the settlement of their difficulties. This commissioner, at page 8 of his report, referring to the history of labour troubles in the West, said:

> Though it has often been a subject of remark that the coal mining industry is more subject than others to labour disputes, Vancouver Island for a considerable time past has been comparatively free from such troubles.

Now, while speaking of the strike in Nova Scotia which my hon. friend the Minister of Labour lengthened out into twenty-two months—which is only an extravagance of between six and eight months—I want to point out that the former Minister of Labour intervened before the strike came on and that a board of conciliation was appointed. Mr. Adam Shortt was chairman of that board. When the miners of Cape Breton were asked to name a representative on that board, they named Mr. McDougall, who was then the president of the United Mine Workers local in the county of Cape Breton. Now, ordinarily, under the act, a Government would not have appointed a person who was directly interested in the strike. But notwithstanding that, Mr. Mackenzie King, who was Minister of Labour, showed to some extent his sympathy with the labouring people of this country by allowing this appointment to go, so that the President of the United Mine Workers' local was a member of this board. And in the recommendation which they brought down they refused to recommend that the United Mine Workers of America should be recognized as a labour organization by the Dominion Coal Company, because that company was already recognizing and doing business with a local organization.

The Minister of Labour says that he had no way by which to intervene further than he did in this British Columbia dispute. He said that neither the operators nor the employees asked for a board of conciliation. I would like to point out, that while that is true, there is another Act on the statute book of this country which would fairly give to the Minister of Labour the right to do more than he did in connection with this strike. I refer to chapter 96 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, an Act respecting Conciliation and Labour. This Act has reference to coal miners as well as other trades. Section 11 provides:

> If it appears to the minister that in any district or trade adequate means do not exist for having disputes submitted to a conciliation board for the district or trade, he may appoint any person or persons to inquire into the conditions of the district or trade, and to confer with the employers and employed, and, if he thinks fit, with any local authority or body, as to the expediency of establishing a conciliation board for such district or trade.

The Minister of Labour did not do that. He appointed a commissioner, but that commissioner did not mention in his report the expediency of establishing a conciliation board. I say that is one way in which the Minister of Labour could have intervened in this matter. Then section 6 of this Act seems to have some bearing on this matter:

> Where a dispute exists or is apprehended between an employer or any class of employers and workmen, or between different classes of workmen, the minister may, if he thinks fit, exercise all or any of the following powers, namely:
>
> (a) Inquire into the causes and circumstances of the dispute;
>
> (b) Take such steps as to him seem expedient, for the purpose of enabling the parties to the dispute to meet together, by themselves or their representatives, under the presidency of a chairman mutually agreed upon or nominated by him, or by some other person or body, with a view to the amicable settlement of the dispute;

Suppose that under one or both of these sections the Minister of Labour could have done nothing, I wish to point out that during the time the late Administration was in power in this country the Minister of Labour and his friends in this House, then in Opposition, cried out day after day for amendments to the Industrial Disputes Act which would make it a more workable piece of legislation. I am now going to put the matter plainly before the Minister of Labour. This strike still exists in the mining district of the province of British Columbia. Let him introduce as speedily as possible an amendment to the Industrial Disputes Act which will enable his department to appoint a conciliation board, where the disputants may fail or neglect to do so; and let that board investigate the matter and recommend some settlement or arrangement between the parties. Let him include in that amendment a penalty to be attached to the party who refused to be bound by that award. The minister has told this House that under present legislation, he cannot intervene in this way. That strike is still on in British Columbia, and let me tell my hon. friend that I think he will get support for legislation of that kind from every hon. gentleman in this House, if in the estimation of the House it will settle the unfortunate labour troubles that have

existed and still exist in the mining regions of British Columbia. If the minister is sincere in this matter, he will do that. This strike is one of the most unfortunate things that has ever occurred in this country. There has been bloodshed; there has practically been murder. A young boy who pleaded guilty on the understanding that he would be acquitted or pardoned or released under parole if he did so, subsequently died in jail. I say again if the minister is sincere he will introduce this legislation and amend the Act under which he says there is no provision made for such a case as this.

The minister has also told us that this matter first came to his attention through press despatches which he noticed on September 18, 1912. But months before that date it was within the knowledge of almost every person in this country who read the newspapers that a strike was threatened in the coal mining districts of Vancouver Island. I want to read part of an editorial with reference to this strike which appeared in the Ottawa Citizen of Tuesday or Wednesday, I think, of this week. It says:

> For nearly two years, since May, 1912, the coal miners of Vancouver Island have been fighting for the right to organize on similar lines to their comrades in Britain. A very large proportion of them are old countrymen; sons, brothers, relatives and friends of the men who make such a strong showing in the British Parliament. To smash their organization on Vancouver Island, the monopoly interests in control of the coal lands, dismissed the men's organizers and finally locked out every union man in the Nanaimo district.

Those organizers were dismissed two or three months previous to the day which the hon. minister mentions as being the first time this matter came to his notice, and that this is what led up to the strike. They were dismissed simply and solely because they were endeavouring to better the conditions of labouring men in the mines of Vancouver Island, and I say that those conditions were such as to make men feel keenly the position taken against them by the coal mine operators of that country. The article goes on:

> To Sir Richard McBride they appealed in vain for a commission of inquiry. A miners' delegate was dismissed from the Mackenzie-Mann mines for reporting unsafe conditions, although provincial mine inspectors subsequently verified the report. Asiatic labour was imported and is now employed in the mines, doing the work of skilled miners. Protests to Premier McBride were merely ignored or evaded, although Commissioner Price, appointed by Hon. Mr. Crothers, verified the fact in his report, as the following excerpt will show:
>
> ..the number of Orientals employed underground in the mines of the Canadian collieries. (Mackenzie-Mann) has increased very materially since last September, not only relatively but absolutely, the total number of Orientals employed in May, 1913, being 432 out of a total of 690, as against 315 out of a total of 766 in 1912, and probably among surface men the increase has been proportionately greater.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> In addition to Oriental labour, coloured men and mongrel breeds were imported, to be used as serfs, to smash the solidarity of the white miners. The cheap imported labour included a lawless element of thugs and gunmen. On the authority of a responsible minister of religion in Nanaimo, the imported blacklegs provoked a riot by insulting conduct to the miners and their womenfolk. But the riot provided the looked-for excuse for the McBride Government to send militia to Nanaimo.

As I explained this afternoon, I cannot altogether agree with that last assertion. (Reading):

> While the locked-out, or striking miners were holding a peaceful meeting to consider an offer to return to work, their hall was surrounded by militia with machine guns. They were ordered to file out of the meeting and were subsequently placed under arrest. Many were held without trial for several weeks, and finally sentenced on a trumped-up charge: to disfranchise them from voting at the next elections, it is alleged——

Then there is some reference to a member of the House, which I am not going to read. (Reading):

> Some of the men, decent English, Welsh and Scottish coal-miners were sentenced to long terms of imprisonment; arousing strong protests from pulpits, press, and all classes of Canadian citizens in the west. One miner's boy innocent of any offence, died in prison a few days ago. He had been advised that if he pleaded guilty he would be let off with a nominal sentence. He took the advice but instead of an acquittal he received a heavy sentence and died in jail. The editor of the Vancouver World, Mr. L. D. Taylor, refers to the miner boy's death as 'blood that calls from the ground.'

And yet the Minister of Labour tells us that August 14, 1913, the day after those riots occurred, was an opportune time for his commissioner, Mr. Price, to make his report. I maintain that this report, if correct, discloses a shameful condition of affairs—and it is taken from the Ottawa Citizen, a paper which has not much sympathy with the Opposition in this House or the political creed of the party to which I myself belong. Canadian militiamen shooting down Canadian workmen who are endeavouring by peaceful methods to better their positions by proper labour organization—it means that and nothing more. Whilst both the Murray Administration in Nova Scotia and the Laurier

Administration were charged, not only in this House by quasi-labour members, but on every public platform where a coal miner could be found in the province of Nova Scotia, with having been guilty of bringing out the militia to quell the strikers during the Nova Scotia strike. I am fair enough, and I have been fair enough, to say I am not charging the Department of Labour or the Militia Department—and no man knowing the Militia Act or anything about it would do so if he were sincere—with being instrumental in calling out the militia of this country in aid of the civil power; but very many people in Nova Scotia have been led to believe that. In this connection I want to say that the way in which the militia is called out in aid of the civil power in this country at the present time is, to my way of thinking, absolutely wrong. The operators, of course, always ask for the militia to be called out and how is it done? It is done by an ex parte application to either two justices of the peace, two stipendiary magistrates, or a judge of the County Court. Affidavits are read from friends of the mine operators; no person appears for the miner, and very often those affidavits are exaggerated or absolutely false. Yet the miner is not represented before the judge who, upon an ex parte statement of the case, calls out the militia to quell miners or other labourers, when there is absolutely no necessity for such a course. If the facts had been investigated, if the miners of British Columbia had been given a chance to be heard before the tribunal that ordered out the militia, they could have shown that it was the gunmen, the thugs, the Oriental labour, the coloured labour, brought into this country by the operators in British Columbia, who started these riots and in return were set on by the coal miners of British Columbia. Had there been a proper inquiry into the facts before the militia were called out the probabilities are that the scenes that have disgraced this country—the militia of Canada shooting down their fellow Canadians who were engaged in an effort to better their own positions—would not have been witnessed.

Mr. SHEPHERD: Does the hon. member think that it was not necessary to call out the militia in the Nanaimo strike after the riot at Extension of August 14?

Mr. CARROLL: I am not giving an opinion on that. I am giving the opinion that if it had not been for the introduction of the gunmen, thugs, coloured labour and Oriental labour brought to that country by the operators, the calling out of the militia would never have been necessary, and if the Militia Act had provided for the appearance, by solicitor or otherwise, before the tribunal that called out that militia, of the miners, and had they been allowed to state their case, the militia would never have been called out. Of course, the hon. gentleman was on the ground: what does he think about it?

Mr. SHEPHERD: I will tell you presently.

Mr. CARROLL: I really think it is the duty of the Minister of Labour to introduce an amendment to the Industrial Disputes Act providing that his department may appoint a board of conciliation where the operators and employees do not ask for one, where a strike is called on, and providing that the recommendations of a board of conciliation may be enforced by penalty. If he does not propose such legislation during the present session of Parliament, he is not doing justice either to himself, to his department, to the labouring people or to the corporations or operators of this country. I do not think, as a matter of fact, that the Minister of Labour takes his work as Minister of Labour seriously. He has told us that he is minister of play. I do not envy the good times that the Minister of Labour gets out of being minister of play. I would surely expect that the Minister of Labour would do a little work as well as play. There is a time for work and a time for play. I say he does not take the duties of his office seriously. We had a visit from the Minister of Labour to the province of Nova Scotia last summer. I was pleased to meet him there. Some days before his appearance in the county of Cape Breton a large advertisement appeared in one of our local papers, the Glace Bay Gazette, telling the people that the Minister of Labour was going to hold a labour demonstration in King's theatre in the town of Glace Bay, and invited all to go there. Arrangements were made for special trains to Glace Bay from all the surrounding towns. We expected to get some wonderful pronouncements from the minister on that occasion. His visit was talked of all through the mining centres. The meeting was not supposed to be in any sense a political gathering. This was advertised in the Glace Bay Gazette. On the morning of the day when the minister was supposed to address this wonderful meeting a notice appeared in the Sydney Post, a

newspaper having a circulation in some parts of Glace Bay, but not having anything like so large a circultion there as the newspaper that heralded his coming. The notice in the Post advised that, owing to bad roads in that part of the country, the Minister of Labour was unable to meet his friends in King's theatre. Of course, there are not very many in this House who understand our local conditions there. When I tell you—and remember that this notice did not come from the Minister of Labour or from the agent whom the Minister of Labour had advertising his meeting in Glace Bay—that the town of Glace Bay has connections by tramway every hour of the day from seven o'clock in the morning till twelve o'clock at night with the city of Sydney, where the Minister of Labour then was, you will be surprised at the excuse the Minister of Labour gave for not being able to be at Glace Bay: bad roads. Now, Sir, what happened? Hundreds of people gathered at King's theatre that night to hear the minister speak. People of both political parties were there. They were glad he was coming to their midst. But what was their surprise when eight o'clock, half-past eight, nine o'clock came, and no Minister of Labour appeared. Finally a chap came along with a copy of the Sydney Post and said: 'The bad roads have prevented the minister from coming to the meeting; and from that day to this the Minister of Labour has given no excuse and no apology to the miners and workers of Glace Bay for his non-appearance at that meeting.

I give this as an illustration, Mr. Chairman, to show that the Minister of Labour was not serious in his task. Had he been serious, he would have considered before advertising this demonstration, and if he had been serious, after having advertised it, he would not have fooled the poor people of Glace Bay by getting them to congregate there and then not putting in an appearance. He has dealt in the same manner with this labour situation in British Columbia. He dealt with it in a jovial, good-natured way. He has not shown that he has any strength behind him; he has not shown that he has any backbone. When the serious part of the labour strike in British Columbia came on, when the riots and shooting began, the Minister of Labour went away to England to study the labour conditions there. Probably he thought he might have better roads than he had found on the island of Cape Breton. He has not handled this question well from start to finish. If he had I believe he would have achieved the very same success that Mr. Mackenzie King achieved during the eight years between 1900 and 1908. The situation is a serious one. It is due not only to the miners of British olumbia but to all wage earners that the Minister of Labour shall exhibit a strong arm in this matter. If there is no provision made in the law under which he can act, let him bring down some of the amendments that he and his party preached about before 1911, let him amend the Act so as to make it applicable to all cases that may arise, let him bring those amendments down this session, and if the minister brings them down this session, he will have the satisfaction, small though it is, I admit, of knowing that I, at least, will come to the conclusion that he is giving the affairs of his department some serious consideration.

Mr. F. H. SHEPHERD (Nanaimo): Mr. Chairman, representing as I do, a constituency on the Island of Vancouver, I wish to say a few words in regard to this matter. I will commence by referring to the charge of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), that I have been guilty of apathy during the last year in that I have not taken any interest or part in the trouble on Vancouver Island. I assure the hon. gentleman that during last session there was no disturbance such as he would lead the House to believe existed at that time in my constituency. At one mine, belonging to Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann, in my constituency, the men had been on strike since September 16, 1912. The men employed in the mine at Nanaimo had been on strike from May 1, and, of course, the House adjourned on June 6, 1913. But there was no disturbance in my constituency such as the hon. gentleman would indicate to this committee. We have been led to believe, and I think rightly so, that the main object of this trouble is to secure the recognition of the United Mine Workers of America. But this was not the initial cause. I wish particularly to refer to this feature of the matter because it bears upon a report that appeared in the Citizen a few days ago reflecting very seriously upon the Minister of Mines of British Columbia for not ordering an investigation to be made in reference to the discrimination of the Gas Committee who examined the mine at Extension. I wish briefly to put forward the position of the Minister of Mines in that regard. The Mines Regula-

tion Act of British Columbia, which I had the honour to suggest to the minister, distinctly states:—

Rule 17. The persons employed in a mine may from time to time appoint one or two of their number to inspect the mine at their own cost, and the persons so appointed shall be allowed, once or oftener in every shift, day, week, or month, accompanied, if the owner, agent or manager of the mine thinks fit, by himself or one or more officers of the mine, to go to every part of the mine, and to inspect the shafts, levels, planes, working-places, return airways, ventilating apparatus, old workings, and machinery, and shall be afforded by the owner, agent, or manager, and all persons in the mine, every facility for the purpose of such inspection, and shall make a true report of the result of such inspection; and such report shall be recorded in a book to be kept at the mine for the purpose, and shall be signed by the persons who made the same. And if the report state the existence or apprehended existence of any danger, the person or persons making the inspection shall forthwith cause a true copy of the report to be sent to the inspector of the district: provided, always, that where the miners in any mine fail to appoint two of their number to inspect the mine, the chief inspector shall select from the men, in alphabetical order where possible, two competent miners, who shall comply with the provisions of this section, and the said owner, agent, or manager may withhold from the wages of the underground employees a sufficient sum pro rata to remunerate the persons making such examination.

They had reported upon the existence of inflammable gas in five working places. The quantity of gas was not stated. The amount of danger evidently was not specified but if the quantity of gas had been very great, the miners could have detected it at the time of the examination and they could have become aware of the fact if the mine had been in a dangerous condition. Why did they not forthwith, according to the provision of the Act, report it? Although that report was made in June, they allowed it to remain until July, before the report was sent down to the Department of Mines.

Now, I desire to say a word in regard to the discrimination against Messrs. Mottishaw and Portrey, which apparently was the initial cause of the strike at Cumberland in September, 1912. Mr. Mottishaw had finished his duties at the extension and there was no place ready for him. The facts are set forth in the following report:

On June 15, 1912, Isaac Portrey and Oscar Mottishaw, the gas committee appointed by the men, as laid down in the Act, reported having found gas in several places in the No. 2 mine at Extension. This report was forwarded to the Inspector of Mines, who verified the same in July, 1912.

Shortly after this report was issued Mottishaw's 'place' ran out, and it was discovered that no other 'place' could be found for him. He left Extension and later arrived at Cumberland, where he obtained work with a contractor at one of the mines. After he had been there a short time the contractor was notified by the manager that Mottishaw must be discharged. The contractor objected, but was told that Mottishaw had to go, excuse or no excuse.

Realizing the insecurity of their position should they allow such a case of flagrant discrimination to occur without some protest on their part, a committee was appointed by the miners to interview the manager in connection therewith, but he refused to meet them. Another committee was sent with a like result. The miners then decided to declare a general holiday at all the mines in Cumberland on Monday, September 16, 1912, in order that this question might be discussed.

At the meeting, on the 16th, a committee was chosen, consisting of union and non-union miners, to again visit the managers. This committee met the same fate as the previous one.

On the miners returning to work on the morning of the 17th, they discovered notices at the mine entrances notifying them to take out their tools, the only condition under which they would be permitted to work being: That each man desiring to work could do so, provided that he signed an individual contract agreeing to work under the old conditions for a period of two years. Thus commenced the strike on Vancouver Island—by a lockout at the hands of the mine owners.

In reference to the charge of the hon. member for Carleton that I had been apathetic in the matter between June, 1911 and June 1912, while the Cumberland strike was on, let me say that the United Mine Workers had a conference in Nanaimo with the Cumberland representatives of the United Mine Workers and they asked me to attend and I did. I desired to the best of my ability to show them exactly where they stood in regard to the charge of discrimination against Mottishaw and Portrey. Portrey was not discharged but he was allowed to continue his work.

I told the convention that if they would lay a specific charge of discrimination, the Minister of Mines of British Columbia was compelled, by the provisions of this Act, to order an investigation. They told me they could not lay a specific charge, but they were morally sure that such was the case. I appealed to them again; I said to them: gentlemen, you are out of court, and unless you can formulate a specific charge and sustain it, the Minister of Mines cannot order an investigation. In support of what I told these men, that the Minister of Mines was compelled by the provisions of this Act to order an investigation, I want to tell this committee that whilst Chief Inspector of Mines of British Columbia I had occasion to lay several complaints with the hon. the

Minister of Mines, and I never on one single occasion found him to object in the slightest degree to holding an investigation and to having the offender punished very adequately. And a singular thing is, that the United Mine Workers or the miners seemed to have overlooked in support of their charge of discrimination, that I had a case of discrimination against this very company in which a foreman discriminated against his own officer, a fireman, and this matter was brought to my attention and I reported it to the Minister of Mines who at once appointed a commission and had the thing investigated, and the foreman was punished, and his certificate cancelled. I cite this as a concrete case in which the Minister of Mines had taken action where discrimination had been charged. But, unless the charge was made I fail to see how the Minister of Mines could, under the provisions of this Act, have ordered an investigation. The miners themselves failed to substantiate the charge or to make a specific charge that discrimination had occurred. Of course, they said, it was morally true. It was one of those peculiar things where actual evidence was not forthcoming, though the charge might have been true. Of course it narrowed itself down into one general demand for recognition of the United Mine Workers of America which, as you are aware, is an international organization. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) held up my predecessor as being a very active member in representing the constituency, but I want to tell my hon. friend from Carleton that my predecessor Mr. Ralph Smith severed his connection with the labour organizations of British Columbia because he refused to enter into any combine whereby the labour union was to be controlled by any international body.

The operators at that time felt as they feel now; they object, for reasons best known to themselves, and into which I do not purpose entering at this moment, to acknowledging an international union. Mind you, I do not say for a single moment that the miners have not the right to belong to any labour union they wish, and that whether they can compel all companies to recognize this union or not, is a matter between them and the companies. I believe the miners have the right to organize; their labour is their own affair; they are the hewers of wood and the drawers of water, and I believe they have every moral and legal right to bind themselves into a society or organization whereby they can obtain adequate remuneration for their services. I would say this, and I am speaking now for at least four-fifths of the operators of Vancouver Island—I do not know about the other one-fifth for the simple reason that I have not interviewed them—but four-fifths of the operators say they have absolutely no objection to the men forming a miners' union among themselves, but they do refuse to recognize this particular international union. I have no brief for the coal operators or for that matter for the Mine Workers of America; I am actuated only by a desire to bring industrial peace to our town and district. Hon. members on the other side of the House have laid very great stress on that fact that Orientals were brought in very freely during this trouble, and they would lead the House to believe that these Orientals were brought in indiscriminately all over the strike zone on Vancouver Island. That is absolutely untrue. The only mines employing Orientals underground are the Canadian collieries and they have employed Orientals in their mines for probably twenty-five years. But in no other mine in the province of British Columbia is there a single Oriental employed, with perhaps one exception and that is the Extension mine, the very mine in which this trouble occurred. I believe that six Orientals are employed in that mine keeping the track in repair in a rock tunnel, but they are not allowed to go into the mine property to enter upon any of the duties that white men usually discharge.

Mr. CARROLL: Is it true that in British Columbia to-day, in only two mines are Orientals employed?

Mr. SHEPHERD: Yes, but both belong to the one company; I mean, of course, underground. There are Orientals employed at Nanaimo above ground, not under ground.

With reference to the convention I have spoken of, and to show that the discrimination was the question at issue at that particular time, I will read a letter that was sent to the hon. Minister of Mines at Ottawa, dated Nanaimo, October 3, 1912. This letter will show clearly that the reason for the strike was really the question of discrimination.

Nanaimo, B.C., October 3, 1912.

Hon. T. W. Crothers,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—We, the representatives of district number 28, United Mine Workers of America in convention assembled, beg leave to submit to you our reply to your request for a statement of our position re the present

difficulty between the Cumberland Coal Company (Dunsmuir), Limited, and their employees. Sunday, the 15th of September, 1912, the employees of said company held a mass meeting and elected at that meeting to take a holiday as a protest against the action of the management of the company in discriminating against two of its employees. There were no arrangements other than that made at the meeting. At the session of the local union, United Mine Workers of America, held in the evening, the action of the mass meeting was endorsed and a committee appointed to confer with the management; that committee went to the officers of the company on Monday, September 16, accompanied by District President Foster, when the management positively refused to meet the committee; on Tuesday, September 17, the management posted notices ordering all men to take their tools out of the mines, also stating that all the late employees of the company would be paid off just as soon as the payroll could be made out. Later, the men held another mass meeting and sent another committee to meet the management. Mr. Clinton, whom they met in the office and whom they had been informed would represent the management, told them he had no authority to do business with them. On the 23rd of September another committee went to the office and met Superintendent Lockhart and discussed the situation with him. There was no offer made by the committee of conditions under which the men would be willing to return to work, nor did Mr. Lockhart make any proposition that the men should return to work or any statement that the company had changed its position or withdrew the notices they had posted or modified them in any particular. Nor as yet have they made any statement to accommodate or posted any notice that they have changed their attitude that simply amounted to a wholesale discharge of all these men. On the 18th day of September, Ladysmith mine workers decided to stop work until the Cumberland mines resumed, and they also were ordered to take their tools.

Yours respectfully,
Robert Foster, President.
John McAllister, Secretary.

You will see, therefore, that the strike in the Extension mine was simply a sympathetic strike, it being one of the mines operated by the Canadian Collieries Company. Passing on to the commencement of the trouble on August 12 the conditions in the strike zone seemed as if the men were becoming very uneasy. There was an undercurrent of ill feeling which led to the supposition that something ill was foreboding. The men assembled at No. 1 shaft in Nanaimo to the number of about 1,000. I was phoned up to ask if I could use my good offices in an endeavour to effect some solution between the company and the men, and I told them I would be willing to do whatever I possibly could in the matter. I went down in an automobile and went through the mob; and, as the press reports stated, they threw brickbats at me, but fortunately none of them hit me.

[Mr. Shepherd.]

However, this did not deter me from doing what I thought was right. I spoke to them and told them that I had come down in order to endeavour to effect a settlement between them and the companies so that this trouble might end peacefully. I made a proposition to them. I could see, to paraphrase Charles Dickens, that the 'ricks were blazing and the mob was mad.' I pleaded for a twenty-four hour armistice, so that they could repair to a hall and there formulate their demands; and I would endeavour, to the best of my ability, to secure a promise on behalf of the company that they would meet them, say at ten o'clock in the morning. My good intentions were evidently misinterpreted. One of the men cried out, 'You want an armistice to get the militia here.' However good a man's intentions may be, they are very often misinterpreted. They turned my proposition down and asked me if I would get the manager to come and speak to them. I got the manager to come and speak to them, and he made a very fair proposition. He said: 'If seven of you men who were working for me on the 30th of April will come to my room to-morrow morning, I will make arrangements with you so satisfactory that I think you will return to work.' They appointed seven men; these men went down to the company's office, but accompanying them was Mr. Farrington, strike manager of the United Mine Workers of America. Mr. Stockett, manager of the mine, refused to meet Mr. Farrington, and consequently the latter's presence rendered the whole proposition abortive.

We come now to the 13th of August. A boy rode into Nanaimo on a foam-flecked horse, rode to the office of the Free Press and stated that six men had been killed by the non-strikers. The result was that a mob a thousand strong, armed with clubs, guns or rifles, or anything they could command, went out to Extension. At the time the riot took place, an incipent riot took place at Nanaimo, a serious one at Wellington, and a very serious one at Ladysmith, a mining town about fourteen miles from Extension and really the mining town of Extension mine. The most serious riot, as far as injury to the person was concerned, occurred at Ladysmith, where a man by the name of McKinnon had his arm blown off by a stick of dynamite being thrown into his building.

9 p.m.

With regard to the hon. member's statement about bloodshed, there was abso-

lutely no bloodshed in the sense he tried to convey to the House, with the exception of this injury to McKinnon. One man, who was simply an onlooker, received a bullet wound; he should not have been there, and he had his curiosity satisfied.

I have no wish to enter into the deplorable details of what happened at the Extension grounds. I visited them two days afterwards and saw the desolation that had been effected by this mob. There is one thing so abhorrent that I can not refrain from mentioning it: that is, the driving of forty innocent women and children from the Extension mine into the woods. These women and children were in the woods without shelter and without food for from thirty-six to forty-eight hours until they were rescued by the militia. This is an act which would bring the blush of shame to the cheek of an Apache Indian, and is not trades unionism in any shape or form.

With regard to the militia, do you not think, Sir, that under such conditions the sending of the militia was well advised? The ricks were blazing and the mob was mad! Do you not think that it was wise, even to save these men from themselves, to say nothing of saving the lives and property of non-combatants in this trouble?

Mr. CARROLL: Was it after the committal of the offences mentioned by the hon. member that the militia came?

Mr. SHEPHERD: Yes.

Mr. CARROLL: The first riots were on the 13th.

Mr. SHEPHERD: They commenced on the 13th.

Mr. CARROLL: And the militia appeared on the 14th.

Mr. SHEPHERD: At daybreak on the 15th.

Mr. CARROLL: All those riots happened in a day.

Mr. SHEPHERD: It was very unfortunate that the militia were not there twenty-four hours sooner. They were not called until after the damage was done. After the advent of the militia, further damage to property ceased. The militia were called out in the usual way, upon the application of two or three justices of the peace. I want to pay the highest tribute to Lieut.-Col. Hall commanding the militia force in Nanaimo. He has probably handled one of the most serious labour disturbances that have occurred, as one hon. member stated, since Confederation.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the hon. member agree with the editorial of the Citizen which states that the miners were assembled in a hall discussing the advisability of a peaceful settlement, when the militia surrounded the hall and, with drawn bayonets, ordered them out? Is that story correct and does my hon. friend agree then that the militia acted as the militia should act?

Mr. SHEPHERD: This is my version of the affair, and I think that my version is the correct one. It was known to the provincial police that from 150 to 200 of the active participants in the riot were in the hall. It was necessary, in the administration of law and justice, that these men be placed under arrest, because they had been guilty of burning homes; they had been guilty of burning property, of driving women and children into the woods. A state of anarchy existed. It was not trades unionism. I am perfectly safe in stating that it was at the request of the provincial constabulary that Lieut.-Col. Hall surrounded that hall in order that he might make his arrests without any further trouble and in order that the men might not escape. The meeting to which my hon. friend has referred was a meeting of the United Mine Workers of America in reference to the settlement of the trouble in one mine, the Jinglepot, owned by the Nanaimo and Vancouver Mining Company. Lieut.-Col. Hall entered the hall and stated that the men were under arrest. He said to them: 'I require you to walk out in single file to the court house, and any one attempting to run away will be bayoneted or shot.' It is no good denying the truth. It is the truth we want. The operation continued until two or three o'clock in the morning. The result was that probably 150 men were placed under arrest, and many of these men, whether the Colonel's action was right or wrong, whether he was justified or not, are serving terms in jail for breaking the law. Now, I desire to offer here the highest tribute to Colonel Hall for the manner in which he handled this most difficult state of affairs, without firing a single shot or shedding a drop of blood, he handled probably the worst labour dispute that ever occurred in the history of the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, as I have said, this dispute arose through the action of the United Mine Workers of America. But I do believe that many of these men, the greater part of

them, were misled, that it was in a moment of excitement that they entered into this, and that many of them now are sorry. I believe, and I take this opportunity of expressing the belief, that no good can come of bringing this matter up for further discussion here in all its harrowing details. I believe that society has to a great extent been satisfied, and I think it would be conducive to harmony and it would hasten industrial peace and the return of prosperity to our stricken town and district if the Minister of Justice could see his way clear to approach His Royal Highness the Governor General to ask for clemency at least in those cases, in which I feel sure the men have been misguided.

Mr. CARVELL: I desire to say just a word. I did not pretend this afternoon to give to the House the cause of the strike, because I did not know much about it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL: Some hon. members say, 'hear, hear.' I quite agree with them. I was trying to show the Minister of Labour that he had not done anything to prevent it, and I ventured the opinion that my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Shepherd) had not done very much to prevent it. If any confirmation were needed for that statement, we have it in the confession the hon. gentleman has made here this evening. I do not know what the hon. member for Nanaimo was doing on that fateful 13th of August, but he has not told this House that he ever even spoke to the Minister of Labour, to say nothing of writing to him, to try to use his good offices and to use the power of his department to prevent this condition of affairs.

Mr. SHEPHERD: I did not think it necessary to go into that matter. But I may tell the hon. gentleman that I was in daily communication with the Minister of Labour from the 1st of May until the 6th of June before this House adjourned.

Mr. CARVELL: Then, the hon. gentleman took mighty good care not to say anything to the public. So far as his constituency is concerned, so far as the people of Canada are concerned, he was as dumb as an oyster; he sat here from the 1st of May until the 6th of June, and never a word was said by him; and he has been in this House since the 15th of January and has been as mute as he was last spring. The same with the Minister of Labour. They are linked together, and they are both incompetents so far as dealing with this matter is concerned. I am sorry to couple the hon. gentleman with the Minister of Labour, but as he wishes to take that position, I can only allow him to have his own way. I congratulate the hon. member on his confession to his constituents of his masterly inactivity in regard to bringing to a conclusion this unfortunate affair. The hon. gentleman says that he was in daily correspondence with the Minister. But both of them took precious good care not to give anything to the public as to what they did—and certainly they did not accomplish very much. I give the hon. gentleman credit for admitting that he would like to have settled this affair if he could. I am sorry I cannot throw the same bouquet at the minister, because I do not think he cares two straws whether it is settled or not. It seems to me he regards it all as a huge joke. The fact is, he is the 'Minister of Play.' But I wish to direct the attention of the hon. member for Nanaimo to this branch of the case: Can he tell this House and this country of a solitary movement made by the Department of the Minister of Labour from the 17th of September, 1912, until 29th July, 1913, to obviate or alleviate the condition of affairs existing in his town?

Mr. BUCHANAN: He sent a telegram.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, he sent a telegram telling these members what the law was. I think the fact that they proclaimed a holiday rather than a strike is pretty good evidence that they knew the law without his telling them. Then, as I have said, he appointed his friend to go out and make a report. A lot of information there is in that report. If there is anything in it at all it is confirmation of the fact that the mine owners absolutely refused to allow one of these men to go back to work. He was prevented from getting employment not only in one mine but in the other mines, because he had made a true report as to the conditions in one of them in relation to gas. I want to take the hon. member for Nanaimo back to the matter we were discussing this afternoon, back to the incompetence of the Department of Labour. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he feels that the department did what it ought to have done or what any live Department of Labour should have done, in order to alleviate the condition of affairs which we have been dealing with this afternoon. I do not blame the hon. gentleman for not going into the harrow-

ing details of this affair. That was not necessary; we have read all that in the newspapers, and do not wish to go into it. If conditions were bad, it was the duty of the minister to make them right. The hon. gentleman has not said a word to defend the minister, and I should like to hear any member who would defend him. I should like to find any newspapers that had tried to defend him. I should like to know which of his colleagues will attempt to defend him. The hon. member for Nanaimo will not do so; the minister himself will not attempt it. I think it is up to the minister to give us the true reason why he has allowed this thing to diddle-daddle along the way it has done, why he has maintained a condition of inactivity in the deplorable condition of affairs that we have been told about this afternoon.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat): I represent a constituency in which there are a large number of coal miners. I know them intimately. And let me say that a feeling has grown up that under the administration of the present Minister of Labour the Department's affairs are not being dealt with seriously. There is a feeling also that the employers have the ear of the minister more than the employees have. I can say for the late Minister of Labour, that, so far as the miners of my constituency are concerned they felt that the Hon. Mackenzie King was anxious to bring about better relations between capital and labour. This does not exist at the present time, but it is felt that the minister now in charge of the department is not anxious to bring about better relations between capital and labour. This very strike in Vancouver Island is an instance of it. It was established here today that no serious efforts, no prolonged efforts, were made by the minister to settle this trouble. I wonder if this has anything to do with the parties who are in control of some of the mines in Vancouver Island. These parties are very intimately in touch with this Government. They have been able to get large subsidies for some of their railroads. Is it possible that they are so much in touch with this Government that they have the ear of the Government in regard to labour disputes in industries in which they are concerned? There is a feeling of this kind among the people of this country. As to the commissioner sent out to investigate, Mr. Samuel Price, of St. Thomas, I have nothing to say against him personally except that I do not believe he was a man properly qualified to settle this particular trouble. It is true that Mr. Price had something to do with mining in New Ontario, but not in so far as it concerned labour and conditions of labour. There are men in this country who have made a study of the matter; there are men in this country who are familiar with mining conditions and who would probably have been accepted by employers and employees as absolutely fair men. If such a man had been sent to Vancouver Island to look into this matter a solution of the problem would have been brought about. I have before me a letter addressed to the Minister of Labour by Mr. Frank Farrington, who was in charge of the strike, and who represented and directed the forces of the labour unions on Vancouver Island. In this letter, written on December 15, 1913, he makes an assertion which goes to show that Mr. Price did not display evidences of fairness in his efforts to get at the bottom of the trouble on Vancouver Island. I believe it is only fair to the labouring men of this country that the views of their representatives should be placed before Parliament and before the country. Here is what Mr. Farrington has to say about Mr. Price's report:

> To those who are familiar with conditions on the island it is clear that the Royal Commissioner has predicated his report upon the unsupported statements of the mine owners and their satellites; and, on the other hand, denied the union men the opportunity of appearing before him in defence of their position or to refute the untrue statements of these hostile agents. In view of my prominent connection with this trouble I should be expected to have much valuable matter to contribute to the investigation, and I have, yet I was given no opportunity to present it to the commissioner. In fact, I never met him but once, and then only informally, during my brief conference with you in Vancouver city the first week in July. I do not mention this because I feel slighted, but because it shows the commissioner was not anxious to have facts. Furthermore, I have made careful inquiry of the district and local officers connected with the strike, and many individuals of influence and activity among the strikers, all of whom unite in declaring they did not have the privilege of appearing before the commissioner, and none of whom were even aware of his visit to the island; which further indicates his desire to escape rather than to find the truth.
>
> Couple his transgression in this respect with his transparent disposition to favour the mine owners and his apparent willingness to accept and include in his report everything, no matter how flimsy, that reflects discredit upon

the United Mine Workers of America, and you must agree the Royal Commissioner's report is destitute of justice to the striking miners.

That is the view expressed by the gentleman who directed the miners in the strike on Vancouver Island; that is the charge he makes against the commissioner who made the report with which we are dealing to-night. The views of this gentleman should be received and considered by the members of this House. I know that the mine workers' officials are anxious to promote the interests of the miners; they feel that they are in just as responsible a position and that they are just as worthy of consideration in a case of this kind as the men who direct and are in control of the mines. I think that if the Minister of Labour would treat both elements in the same way, and do his utmost to bring about better relations between the employers and the employees, he would be doing something which would make the administration of his department worth while. This gentleman refers to the matter of wages as connected with the commissioner's report. He says:

A number of Nanaimo miners, as well as the mayor, testified before the Labour Commission referred to in the quotation. They told of low wages, blacklists, discrimination, disobedience of laws, robbery and other injustices suffered by the men, but their testimony failed to supply the commissioner's wants. What was needed was something to indicate the men were earning substantial wages, so the testimony of the men was ignored and that of the mayor was incorporated in the commissioner's report. The fact that the mayor had never worked in the mines a single day in all his life and was not in a position to furnish first hand, reliable information as to the conditions under which the men worked or the wages they earned does not seem to have made any difference. The mayor had something that had a tendency to verify the managers' assertions that the men were receiving good wages, and that was sufficient to make his testimony worthy of mention in the report.

That is a rather serious assertion: that every statement made to oppose the contention of the mine owners was given prominence in the report, and that the testimony of the miners was not given the same prominence—in fact, was not treated at all. I believe there is much to be said in criticism of Mr. Price's report, of the methods he adopted in obtaining the information upon which he based that report, and, in fact, of his appointment. Mr. Price knows no more about mining conditions in western Canada than I do about fruit conditions in eastern Canada; yet he was sent to western Canada to investigate these conditions—the most serious industrial conditions that have ever arisen in this country—and he made a report which is open to this criticism on the part of the men he was supposed to be anxious to conciliate; whom he was supposed to be endeavouring to establish on better relations with their employers.

The minister took occasion to-day to boast of one settlement which was effected by this Government. If that is all he had to boast of so far as the administration of his department since he took charge of it is concerned it does not say very much for that administration. I want to say that the Alberta strike of 1911, to which he referred, was not settled by the Minister of Labour or by any member of the Government. That strike was settled before the minister of the Government got to the city of Lethbridge. The terms were agreed upon and the miners said: If the Minister of the Interior will get anything more for us, let him come along. The minister went there, but he did not get anything more for them than had been agreed upon with the operators before his arrival.

Mr. ROGERS: I should like to correct that assertion of my hon. friend, which is absolutely incorrect. No agreement whatever was made.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I have the authority of an official of the miners' union, a gentleman who was a member of the conference held on that occasion, that this is true, and that an agreement had been reached. Anyway, the agreement that was signed in connection with that strike was the one recommended by the Rev. Dr. Gordon of Winnipeg, who was the chairman of a board appointed by the late Government to investigate that particular trouble. The miners accepted that agreement, and the reason that the strike was prolonged was because of an addition made to the report by the representatives of the operators. As soon as that addition was removed, they accepted the report of Rev. Dr. Gordon, and the strike was settled. I say, therefore, that this settlement is no credit whatever to the Government; it is a joke in my part of the country to talk about the Government having settled that strike. If that is the only thing that the Minister of Labour has to point to in respect of his administration of the Labour Department, then no credit is due for his administration of that department of the Government since 1911.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver): I think it is somewhat unfortunate that the

discussion of a subject of such very grave importance—a subject so closely connected with one of the greatest problems we have before us to-day, that of the relations between capital and labour—should have degenerated into a very petty attack upon a member of the Government. Many of the assertions made by those who have spoken on the other side of the House are quite true; many of the assertions made can be justified by a careful perusal of the facts. But there has been an absolute failure on the part of the hon. gentlemen who have attacked the minister so bitterly to point out where the weakness lay in this matter of failing to secure a settlement or to point out remedies that might be introduced to overcome this difficulty. I shall reply to one or two of the statements made. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) asked: Has there been a single case where the present Minister of Labour effected a settlement in a labour dispute of this kind? I would call attention to the dispute which occurred prior to this Government taking office between the Grand Trunk and its employees which dragged along, after an award was made, for two years or thereabouts. As a matter of fact the then Minister of Railways and the then Minister of Labour (Mr. King), had frequent conferences with the Grand Trunk and utterly failed to get a settlement of that dispute. The present Minister of Labour did secure a settlement after he came into office. That alone, I think, should be placed to his credit. Another occasion I can cite is that of a strike which occurred at the Britannia mines at Howe Sound in my constituency involving about six hundred men. I drew the attention of the Minister of Labour to it and at once steps were taken to appoint a board. The men in that case acted in accordance with the Act and made an application in proper form. A board of conciliation was appointed and an award was given, but there happened at that time what will happen in almost every labour dispute we attempt to settle with the limited powers contained in the present Act, the company refused to accept the award and the Government were absolutely powerless. In the case of the Grand Trunk the minister exercised what is known as the power of the big stick; he exercised a power through another source to effect a settlement. But in the case of the Britannia mines there was no other way in which a settlement could be forced on the company or the company could be forced to accept the award.

Mr. CARROLL: Would the hon. member be favourable to an amendment to the Industrial Disputes Act imposing a penalty upon any party to the trouble not obeying or fulfilling the recommendations of a board of conciliation?

Mr. STEVENS: I shall discuss that in a moment. I may say now though that I am in favour of such an amendment. I am informed by the minister himself, and I think the notice is on the Order Paper, that he is introducing a Bill so to amend the Act as to incorporate this and many other points. I do not know that this point will be included as we understand it but if it is not I intend making reference to it on the floor of the House. He is at present drafting amendments to the Industrial Disputes Act to remedy the defects which have been found to exist. It is amusing to listen to the very generous bouquets that have been flung to the gallery. Whatever credit may be due to the gentleman who drafted the Act, there is one thing we can certainly say and that is that the Act is made absolutely useless by the absence of the point made by my hon. friend, the absence of any penalty that can be possibly applied to enforce the findings of a board of conciliation. You cannot enforce the Act under any statute of Canada.

I wish to refer briefly to the unfortunate conditions obtaining on Vancouver Island. A very unfair attack was made by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) on the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Shepherd). I know, as a matter of fact, that the hon. member for Nanaimo was constantly in touch during the last session with the Minister of Labour in connection with this matter; not only was he in touch, but other members from British Columbia, who were appealed to by the labour men in different parts of the province, were constantly in touch with the Minister of Labour as occasion arose. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) is an astute, keen lawyer, and he knows that to rise in this House, prior to the outbreak of a riot, and declare that danger was in the air, that a riot was going to occur, would be the very way in which to incite a riot. My hon. friend would be the first to advise his clients in such a case to take the matter as calmly and quietly as possible.

Mr. CARVELL: Does the hon. member mean to say that I wanted the hon. member for Nanaimo to state that there was going to be a riot?

Mr. STEVENS: I gathered from the hon. gentleman's remarks that he blamed the hon. member for Nanaimo for not having discussed on the floor of the House all the features of this dispute and prophesying, shall I say, that there was grievous danger of an outbreak.

Mr. CARVELL: Oh no.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. member practically took it for granted that we knew before the riot broke out that a riot was likely to occur. I do not think any persons were more surprised than those in British Columbia when the riot did occur, except for the day or two prior to their occurrence.

I wish to refer to what I consider to be the important feature of this whole trouble. In the first place, it was pointed out here to-night and conclusively demonstrated that the actual cause of that strike or labour trouble was the discrimination against Mottishaw. The unfortunate thing in this whole trouble is that when the miners, in a thoughtless, unguarded moment, broke out into violence they alienated from their cause all the sympathy which had been in the public mind up to that time. Right up to the day of the riot there never was a strike in the province of British Columbia conducted with more fairness on the part of the men or observance of law and order; but the minute they broke into a riot they alienated the sympathies of the public at large. So far as I am concerned, I am prepared to make the statement on the floor of the House on my responsibility as a member, that my sympathies lean largely towards the men in this strike; but there is nothing which can justify the violence which was perpetrated against innocent parties in that district. And the unfortunate part of the whole thing is that their actions involved the question so much that I believe it is now almost an impossiblity to separate the causes of difficulties so as to place the blame where it actually belongs. This discrimination by the company is one of the vilest acts that can be perpetrated by an employer against an employee. As I remember, a suggestion is made in the report that some action should be taken by the Government to deal with cases of this kind. In British Columbia there is a law which makes it illegal for an employer to discriminate against an employee, and which fixes a distinct punishment for that offence. This Act has been applied in several cases where discrimination has occurred. One incident was cited in the very mine in which the present trouble occurred. The foreman was deprived of his certificate as a mine foreman because of discrimination. We have provided for that in British Columbia, but there is no Dominion Statute and I think the Minister of Labour will be well advised to take that point up in the amendments he is now considering.

The insinuation was made by one hon. gentleman that the present Government, because of the friendly relations which have been said to exist with the employers, referring to Messrs Mackenzie & Mann, I suppose, refused to take any action in this affair. In fairness to the Government it must be stated that no such thing influenced them. There is no evidence of any such thing being the case. I do not think it is wise to throw out carelessly damaging insinuations of that kind. The evidence upon which the hon. gentleman based that insinuation was that last year we granted some heavy subsidies to the Canadian Northern. If there is logic and reason in that, what about the subsidies granted to the Canadian Northern in the years prior to the time at which this Government came into power? We could just as reasonably argue that the late Government was very friendly to this concern. There is no sense in this allegation.

I wish to refer to a man who has been very prominent in this fight and that is Mr. Frank Farrington. I met Mr. Frank Farrington on many occasions in Vancouver and discussed this and other matters with him. I found him a very intelligent man, a man whom you would recognize immediately as a very skilful labour leader and administer. He is the representative from, I think it is, Indiana, of the United Mine Workers of America. All the companies absolutely refused to deal with Mr. Farrington because he was the representative of a foreign union. This raises the question of how many members of this House are prepared to support the policy of acknowledging international unions in Canada. How many of us are in favour of having the labour organizations controlled by Canadian committees? The hon. member for Cape Breton(Mr. Carroll) who has arraigned the Minister so severely, is absolutely opposed, from his statement to-day, to the control of labour unions by a foreign organization.

Mr. CARROLL: I have never made any such statement.

Mr. S. SHARPE: What is your position?

Mr. CARROLL: My position is that if there is an international organization and no other Canadian organization the workers of this country should be forced to recognize them as a labour organization.

Mr. STEVENS: If I remember rightly, the hon. gentleman stated clearly, and 'Hansard' will show it, that during the progress of the labour dispute in Cape Breton some years ago, there arose dissensions in the ranks of the labour organizations and there came into the country representatives of the United Mine Workers and organized a strike. He stated that in so far as he was concerned he was in sympathy with the attitude assumed by the provincial association.

Mr. CARROLL: I beg to differ from the hon. gentleman and I wish to tell him that he will find no such statement from me on the 'Hansard' of to-day, or on any other 'Hansard.' I said that the recommendation of the Board of Conciliation stated that the Dominion Coal Company was justified in not recognizing two labour organizations in the same district. They were recognizing one, and they could not, in justice to the organization, recognize the other. It would lead to innumerable difficulties.

Mr. STEVENS: I quite remember the statement that the hon. gentleman made. Possibly his memory is a little short.

Mr. CARROLL: I want to rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that the hon. gentleman should take the word of the hon. member for Cape Breton.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not disputing his word. I am simply suggesting that it is a lapse of memory.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I understand that the rule of the House is that the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), is bound to accept the statement of my hon. friend from South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll). I was sitting beside my hon. friend when he made his speech, and I gathered exactly the sense he has now stated as being the sense in which he spoke. Far from being guilty of a lapse of memory, my hon. friend's memory absolutely confirms what he actually said. If there be a lapse of memory it is on the part of the hon. member for Vancouver, but I only rose to a point of order for the purpose of pointing out that the hon. gentleman is bound to accept the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Carroll).

Mr. STEVENS: I accept the hon. gentleman's statement without any question whatsoever. I have a very high regard for the veracity of my hon. friend. The question of the recognition of international unions or Canadian organizations is a very important one which is fraught with very grave consequences. At the present time there are in Canada many unions of the highest possible type which are of an international character. The Typographical Union is one of the strongest and best in the country and there are also different organizations of railway employees which are international in their scope. On the other hand, there is a widespread sentiment throughout the country that an American organization controlled entirely on the other side should not be recognized. In order that I may not be misunderstood, I hold this, that the labour body have a perfect right to organize themselves for the advancement of their own interest. They have a right, and one which should never be disputed on any occasion, to organize for the protection of their rights and privileges, but the difficulty about labour organizations in Canada and other countries is that you cannot fasten a penalty upon them. The property and funds of this union are always placed in the hands of trustees so that you cannot fix a penalty successfully upon any labour organization. The reason for that, as explained by the men, is that if they allowed their property to remain in the hands of the recognized treasurer or secretary of the organization, there would be great discrimination in the settlement of a dispute and the labour organization would be forced to pay the penalty whereas the employers would go free. I wish that the hon. Minister of Labour would undertake to devise an amendment to the Act which would place an equal responsibility upon the employer and the employee. I think it would be far better to attack the labour union by the disbanding of the union than by imposing a fine, while imposing a fine in the case of the employers. One of the difficulties of such an Act would be that a large number of employers, such as manufacturers' associations, are in existence but in name only. There is no legal organization, and in this way the employer is enabled to escape responsibility. I freely

grant that this is an extremely difficult proposition. I believe that until such a measure is placed on the statute books it will be utterly impossible to deal properly and equitably when such questions as these arise.

Mr. CARROLL: How does the hon. gentleman propose to disband a labour organization without making it a criminal offence?

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend is better able to explain that than I am, being an astute and clever lawyer.

Mr. CARVELL: I would like the hon. member to explain it; he has put it forward.

Mr. STEVENS: I presume we have power under the British North America Act to pass such a statute. You could make it criminal if you liked, but you could pass a statute which would enable the Government to disband a union in case of the violation of the Act.

Mr. CARVELL: That is a very violent presumption, I am afraid.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend makes an off-hand statement, but I doubt very much if he has given the matter any great thought. I submit the proposal as the only way in which we can secure the settlement of labour disputes. You cannot enforce the penalty now. My hon. friend, when he was supporting the late Minister of Labour, was unable to suggest any amendment of this Act which would enable the Government to bring about a settlement of these disputes.

Mr. CARVELL: The late Minister of Labour always settled them.

Mr. STEVENS: No, he did not.

Mr. CARVELL: He had no trouble under this Act.

Mr. STEVENS: The late minister made just as many jokes, as the hon. gentleman calls them, as the present Government or the present minister has—quite as many.

Mr. OLIVER: Perhaps the hon. gentleman would give instances which occurred under the late Minister of Labour that would compare with the incident we are now discussing.

Mr. STEVENS: We all admit that the present dispute is one of the worst that has ever occurred in the country; but I referred a moment ago to the Grand Trunk strike, which was a very serious one.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Grand Trunk strike was settled.

Mr. STEVENS: It was not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Pardon me; it was.

Mr. STEVENS: The Grand Trunk strike was settled in so far as the award was made, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company agreed to take back some 200 employees; but two years ago, when the Grand Trunk Bill was up before the Railway Committee, there were 125 or 150 of these employees who had not been taken back, in spite of the fact that a written agreement to do so had been made by that railway company with Mr. Graham, then Minister of Railways, and the late Minister of Labour, Mr. King.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does not the hon. member know very well that what he is talking about is the carrying out of the terms by the Grand Trunk; but the strike was settled, and the railway was operating, which was the important thing for the country.

Mr. STEVENS: The strike was settled, and the railway was supposed to be operated by the men who had been ordered by Judge Barron to be reinstated, but 150 or 170 of the older employees were absolutely not reinstated, and when the Grand Trunk Bill was before the Railway Committee, the company was compelled to reinstate them before that Bill was allowed to be passed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The big stick was used then, and very properly.

Mr. STEVENS: Certainly, but it proves the point I am making, that under this Act which was passed by the right hon. gentleman's Government, you cannot effect the settlement of a dispute.

Mr. MACDONALD: How do you propose to do that?

Mr. STEVENS: I have suggested that both the employees and employers be made responsible parties and that penalties be employed. I have suggested a remedy which my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell), with his great depth of wisdom, lightly flings aside as being unworkable; but I venture to say that if he studies the matter out and gives his advice on it two weeks hence, we may get something more erudite from him than anything he has suggested up to the present moment.

I do not believe that the militia of Canada

should be a mere tool in the hands of employers for the settlement of labour disputes. There are times when it is absolutely imperative to call the militia out in the interests of law and order, but I believe that very great care should be taken before the militia is called out. In the present case, the facts are simply these: the riot had been on for over twenty-four hours before the militia was called out, and several members of the provincial police, special constables, were driven off a wharf, as I understand it, into the water by a mob. I am not saying this was done by the union men, but it was done by a mob which had congregated as a result of the labour trouble, and the militia was called out under these circumstances. Then, in regard to the meeting which my hon. friends opposite have referred to, that meeting was convened for the purpose of discussing certain business. Colonel Hall entered the building at half-past eight o'clock and he told the men to go on and finish their business, and they stayed there until one o'clock, some five hours after Colonel Hall entered the building, and they finished the business they had under discussion. Then they were marched out as described, and arrested. I am not at this particular time attempting to justify or to blame the militia in their action. They were called out and it was incumbent upon them to restore law and order in that vicinity. After the militia is called out, it is under the control of the commanding officer who is supreme, and the responsibility for his action must rest upon his own shoulders. But insofar as those present at the meeting were concerned, they were allowed to finish their business. It is desirable in a discussion of this kind that we should be fair and seek to get at the root of the matter.

I contend, insofar as this dispute is concerned, that the blame rests upon the Act for the failure to arrive at a settlement. Reference has been made to the Minister of Labour; very bitter reference; very unjust reference. The Minister of Labour went out there and spent ten days or more on Vancouver Island right in the strike area. When he came to Vancouver Island a committee of the Labour Congress of British Columbia met the Minister of Labour, who received them in his car, and spent several hours discussing the matter with them, with perfect frankness and perfect courtesy. I am not here to-night holding a brief for the Minister of Labour; he is quite capable of defending himself, but it is right and fair that we should give him credit for what he has done. He spent ten days on the Island.

Mr. MACDONALD: What else did he do?

Mr. STEVENS: He did his utmost to settle the strike, and to bring the parties together. But he was met with this difficulty: the company declared there was no lockout, and that they declared up to the present time, and on the other hand the men declared there was no strike. There was an investigation held under the Immigration Act into the case of the men who were brought from the old country, and in that investigation the parties refused to acknowledge that there was either a strike or a lockout. It was, therefore, impossible to appoint a conciliation board. I blame Mr. Stockett and some of the managers of the mines, because I believe that the employers should exercise a little more common sense, shall I use that expression, than we may expect from the workers; for the reason that the worker looks upon such a question from the standpoint of a personal grievance; he believes he is injured, and he has but one idea in his mind. We all know perfectly well that while it may not be in harmony with our wishes to meet a party who is holding opposite views to ours, at the same time any reasonable man possessed of intelligence will go more than half-way to meet his opponent, and to discuss the question. I hold that the managers of these mines ought to have set aside their prejudices to a large extent, against Mr. Farrington and some other workers, and at least have met them and discussed the question with them. It was not necessary to meet all the demands; they might have considered some of them unreasonable; but I say the mistake made on the part of the company was that they refused to meet these men. The Minister of Labour could not force them do do so; he used every power and influence he had to bring about an adjustment, or a conference on that occasion.

I hold that insofar as the Minister of Labour is concerned he has done what he could, under the provisions of this Act, but we know now, as we have known for some time, that this Act is faulty, and that it is impossible to enforce, and the Minister of Labour should give his specific attention to an effort to remedy it, if it is possible to remedy it.

Mr. CARVELL: Would the hon. member go so far as to advocate an amendment to

the Act, providing for compulsory arbitration?

Mr. STEVENS: The question of compulsory arbitration is an exceedingly large one, and I am under the impression that compulsory arbitration is not a very successful method of dealing with these disputes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Then how would you enforce the Act?

Mr. STEVENS: I understand that the method known in New Zealand as compulsory arbitration is not very successful, but if we had on our statute books a power which could be exercised in a case of necessity, I believe we would have less disputes, and there would be, in the minds of the parties, a greater inclination to deal with the question outside the Labour Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That would be compulsory.

Mr. STEVENS: It would not be compulsory; it would be a sort of inducement.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: My hon. friend (Mr. Stevens), in propounding his solution of how to cure the labour troubles in this country, has, I am sure, not satisfied this committee that he has discovered the happy medium, because, as my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has pointed out, his proposal is nothing more nor less than compulsory arbitration. It is compulsory investigation, with compulsory carrying out of the recommendations. That is another way of saying that you have a tribunal which makes a finding, and that the finding must be carried into effect by some legal method.

Mr. STEVENS: If it was considered of sufficient importance by the minister or the department which controlled the matter.

Mr. MACDONALD: If it was considered of sufficient importance by the Administration to have it carried into effect. That is a very elastic method, and I must say that the leading labour men of this country would not be disposed to entrust the investigation to this minister. The minister knows very well that he has been condemned by resolution by a great many of the labour men of this country. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll), referring to the very curious visit which the minister paid to the island of Cape Breton, stated that one of the trails which he left behind him, besides his non-appearance in Glace Bay, was that the Trades and Labour Congress of Cape Breton passed a resolution condemning his methods right there and then. The minister is aware of that fact. It is a fair inference that if the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) is willing to commit the carrying into effect of the finding of any tribunal, however constituted, into the hands of this minister, he is doing something which the labour men of this country do not want.

This discussion as to whether we should vote to the present Minister of Labour the sums of money which are contained in this Estimate, has naturally caused us to drift into the consideration of the very important situation existing in the province of British Columbia. There for a year and a half industrial trouble has existed, and up to the present moment this minister and his Government stand absolutely incompetent, by any means under the law, by any power which they may possess inherently by statute or otherwise, to settle it.

Of course in this particular province of the Dominion, this situation is but the natural heritage which these gentlemen ought to expect. They are reaping what they sowed. Who was it but these hon. gentlemen, some of them at present sitting in the House, that made that province ring with the cry of a white British Columbia, who attacked my right hon. leader day in and day out with the most inflammatory appeals to the labour men of that province, because he permitted to remain on the statute book a law which carried into effect an international treaty made by the Government of this empire? These same gentlemen last year, after all their protestation, after all their inflammatory appeals, passed a treaty wider in its effect as regards the admission of Orientals than this treaty in regard to which they had been attacking my right hon. leader. Every one of them knew, as did Sir Richard McBride, when he was passing legislation, which he knew for Imperial reasons solely must be vetoed, which was passed simply for the purpose of misleading the people of British Columbia, that the Premier of this country at that time, just as the Premier of this country to-day, was bound to carry into effect the terms of an international arrangement made by the Government of the empire. Therefore these gentlemen are only reaping what they sowed, and if the labour men of the province are beginning to ascertain that

10 p.m.

the men who there preached sedition, the men who talked about the evils of Orientalism, did not mean what they said, and if they have a Minister of Labour supposed to deal with this particular matter, who goes out to British Columbia on a jaunting tour of two weeks and then proceeds to England, is it any wonder that the labour people of British Columbia have no respect for the Minister of Labour and the Government which is in power? That is one of the reasons why this strike remains unsettled, and why these gentlemen are absolutely unable to go forward, and it is impossible for them to go back. That is where these gentlemen stand in regard to this whole matter.

In his report, we have the evidence of the reaping time. This gentleman, whom the Minister of Labour sent out to investigate, comes back and reports to this Government that to-day there are more Orientals employed in the mines of British Columbia than ever before. One result of the methods of those gentlemen who stood for a white British Columbia, has been that after two years of administration, the miners from the old land, from Northumberland and Wales, and the men from the East who have gone out to that country to earn their livelihood in the mines, have been driven out of employment by the Orientals who have been permitted to come in by this Government. Mr. Price says:

> It is true, however, that the number of Orientals employed underground in the mines of the Canadian collieries has increased very materially since last September, not only relatively, but absolutely, the total number of Orientals employed in May, 1913, being 432 out of a total of 690, as against 315 out of a total of 766 in 1912, and probably among surface men the increase has been proportionately greater.

Therefore, if this gentleman whom the minister sent out there to make inquiries has not settled this strike, these gentlemen who stood for a white British Columbia have the satisfaction of having it on record in this country, on the authority of their own appointee, that under their control Orientalism is making strides against the white men of that province.

What is the situation ? This strike began at the mines at Cumberland and at Ladysmith, and was allowed to run for eight long months without any intervention on the part of this Minister of Labour, except that he sent a telegram. Hon. gentlemen representing that district sat in Parliament for a whole month last year and yet never suggested that, if the laws of this country were inadequate to permit the minister to interfere, in the business interests of the country as well as in the interests of the labour men, the necessary powers should be sought from Parliament. I am speaking about the time when the strike had taken a wider range on the first of May last year, and when the minister woke up and sent a telegram.

Mr. CARVELL: He had five weeks.

Mr. MACDONALD: After he awoke from his slumber he had five weeks in which to pass legislation. Did he know when he sent that telegram that he had no power to enforce these terms? If he did know, then why did he not take the power from Parliament? If he did not know, that is only an evidence of the truth of the opinion that is entertained of him by labour people of this country. For five weeks my hon. friend came to Parliament day after day. I assume he knew that the legislation of the statute book was inadequate to enable him to deal with the situation, but he never asked Parliament for further legislation. After sending the telegram, he sat down to wait. After a while he took the jaunt to British Columbia, and spent two weeks in his private car looking over the situation. Those who have been born and bred among the labouring classes know with what curiosity the miners would view this gentleman from Ottawa who came there in a private car and wanted to settle the strike in a minute. They would just size him up and come to the conclusion that he could not do it. The consequence was that my hon. friend thought he could not do anything, and he went out to Europe on a pleasure jaunt. This Minister of Labour, like every Minister of Labour of this country, has not such very wide duties to perform. If he had as much to do as the Minister of Public Works, such tremendous expenditures to oversee, if he had such responsibility as attached to some of the other ministers, it would be a different matter, but the Minister of Labour, like my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel) has not very much to do. The estimates of the Minister of Labour are something like $100,000 a year. The labour people of this country have a right to complain of the minister in that, with the serious condition existing which he had allowed to rise through his own neglect and inability to give himself power through legislation to deal with it, with a rising breaking out on the 14th of August, he showed so little regard for the responsibility of his office as to leave Canada and

proceed to the old country. What would be thought of the Minister of Railways, for instance, if all the engineers on the Intercolonial railway, from Montreal to Sydney were on strike, and in the middle of that strike, the Minister of Railways should go to England? Yet, when this difficulty arose in British Columbia, originating in two collieries and extending to all the labour interests of British Columbia—for it was not confined to the miners but extended to other sections of labour as well—this of all times was the one the minister chose for his holiday. Is it any wonder that the public, whether labouring men, employers or men who view public affairs only in a most casual way, were shocked that, under these circumstances, the minister should desert his post? I am sure the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) would not have done it. True, he allows steamers to go off carrying flour barrels with whisky in them. He says he does not know about that, but I think he has a shrewd suspicion as to what was going on. I will say this for the Minister of Customs, that he is usually on his job. But it was apparently not so with the Minister of Labour. Compare this with what was done in England. There they had coal strikes and threatened railway strikes. Did ministerial gentlemen of that country hold their hands in supine content? Did they run away from the country? The Prime Minister of Great Britain summoned to his aid the most active of his colleagues, treated by intercession with the different interests involved, to save the country from the difficulty which would arise through the stoppage of the coal supplies and of the railways. It does not seem to make any difference to the Minister of Labour whether the miners of British Columbia have work or not, whether the artisans in other lines of labour are employed or not, whether the business men of that country have to import coal from the United States or not. He was in England, enjoying himself with the Unionists of that country. No doubt, sitting at the table of the Carlton Club or some other organization of the kind, the hon. gentleman over his good dinner never thought for a moment of these men, who, exasperated by their sense of wrong were fighting for what they deemed, rightly or wrongly, to be their rights. Such thoughts were not for the minister; he was on his jaunting tour and proposed to have his fun. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) went out to British Columbia, and I believe a picket stopped him somewhere. But, so far as he is concerned, the mention of that incident is the only one to show that he ever gave the slightest thought to this question involving the welfare of the labouring men of British Columbia and the business interests so seriously affected by that strike.

I now come to my solemn and intellectual friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty). He jaunted out to British Columbia. Has anybody told us that he applied his intellect to an attempt to solve this problem as to how labour and capital could be reconciled? So far, there is no glimmer of such an idea. One minister was in England—the responsible minister—others were everywhere else. Two of them happened to go into the country where this strike existed, but they did not bother their heads about it. Is it any wonder that the labouring people of British Columbia reached the point where they had no respect for this Government or for the men composing it? And that is why the strike is on.

Now, we have the report of Mr. Price who was sent out as commissioner. I do not know the gentleman, but I agree with my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Buchanan) in his criticism of the selection made. Coal miners are a class of workingmen whose sense of justice, whose desire for remedies for the problems of labour, are peculiar to themselves. And so, though the hon. minister's late partner may have been a most estimable man, I do not think that the fact that he had had some experience in regard to miners in Cobalt fitted him for the work he was called upon to do in this case. Every one familiar with these matters knows that there is a great difference between the coal miners and the gold miners in their conceptions of labour conditions. The hon. minister should have come to Nova Scotia or should have gone to British Columbia, to find a man, who knew what were the coal miners' conceptions of right and justice. Had he selected some one familiar with the ideals of these men and with the methods adopted by employers in dealing with these questions, instead of taking his former law partner, he would have had one whose opinions would have commanded more respect among the men and in that way might possibly have reached a solution of this diffficulty.

We have heard a good deal about the former Minister of Labour, and the question of what he did or did not do. I notice in his report the commissioner tells what Mr. Mackenzie King did on one occasion deal-

ing with the same conditions in the West as were involved in this strike. He says:

In 1905, trouble occurred at the mines of the Western Fuel Company, arising out of an order of the company requiring the men to provide their own transportation to a shaft where they could enter in nearer proximity to the place of work. This order was said to have been by reason of the enforcement of the provincial law limiting the hours of underground labour to eight hours a day, bank to bank. As usually happens in such cases. Other differences were also presented after the trouble arose, and the recognition of the United Mine Workers' union, to which a number of the miners then belonged, was also demanded. With the assistance of the then Deputy Minister of Labour, Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King, the matter was finally adjusted between a committee of the men and the mine management, and an agreement entered into between the company and the men which with some alterations, has continued down to the time of the present strike.

Dealing with exactly the same conditions and exactly the same problems, the commissioner whom my hon. friend sends out to British Columbia comes back and gives us evidence that the late Minister of Labour knew how to deal with these problems and succeeded in bringing industrial peace to that part of the country. We need no further evidence as to this; I presume my hon. friend the Minister of Labour and his followers will not question the finding of their own commissioner upon that point.

There is another interesting finding here in which I happen to have a very great personal interest. I remember being in this House when the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act was passed, and I remember the election which followed. In my constituency we have eight or nine coal mines in operation, and one thing for which I was bitterly attacked during that election campaign was that the Government which I had supported had undertaken to pass a piece of legislation which would take away from the labouring man the right to strike. Orators, party leaders, like the present leader of the Conservative party in the provincial House, who was my opponent in that election, shouted all over the constituency about the horrible treatment that had been accorded to the labouring men by the Liberal Government. One would have thought that this Government upon taking office would have hastened to the task of sweeping this iniquitous piece of legislation off the statute book. Every man on this side of the House who represents a constituency in which there are labouring men, remembers that he had to pass through the same ordeal. If this Government came in committed to anything other than the Halifax platform, which they have forgotten all about, it was that this Lemieux Labour Act, as it was called, would be repealed. The hon. member for Vancouver does not want it repealed; he wants it made tighter; he wants compulsory arbitration. But here is the opinion of the commissioner:

I believe that the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, notwithstanding defects, which could hardly be hoped would be avoided in its earlier history, is a very beneficial Act, not only in the interest of the general public, but also in the interest, ultimately, at all events, of both employees and employers as well.

I wanted to get that assertion on 'Hansard'; this Conservative Minister of Labour having sent out his own confidant to investigate labour conditions in this country, I wanted to put on record the deliberate opinion of his commissioner as to the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. I want to have it established that the stories told by Conservative orators in 1908 were all moonshine, and that this Industrial Disputes Investigation Act is a very beneficial Act. Out of the mouths of our enemies comes this praise of that piece of legislation passed by the Liberal Government in 1907. For two years hon. gentlemen opposite have been in power, and the Minister of Labour has allowed that Act to remain on the statute book untouched and unaltered even in the slightest degree. To argue the question as to whether or not the principle of this Act is a matter for which we on this side of the House have to make any defence to-day seems to me, in view of the position adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite at this stage, to be entirely unnecessary. But the hon. member for Vancouver has told us that the minister is contemplating some amendments to the Act; it will be interesting to see what those amendments are. I observe that the commissioner has given us some suggestions; these are the amendments he wants us to make:

In order that there may be no room for doubt in the mind of any one as to what is forbidden by it, I think the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act should be amended, especially the definition of 'strike' and section 56, so as to clearly cover what is in reality a strike or lockout, and make the provisions of the law more easily understood and more likely to be properly enforced.

That is a rather general recommendation, and it is somewhat difficult to see on the

face of it what its effect would be. He goes on to say:

> Without any further comment upon the practice of calling cessation of work a 'holiday,' or reflecting on the bona fides of the contention that the men at Cumberland and Ladysmith believed they were not offending against the law in what they did, it will be recognized that it is desirable and very important that this work should be made plain.

That apparently is a proposed amendment of the law intended distinctly to militate against the interests of the labour men. If that recommendation made by Mr. Price means anything, it is intended further to confine and limit the right of labour men under this Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. Here is another one:

> I think it should be made clear by special prohibition, under penalty, that it is unlawful to practice any kind of intimidation, abuse or insult against any one or to publish, call or refer to any one as a 'scab' or 'blackleg' or as unfair to labour or to incite or threaten to do any of these things, with a view to influencing the acts of any person in connection with any strike or labour dispute.

Does the commissioner mean that we should have legislation absolutely prohibiting the right to picket? I remember being in the Imperial Parliament some six or seven years ago and, sitting in the gallery, hearing a discussion on the labour legislation proposed by the Liberal Government of that day, in which the right to picket was expressly recognized by statute; I think that is on the statute book of the mother country still. So far as I can judge from the report made by Mr. Price, his recommendations in regard to this matter are all intended to militate against the rights of labour men. His report is a very nice, academic essay upon labour questions generally, written too late in some respects, but all too soon in others. When the minister went to England, why did he not instruct Mr. Price to remain on the ground and investigate conditions after the riot? Why did he instruct him to fold up his portmanteau, come back to Ottawa and write his report when the most crucial point in the whole matter had been reached? The short time he spent in considering the matter and two weeks' deliberation on the part of the minister in regard to the industrial conflict which has now lasted for a year and four months is the only evidence we have that the minister bothered his head about the subject. Is it any wonder that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House raise questions in regard to this matter? Is it any wonder that when my hon. friend asks us for money to carry on the affairs of his department we should take advantage of the occasion to arraign him for his incompetency in dealing with these matters? I think that those of us who represent constituencies wherein labouring men are employed, as well as those who represent constituencies where the interests of capital are concerned, would be recreant in our duty if we did not point out that the administration of this Government, after two and a half years of trial, has been marked by incompetency and absolute failure even to give any thought to the serious problems which have arisen throughout the country. For a year and four months in the great western province of British Columbia, not only have the labouring men suffered under conditions which have called forth protests from their representatives all over the country, but the business interests of the country as well have been paralyzed, and the conditions that exist in that province are wholly and largely due to the failure of this ministry and this Government to grapple with the serious situation which has arisen.

Mr. CROTHERS: The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has expressed a burning desire to have pointed out to him conditions parallel to those which he has been describing during the last half-hour. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) also expressed a desire to have pointed out to him any conditions at all similar to those which have prevailed on Vancouver Island for several months.

Mr. OLIVER: What I asked the hon. member for Vancouver was if he could point to conditions as extraordinary as those in the province of British Columbia.

Mr. CROTHERS: That is about what I said. As my hon. friend's request seems legitimate, I shall, even at this late hour, try to give him some facts showing a parallel case. In 1909-10 there was a strike amongst the coal miners of Nova Scotia extending over twenty-two months, seven months at Glace Bay, seven months at Inverness, and twenty-two months at Springhill. The militia were called out at Glace Bay, Springhill and Inverness. My hon. friend from Pictou was a member of this House. It is not on record that he suggested any amendment to this Act to meet the situation. That situation was obtaining in his own province, within a stone's throw of his own door. He was in this House but did nothing. I would not, by substantive motion,

find any fault with him for not taking any action but I am simply trying to gratify his burning desire for a parallel case. Perhaps the hon. member from Cape Breton was at Glace Bay at that time. It is not on record that he did anything to settle the strike that was on at Glace Bay for about seven months or to expel the militia from Glace Bay. They were sent there by the preceding Government.

Mr. CARROLL: Would the hon. gentleman like to know what I did?

Mr. CROTHERS: Perhaps I had better go on now.

Mr. CARROLL: Perhaps you had better.

Mr. CROTHERS: It is too bad that the hon. member for Pictou did not enlighten the House as to what he did in those conditions in Nova Scotia. If he had been in a position to tell the House that on that occasion, in order to bring about peace at Glace Bay and Inverness and Springhill where the militia had been out, he did something as a member of this House, he would have been in a better position to find fault with me for not introducing any legislation last session. He never heard of such a thing as a minister of labour leaving this country when things were in such a condition. When the strike was on, when the militia were at Glace Bay and Inverness and Springhill, my predecessor spent two months of his time in Europe.

Mr. MORPHY: And there was no criticism from anybody for doing it.

Mr. CROTHERS: No. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have short memories or not to desire to exercise the memories they have. I hope the hon. member for Pictou will not make so much noise again in insisting on somebody telling him that there was a parallel case some time, somewhere that occurred in his own province. According to his own remarks the circumstances convict him of having folded his arms when his fellow citizens were suffering the penalties which were inflicted on them by the militia sent there by the preceding Government.

Mr. CARROLL: Is the minister really in earnest when he says that the preceding Government sent the militia to Glace Bay?

Mr. CROTHERS: The militia went to Glace Bay. They were there.

Mr. CARROLL: You want to be fair.

Mr. CROTHERS: Everybody knows how the militia got there, we did not send the militia to Vancouver Island.

Mr. CARROLL: Certainly not; nobody said you did.

Mr. CROTHERS: They were there, and nothing was done by the preceding Government by way of legislation, and nothing was done by the hon. member for Edmonton, who would like to hear of a parallel case to-night, although he was a member of the Government at that time—and nothing was done by the hon. member for Pictou to allay the suffering and the want that existed in his own native province during twenty-two months. I think we have been perhaps a little premature in this discussion to-night, although it might as well have come to-night as any time; but I may refer the House to the fact that the right hon. leader of the Opposition has a notice on the Order Paper calling for a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents issued by any department of this Government in respect to the strike on Vancouver Island. It is something like putting the cart before the horse to spend hours in discussing matters when many who have spoken do not know the facts and have made statement after statement that has no firmer bottom to rest on than base and discreditable insinuations. It would be much more in order to wait until we get the documents before the House and then discuss the question on the facts brought forward by these documents. The hon. member for Pictou raised one or two points that I may refer to. Mr. Price had had seven years' experience as Mining Commissioner. He was appointed after he had resigned from that position by the Government of Ontario to look into the question of the eight hour movement, and he spent a year on that, not only in metalliferous mines, but in coal mines, and he got to know a lot.

Mr. MACDONALD: What coal mines are there in Ontario?

Mr. CROTHERS: He did not remain in Ontario.

Mr. MACDONALD: Where?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not remember; but outside of Ontario.

Mr. MACDONALD: I would like to know where.

Mr. CROTHERS: I can tell you when I see him and ask him.

Mr. MACDONALD: But you cannot tell me.

Mr. CROTHERS: How dare you say that when I say I can tell you. He did inquire into the length of hours in coal mines as well as in metalliferous mines.

Mr. MACDONALD: Was he ever in one?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think I have been as deep in a coal mine as ever my hon. friend was.

Mr. CARROLL: You are deep in it now.

Mr. CROTHERS: Hon. gentlemen opposite have seen fit to make a concerted attack upon the Department of Labour. Let me tell them a thing or two that they do not seem to know. During the first year I was in charge of the department the number of days lost in strikes was nine hundred thousand less than the year before, only about one-half the number of days lost in strikes that were lost the year before. When I was placed in charge of the department I found that the labouring men were finding a good deal of fault about delays in the operation of the Act, the length of time that elapsed between the application for conciliation boards and their appointment. I took the matter up at once and gave instructions that no unnecessary delay should be permitted, with the result that the number of days spent between the receipt of an application for a board and the establishment of the board was reduced less than one-half. In the first year I had charge of the Labour Department the average number of days between the application and the establishment of the board was seven days. The average time that elapsed during the previous year was fifteen days.

Mr. CARVELL: Does the minister include the Canadian Pacific railway freight handlers' strike in that category?

Mr. CROTHERS: I am glad my hon. friend has mentioned that particular strike. He spoke about it last year.

Mr. CARVELL: And you settled it up about four days afterwards.

Mr. CROTHERS: And he said, amongst other things, that they had made an application that year and it had not been granted. I think the leader of the Opposition also said on that occasion that it was the duty of the Minister of Labour, on application being made to him in due form, to establish a board without further delay—that it was an administrative office and not a judicial one. The facts are that the application to which he referred was dated on the 14th day of August, 1911, and hon. gentlemen will remember, and remember for a long time, that the election occurred on the 21st day of September, and that we came into power on the 10th day of October. That application, made on the 14th of August, did not reach the Labour Department until some days afterwards; but on the 23rd day of September, two days after the election and seventeen days before we came into power, the Department of Labour refused to grant that very same labour organization a board.

Mr. CARVELL: Now tell us what you did.

Mr. CROTHERS: I will tell you what I did with respect to that particular matter. My attention having been called to it, upon going over the evidence I made up my mind that a board ought to be granted and a board was issued, or at least a settlement was effected with the men and they consented to our not proceeding.

Mr. CARVELL: After this has been brought up in Parliament.

Mr. CROTHERS: No, before it was brought up in Parliament. That was not brought up in Parliament that I remember of. The hon. member tried to attach it to the other application but not to the one that was made to me. There were two applications made by this association. An application was made and on the 23rd September, 1911, seventeen days before we came into power, my predecessor refused that same association a board. They made another application to me but I do not think it is necessary to go into that as it has all been explained before.

In regard to this Vancouver Island strike, it has been said over and over again, and repeated here to-night, that the strike at Cumberland was caused by reason of two men being dismissed because they had reported that gas was found in a certain mine. That is not true, it never was true and I hope it will not be repeated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is what they allege.

Mr. CROTHERS: That is what somebody alleges in this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is what the men alleged.

Mr. CROTHERS: Did any of the men allege that to my friend?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Not to me, but to my hon. friend. That is what I find in the report.

Mr. CROTHERS: What do they report?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: A letter was written by the Minister of Labour to Mr. Peter McNiven. As the hon. gentleman stated, Mr. McNiven had ceased to be in office but he received an answer from the acting secretary at Cumberland as follows:

Hon. T. W. Crothers,
Minister of Labour.
There is no strike declared at Cumberland mines. The company have openly discriminated against men who were taking an active part in union organization.

Mr. CROTHERS: That does not answer the question at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes.

Mr. CROTHERS: No, what I said was that it had been stated in this House, and repeated over and over again, that two men had been discriminated against because they had reported gas in that mine. There is no truth whatever in that. As a matter of fact, the two men who ceased to work for the company were one Mottishaw and one Smith. The two men who were on the gas committee were Mottishaw and Portrey and the man who wrote the report reporting gas in the mine was Portrey. Portrey, the man who wrote the report, and a member of the committee, was working for the company right up to the strike. He continued right along. It is true that Mottishaw, the other member of the committee, though not directly, was substantially dismissed; I will admit that. If they had been dismissed upon the ground alleged Portrey would have gone too. Portrey was really the man who made the report. It was written by his own hand; yet, he continued to work for the company. I think that is pretty strong evidence that they were not dismissed because they reported the existence of gas in the mines. Mr. Price finds in his report that they were not dismissed for that reason.

One of the hon. gentlemen who spoke referred to the charge that the mine owners on Vancouver Island had sent to England and secured a number of employees in Durham by fraud and misrepresentation. My hon. friend from Carleton is very familar with these words. The facts are that the Department of the Interior appointed an immigration agent at Vancouver to inquire into some charges that were made against an employment agent in Vancouver, and during the progress of his investigation a number of these miners who were brought out from England gave evidence under oath. I have had the advantage of reading the evidence of these men. I have the evidence right in my desk here. Five of these men who were brought out declared before Mr. Reid, the immigration officer at Vancouver, that there was no misrepresentation whatever made to them in England, that when they got to Cumberland they found conditions exactly as they had been represented to them in England, and even better. It is said that some of the others jointly signed an affidavit in Vancouver to say that they had been deceived. It is only fair to state that. There were a number of them in Vancouver, they were being taken care of by the labour organization and the labour leaders were in the room and in their presence these men signed the affidavit one after the other. Some of those who signed that affidavit gave evidence under oath before Mr. Reid and stated that they were under the care and protection of these men and that if they refused to sign that affidavit they would not get any more shelter or food. I am not stating that they were not deceived in England, but I am stating that there is plenty of evidence touching that, because five of them who testified under oath stated that they found conditions, when they reached Cumberland, better than those which had been described to them in England. The question arose in this way: The company at that time was working the mine and putting out about 60 per cent of the normal output. These men who gave this testimony stated that they were told in England that there had been labour trouble at Cumberland but that they had got some men from other places and some of those who had gone on strike were returning, and that they were putting out 60 per cent of the normal output. They also said that they believed in England that they were justified in coming and working in these mines, that they had come and that they were not deceived in any respect. Others stated differently, signing this affidavit in Vancouver to which I have referred. It was stated by the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll), that an officer of the labour union had made a statement to the effect that I had refused to establish a board. To this day I have never been requested to establish a board in connection with the dispute on Vancouver Island. I requested the parties who were interested in it to apply for a board—the

miners, the mine owners and those who did not belong to a union. They all refused to do it. These gentlemen never asked me to appoint a board under the Act. They did come in one day and suggest that the men were willing to appoint a man if I would appoint a man and let the two go and inquire into the matter without any reference to the mine owners themselves. I never promised to do even that. I remember very well talking to these men and saying at a certain time that I would even at that late hour appoint a board if any one would apply for it.

In the meantime the Court of Appeal of the province of Quebec had given judgment to the effect that I had no jurisdiction to establish a board in a dispute between men who had gone on strike and former employers, because the Act applied only to disputes between employees and their employers, and as these men were no longer in the employ of their former employers, they were not in a position to ask for a board.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What case is that?

Mr. CROTHERS: The Montreal Street Railway case. My predecessor established a board in that case, and a prohibition was applied for and the judge in the first instance refused the prohibition, but there was an appeal and the Court of Appeal of the province of Quebec held unanimously that the board should not have been established, because those who were applying for it were no longer in the service of the Street Railway Company. A decision directly opposite to that has been given by the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. In that case, under one of the clauses of the Act, a man had been convicted for supplying food to strikers while they were on strike, contrary to the law. There is a section of the Act which prohibits any one aiding or abetting, and the court held that it was illegal to support men who had illegally gone on strike. The matter came before the Appeal Court in Nova Scotia and the contention was put forward there that the Act did not apply to these men, because, as held in the Quebec case, they were no longer in the employ of their former employers, but the court in Nova Scotia held, that within the meaning of the Act they were still employees. We therefore have a decision on both sides.

Mr. CARROLL: It was under the Conciliation Act in Nova Scotia.

[Mr. Crothers.]

Mr. CROTHERS: There was no board there at all, and that is why it was illegal for them to strike. The conviction was sustained by the high court in Nova Scotia on the ground that although there was a strike, and they were no longer actually in the employ of their former employers, yet they still were employees within the meaning of the Act. These men who were to see me, did not ask, and never did ask for a board, but I casually told them of this decision, and that as I did not want to take any chances of another prohibition as in the Quebec case, I intended to propose to Parliament this session certain amendments which would become law sooner than an appeal from the judgment of the courts would likely be determined. It is not true that I ever at any time refused a board.

One hon. gentleman has read an extract from the Ottawa Citizen, and another hon. gentleman has read some sentences from a letter said to have been written by Mr. Frank Farrington. Well, I think we have all lived long enough to know that we should not place too much reliance on what we read in newspapers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. CROTHERS: To my mind there are mis-statements in that article in the Ottawa Citizen; several important mis-statements. I hope my hon. friends opposite will not too seriously try to palm off on this House as gospel truth everything they can find in any newspaper. As I have said, some sentences were read from a letter sent me by Mr. Frank Farrington, and notwithstanding the observations made with reference to that gentleman by my hon. friend from Vancouver, I may say that there are a good many statements in that letter that I personally know to be untrue. I may say, further, that I wrote to this gentleman, as an officer of the United Mine Workers of America, and pointed out to him—I think it was his chief the president who referred it to Farrington, but the reply came from Farrington—I pointed out that it was illegal to strike in this country until there was a board appointed, and asked him to make application for a board that we might have all the evidence before the public and an award given by an independent tribunal of three men. He wrote back that he was not breaking any Canadian law. That is the gentleman, part of whose letter to me was read by my hon. friend.

Then, some hon. gentleman opposite made

the statement that Mr. Price denied the men the right to appear before him. There is not a word of truth in that. I know that on one occasion Mr. Price had one hundred and twenty-five men before him and gave an invitation to each and every one of them to come forward and say anything he had to say touching the matter. On another occasion I was present when he had seventeen men before him, and on another occasion when he had forty men before him. There is no manner of foundation for the statement that he refused to hear anybody. Mr. Price is not a man of that kind; he is one of the most high-minded men we have in the country, and he is so regarded by every one who has the advantage of acquaintance with him.

There are some general observations which I might make with reference to the Labour Department. I have told you that during the first year I was in charge of it there were 900,000 less days lost in strikes than there were the year before. I may state now that for twenty years before I was placed in charge of the Labour Department there was on an average a strike in the coal mines of Nova Scotia every year. There has not been a strike in Nova Scotia in the coal mines since I came into office. There have not been any other labour disputes of any significance, and every one of them has been settled by boards established under the Industrial Disputes Act. When we came into power we found that strike out in the Crowsnest Pass going on for eight months. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) was in the House at that time, and so was my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell), and neither of them introduced any measure to amend the Industrial Disputes Act so as to settle that strike. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition was leader of the Government at that time, and there is no evidence that he suggested any additional legislation.

Mr. CARVELL: It was not necessary; the existing legislation did the trick.

Mr. CROTHERS: They were on strike for eight months and it did the trick about a month after we came into power, but not before. My hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, succeeded in getting put into that agreement a very important clause, and that was a provision that should any disputes subsequently arise within, I think five years, it would be decided by one man named in the agreement to act on behalf of the mine owners, and another man to act on behalf of the miners, and if these two failed to agree on a third the Minister of Labour would appoint him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Did the Minister of Public Works do that?

Mr. CROTHERS: I understand he was the means of getting that put into the agreement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Then why didn't you send him to British Columbia?

Mr. CROTHERS: Under that agreement there have been several disputes settled in the Crowsnest Pass, and we have had no serious strike since it was entered into. My right hon. friend need not be too gay about sending the Minister of Public Works to Vancouver Island. There are some disputes more difficult to settle than others, as he has lived long enough to know. He was Prime Minister of this country for 22 months, during which there was a strike at Springhill, and he did not succeed in settling it.

He was here and saw the militia sent to three points in Nova Scotia; yet he did not raise any disturbance about it. As far as concerns anything which has occurred since the rioting and unlawful acts on Vancouver Island, I am glad to know that the Government of British Columbia has recognized the fact that it is their duty to preserve law and order in all parts of that province, and I am very glad to know that they are vigorously performing their duty in that regard.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt): The Minister of Labour seems to be under the belief or suspicion that members on this side of the House are conducting a concerted attack upon these votes in order to attack the minister himself. I am sure that there is no desire on the part of any member on this side of the House to deal unfairly with the Minister of Labour or with the vote that he has passed, or is asking this committee to pass. All that this Committee wants is a fair and reasonable explanation by the minister of the part that he and his department have played in this very serious labour disturbance that has agitated the province of British Columbia and, in fact, practically the whole of Canada during the last year and a half. It seems to me that the minister has absolutely failed to meet the point of criticism from this side. Not only has he failed, but the hon. gentlemen from the province of British Columbia, who have undertaken to defend the minister

and his department and to show that the minister has carried out his responsibility in a proper way in this matter, have absolutely failed to meet the real point of the criticism. The minister knows very well that in my country we do not believe in putting out a prairie fire after it has devastated forty or fifty miles of country; we believe that a prairie fire is such a dangerous thing that we must attack it right at the beginning or as near the beginning as possible.

I take up this report of the special commissioner appointed by the minister, and what do I find? The minister says that we are somewhat previous in our discussions because we have not had certain returns brought down. So far as that is concerned, I might retort that the minister is previous in asking us to vote these sums of money until information, to which the House is entitled in connection with his department, is brought down.

From the somewhat incomplete report of a certain part of the events which took place on Vancouver Island in connection with this strike, what do we find in regard to the minister carrying out his responsibility as Minister of Labour, as the one upon whom devolves the responsibility of seeking to avert these unfortunate crises that sometimes arise between labour and capital? What evidence have we from the minister's own statement that he has actually seriously undertaken to carry out that responsibility? In the report of his special commissioner, so far as the inception of the trouble is concerned, we have one document signed by the Minister of Labour, that is the telegram in which he tells the contending parties on Vancouver Island, the mine owners and the miners, what their duty is under the Industrial Disputes Act. In other words, he tells them what they already know, that before striking they should have applied for a conciliation board.

11 p.m. In my judgment, the whole trend of the Minister's statement is to the effect that the men were to blame for the strike. From the facts I do not find that the mine owners communicated with the minister or with the Department of Mines of the province of British Columbia in connection with the trouble, but I find in this report four communications, three addressed to the Minister of Labour at Ottawa and one addressed to the Premier of the province of British Columbia, in which representatives of the different labour organizations addressed themselves to the minister to see if some way could not be found out of the serious difficulty in which those miners found themselves as the result of the disagreement between them and the mine owners. So far as I am concerned, the real essence of the criticism against the minister is the fact that, from the month of September, 1912, until the strike became general on the first of May, 1913, the minister, beyond sending the telegram pointing out to the miners of Vancouver Island what they already knew to be their duty under the Industrial Disputes Act, month by month sat still, realizing that the dispute was not settled, realizing that if it were not settled it must inevitably become worse as the disease spread.

I did not notice in the House last session that the Minister of Labour—we will call him that although he prefers, I understand, to be called by another name, the Minister of Play—was so acutely and actively busy that he could not have spared two or three weeks to take a trip last winter, instead of waiting until the following summer, to investigate the conditions that prevailed. Does not the minister himself think, does not any right-minded man in this House think that, when the first trouble commenced in the mines on Vancouver Island, the minister should have gone himself or sent his deputy or some man experienced in the settlement of disputes of that kind, preferably of course the Minister of Public Works, who is the wonder of the age, judging by what his colleagues say of his ability to settle strikes? If there was any time when he should have been busy in the settlement of the dispute, surely it was before the trouble became general and not when the minister went out last July, when he found a situation which he himself could not control and with which he found it impossible to deal.

Having allowed the situation to go so far, and having allowed the strike to become general, what do we find the minister endeavouring to do? A general strike is called on the 1st of May. Surely the hon. minister must have had advance notice of it through his correspondents. If not, I wonder what these correspondents, who in different parts of the country are paid from $100 to $300 for furnishing reports to the Labour Gazette, which this House is asked to vote money to publish—I wonder what the correspondents in Van-

couver or Victoria were doing. If they did not furnish the hon. gentleman with information as to this strike, he ought to fire those correspondents and appoint men who would be alive to the situation. For here was a strike which threw hundreds of men out of employment, and with further trouble impending, yet the minister tells us he knew nothing about it until the announcement was made that a general strike had been called by the President of the United Mine Workers of America.

Mr. SHEPHERD: The correspondent at Nanaimo, I may tell the hon. gentleman, is an appointee of the late Government.

Mr. NEELY: If he is, and if he does not furnish better information than that to which the minister refers, he ought to be fired. There is one decapitation which I can tell the hon. gentleman, we on this side will heartily endorse, if that is the way this man carries out his responsibility to the minister who is over him.

Now, when the general strike is called the minister seems to awaken out of the lethargic condition of somnolence which, apparently, like some animals, he enjoyed through the winter months. The session of Parliament over, the minister recommends the appointment of a Royal Commissioner to investigate the matter. I have no fault to find with this commissioner. I do not know anything about Mr. Price or his qualifications, but I have no reason to doubt his qualifications for the position. But I would like to ask this question: In the name of common sense what is the responsibility of the Minister of Labour, what is he appointed for by the Government? Why is there such a portfolio, why does this House vote the minister a salary year by year? Is it to sit in his office in Ottawa the year round, or to take pleasure trips to Europe or somewhere else? I have no fault to find with the minister for taking a pleasure trip at the proper time. But why appoint a special commissioner to investigate a situation when he, as the member of the Government responsible for the conduct of labour affairs was taking a trip to look into the situation? If I were a labouring man in Vancouver Island and saw the minister of the Crown who is responsible for looking after the interests of the workingman travelling to the seat of trouble in a private car accompanied by a gentleman to whom he had transferred a portion if not all of his responsibility, I certainly should begin to wonder what sort of an administration was in charge of affairs in this thing. I say it is an extraordinary thing, it is anomalous, this appointment of a commissioner when the minister was going to the seat of trouble to investigate personally the state of affairs. I have here the report of the commissioner. I am not going to discuss it. It is somewhat extended and the commissioner's conclusions are general. Like the minister, he has come to the conclusion that nothing could be be done. When a man's house is afire, he may think it is a hopeless case and that the house will burn down, but surely he will struggle to preserve as much of his property as he can. But what do we find happens so far as the minister is concerned in the case? He comes back to the city of Ottawa and spends two or three weeks, I suppose in the supervision of his departmental affairs. Then, on the 13th of August, the press despatches contain the information that a serious condition has arisen in connection with the strike, that riots have occurred, that there is danger of loss of life and property. So serious is the matter that we find the militia are called out to maintain order. And in four days' time from that, we find the minister packing his grip and taking the first train out of Ottawa to put several thousand miles of briny ocean between him and the possible stray bullets from Vancouver Island that might reach the city of Ottawa. That may be the minister's view of the proper way to discharge his duty towards the workingmen of this country. But the workingmen, especially those in the province of British Columbia, must have heard with wonder the news that immediately the situation in Vancouver Island had become acute, the Minister of Labour packs his grip, takes the train out of Ottawa and presently is on the ocean on his way to have a little pleasure trip across the sea.

Perhaps I speak unfairly in referring to that as a pleasure trip; if I am not mistaken some one has suggested that the minister went to England to study industrial conditions and investigate conditions of labour across the sea. If the minister is prepared to get up in this House and say that the reason why he took this trip across the sea, when the real crisis of the trouble in British Columbia had been reached, was to find a solution for the labour problem in British Columbia, which, apparently, he could not find in this country, then he

would be offering some justification for his action. But I quite fail to understand how it was possible for the minister to manifest such absolute callousness and indifference in respect of this matter when the most serious crisis of the situation had been reached, by deliberately packing his grip and leaving on a trip to Europe. We have not had from the minister any report with regard to his trip to Europe. He is asking us to vote money to-night for the purpose of carrying on the work of his department. It has been said that the minister is asking for less than $100,000 whilst other ministers have the responsibility of spending larger sums. It may be quite true that the Minister of Labour is not responsible for the expenditure of a large sum of money, but I do maintain that he is the responsible head of one of the most important departments of this Government. The fact that he has the responsibility of dealing with labour disputes and of difficulties between employers and employees places upon the minister's shoulders a responsibility far greater, in my judgment, than the disbursement of money in public works. We are told that the minister went across the sea to study industrial conditions in England. There is one thing to be said in favour of the special commissioner who went to Vancouver Island; he did bring back a report, and we have it before us. I think the minister in asking for this vote should give the committee some insight as to the conclusions he arrived at as the result of his investigations in the old country. I am sure the committee would be delighted to know just what the minister discovered over there as to the best means of settling disputes of this nature. Did the minister actually look into labour conditions in England? Did he meet the labour leaders over there? Did he go down into the mines and collieries and study conditions there? Did he look into conditions in the slums of London? I am sure we should all be glad to become acquainted with what the minister's trip to England means as far as any benefit to the people of this country is concerned. Is it the intention of the minister to bring down a report of this investigation? We are interested in this matter, because this country pays the minister for looking after his department. He has spent the money of this country not only in his trip across the continent to the province of British Columbia, but, I presume, also in his trip to Europe, and it is only fair that the minister should give us the information for which we are asking.

[Mr. Neely.]

I wish to ask the minister if in his judgment he thinks that he used every proper and possible endeavour to prevent this strike in the province of British Columbia, which occurred in September, 1912, from becoming general, as it did, in the early part of May, 1913? That was the time to stop the trouble; did the minister take the necessary steps or put forth the needed efforts to bring about a cessation of trouble at that time? Everybody knows that a trouble of this kind, tackled at the proper time, is often very easily adjusted, but if it is allowed to grow for months and the passions of the contending parties are permitted to become inflamed by continuous friction and conflict, then it is very difficult to effect a remedy. I do not think that the minister ought to feel that he has been subjected to unfair criticism in this matter.

Mr. CROTHERS: No, go on; I have no objection at all.

Mr. NEELY: I am glad the minister enjoys it, and is willing to bear with it, because I was somewhat under the impression that he had the belief that some of the criticism offered by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House had been unfair. I can do nothing fairer than leave the matter, as I have presented it, to the judgment of the minister himself. I want to point out to him that the hon. gentlemen from the province of British Columbia who undertook to defend him and his department absolutely failed to meet the point to which I have just referred. They glossed it over—passed it aside. They never undertook to combat the criticism that for eight months before the strike became general the only thing the Minister of Labour did to settle the dispute was to send a telegram to the miners on Vancouver Island to the effect that they should apply for a board of arbitration. We have a right to question the propriety of the minister in asking us to vote these sums of money. We have a right to consider seriously the advisability of voting these sums of money, in view of what we conceive to be the flagrant neglect of duty and responsibility on the part of the Minister of Labour in connection with that which he concedes to be the most serious labour situation that has arisen in Canada since the days of Confederation.

I happened to be looking over the Civil Service list the other day, and I found that for the year ended March 31, 1911, the list of employees of the Labour Department consisted of twenty-one names. In the list for last year there are thirty-nine

names. In a little over two years in this department, which is what might be called a non-productive department from a material standpoint, there has been almost a doubling of the staff, and yet what is the net result? The net result is that the most serious labour dispute in the history of Canada, as admitted by the minister, has dragged its weary way for one year and four months and the minister to-day sees no more light on the horizon than he did sixteen months ago. That is the net result of the administration of the Minister of Labour, and yet we are asked to vote these sums of money for the purpose of carrying on this department for the purpose of loading up the Government of this country with a staff practically double what the hon. gentleman found employed in his department when he came into office two years ago. That is the least consideration, the amount of money to be voted; we can vote the money as it is not a large sum, but we on this side of the House do want to see at the head of the Labour Department one who would take seriously the responsibilities placed upon him by the Prime Minister when he called him into his Government to fill what I believe to be one of the most important and responsible positions in the Government.

Mr. CARVELL: Did this Government pay any portion, and if so what portion, of the expenses of the militia sent to Vancouver Island? Has the minister any well defined ideas in order to meet the various conditions that exist there at the present time?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not think our department has paid anything towards the expense of the militia.

Mr. CARVELL: Has this Government?

Mr. CROTHERS: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. ROGERS: Not that I ever heard of.

Mr. CARROLL: It pays the difference between what the officers and men would get when not on active duty and what they would get when they are on active duty.

Mr. ROGERS: The suggestion may be correct, but I am not sure. I would like to suggest that as the hour is late we should make a little progress, and then we might adjourn.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Minister of Labour referred to the fact that there is a notice on the Order Paper which I intended to move asking for all papers and documents in connection with this matter. I do not think that I should have been called upon to make such a motion; I think the papers should have been brought down as soon as possible. My hon. friend has already brought down part of the record of his department in the report of the commission which he has appointed. This report, without the correspondence, is only part of the information we should have, and I would suggest to him that he bring down the papers before the next sitting of the committee.

Mr. CROTHERS: I think my hon. friend from Humboldt is all out in saying that we have 39 on the staff now and that there were only 21 when we came into power.

Mr. NEELY: Those are on the list.

Mr. CROTHERS: I want to look up the list. Perhaps the hon. member for Humboldt was not here when I stated that we knew nothing about this strike at Cumberland until after it had actually occurred; we had no intimation whatever. By the first of May the mines at Cumberland were in operation and the output had grown to be almost normal. At every other mine on Vancouver Island there was an existing agreement between the men and their employers. Some of these agreements would not have lapsed for a year and a half more, and some would not have elapsed for six months more, so there was nothing to indicate that these men were not going to observe the terms of these agreements between the strike at Cumberland and the strike of the first of May, nothing whatever. If my hon. friend knew anything about labour movements he would know that men by the thousand may be called out in a few minutes by telegram. That is what happened in this case. A telegram sent, as I understand, from Seattle, calling out all these men who had no grievance against their employers and whose agreements with their employers had not expired. I had some 27 of these men before me and they admitted that they had entered into a written agreement. These were employees of the Western Fuel Company, of Nanaimo, and that agreement would not expire until the following October. They admitted that since that agreement had been entered into they had not made a single complaint to their employers. Yet, notwithstanding that, on a telegram from an officer of their association they quit work five or six months before the expiration of the agreement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: On account of the trouble at Cumberland.

Mr. CROTHERS: Probably on account of the trouble at Cumberland, which was passing away. So we had no intimation of the strike until after it had occurred. Yet my hon. friend thinks we should have had a deputation out there watching all the time.

Mr. NEELY: Would the minister not know from the history and course of strikes?

Mr. CROTHERS: No, it is not usual, it is very unusual to have these sympathetic strikes, and it is unusual for the men to break their agreement. The usual thing is that they carry out their agreement. As I said to them: You admit that you signed an agreement fixing the rates of wages and hours of labour; you admit that you never complained since that agreement was signed, and yet you went out on strike six months before the expiration of that agreement. That applies to all mines except those controlled by the Canadian Collieries. When the corespondence is brought down the hon. member for Humboldt will find that his statement that nothing was done except sending telegrams is absolutely without any foundation. I saw the man who controls the Cumberland mines, and my deputy went to Toronto to see another man, who is manager or next to the head man of the company that really controls those mines. We saw those men.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Let us see the correspondence.

Mr. CROTHERS: We will let you see it when you get an order of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Why not before?

Mr. CROTHERS: It is not usual to bring it down when there is a notice of motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is usual to bring any necessary information when you are asking for Supply.

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not think it is usual to bring all the corespondence you have in your office.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is useful if it is not usual.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

Monday, February 9, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

DUTY ON AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. KNOWLES: The Moosejaw Morning News on the 6th instant contained an editorial statement to the effect that this Government will introduce legislation for the purpose of substantially reducing the duty on agricultural implements. I know I would not be in order if I asked the Prime Minister whether the report were true or not, because this is probably not the time to discuss tariff matters; but I would ask the right hon. gentleman whether there is any foundation for the report or whether there has been any utterance by any member of the Government which would be a justification for the report that this Government will introduce legislation substantially to reduce the duties on agricultural implements.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN: I think I am constrained to answer the hon. gentleman's question in the way that he suggests another question should be answered.

Mr. KNOWLES: I just wish to ask what the Prime Minister meant by his answer. Did he mean that there had been no announcement made of the proposed reduction?

Mr. BORDEN: I meant exactly what I said to my hon. friend. Announcements with regard to the tariff are made in this House in the first instance, and on the proper occasion.

VICTORIA COUNTY ESTIMATES.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am advised by a person resident in the county of Victoria, Nova Scotia, where a provincial election is now being held, that is, the election which was referred to last week in connection with the customs boat Alert, that persons supporting the Conservative candidate in that election are publicly saying that the Supplementary Estimates contain specific votes for expenditures in specific localities in the county of Victoria. I desire to ask the Minister of Public Works if there is any authority for such statements or if any person is authorized to make a statement to that effect and if such statements

have any foundation in fact. The minister will remember the occurence of a similar matter about a year ago in connection with a provincial election in the county of Antigonish, and I think the Minister of Public Works stated in Parliament that he deprecated such conduct on the part of any person. Has anybody been authorized to make a statement of this kind, and have advance copies of the Supplementary Estimates been issued from his department and information contained in them placed in the possession of any person?

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS: Of course, I am not in any way responsible for any statement that my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax may have heard or any reports he may have seen, and not having information as to the exact report or statement to which he refers it would be impossible for me to give a definite answer as far as that part of my hon. friend's question is concerned. I may say, however, in respect to Supplementary Estimates, that whatever we may have under consideration for works to be carried on in this particular locality, the county of Victoria, I believe, they have not been published nor has any information, so far as I am aware, been given to any individual outside of the department.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Has there been any definite conclusion about any expenditure?

Mr. ROGERS: With respect to definite conclusions they will only be announced when the Supplementary Estimates are brought down to the House.

Mr. CARROLL: I have a telegram from the same source which says that the Conservative workers in Victoria county are using lists of Supplementary Estimates purporting to be for public works in the riding. Is there some authority for the use of these Estimates? These people must have some source of information, otherwise they would not be using these lists.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Copy of agreement with the Royal Steam Packet Company for the Canada West Indies steamship service.—Mr. Foster.

Report of the Secretary of State for the year ended March 31, 1913.—Mr. Coderre.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY AGREEMENT.

Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Was a memorandum or agreement entered into within the past six months between the Canadian Government railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, covering the transportation of freight and passengers between Halifax and St. John over the Intercolonial railway, in connection with the Canadian Pacific and Allen line of steamships, carrying British mails, making Halifax the terminal port for such ships? If so, what is the date of its execution, what date did it bear, by whom was it signed, when did it take effect, and for how long a period?

2. Was the said agreement, if any, ratified and approved by an Order in Council of His Excellency the Governor in Council? If so, what was the date of such Order in Council, and when was it passed and assented to by His Excellency the Governor General?

3. Did the right hon. Prime Minister, or any other member or members of the Government have a conference or interview with, or receive a delegation from the city of St. John, representing the Board of Trade or the city of St. John, on the subject-matter of said agreement or the draft thereof? If so, what was the date or dates of the holding of said interviews or conference, or of the hearing of said delegation by the Government, or by any member or members thereof?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes. The date of its execution is September 30, 1913. It is signed by G. M. Bosworth, for the Canadian Pacific railway, and F. P. Gutelius, for the Canadian Government railways. It is effective from November 15, 1913, to May 15, 1914.

2. No.

3. The department has no information.

Mr. BORDEN: Replying to the third part of the question of my hon. friend from Westmorland, as to which the Department of Railways and Canals has no information, I may say that the interview to which reference is made took place, as I am informed—and I can personally verify it—on the 8th of October.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Is the Government aware that in 1905 a Royal Commission on Transportation was appointed?

2. Is the Government aware that said commission reported in favour of the construction of the Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal, if feasible from an engineering point of view?

3. Is the Government aware that subsequently in 1908 the Department of Public Works reported that the work was feasible, and gave a detailed estimate of the cost after careful and extensive surveys being made?

4. What is the cause of the delay in the building of said canal?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. No; Commission made no recommendation.

3. Chief Engineer E. D. Lafleur, Engineer-in-charge A. St. Laurent, District Engineer Coutlee, and District Engineer Chapleau, made, in 1908, an estimate as to probable cost of the Georgian Bay canal, but no further action was taken by the Department of Public Works or by the late Government.

4. Matter under consideration.

QUEBEC SEIGNIORIES.

Mr. BOYER:

1. How many seigniories are there in the province of Quebec?

2. What are their names and the amount paid to each of them as an indemnity by the Government, after the adoption of the law of 1854?

3. What is the value of each of the seigniories on which the consolidated funds were based?

Mr. BORDEN: In the absence of the Minister of Justice, I am not aware whether any information on such a subject is available to the Government. Can my right hon. friend say with regard to the seigniories in the province of Quebec?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I may say that I discussed that with my hon. friend from Vaudreuil (Mr. Boyer), and I do not think the department has any information on this subject.

Mr. BORDEN: I shall bring the question to the attention of the Minister of Justice.

APPOINTMENT OF MESSENGERS.

Mr. KYTE:

1. How many appointments were made to the messenger staff of the House of Commons since the present Government took office?

2. What is the number from each province?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. One permanent messenger and thirty-four sessional messengers.

2. Twenty-five from the province of Ontario; nine from the province of Quebec, and one from Prince Edward Island.

HULL CUSTOMS OFFICE.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. How long has the customs office at Hull been opened?

2. What have been the receipts since the opening of the said office?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to erect in the city of Hull a building for customs?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. Since 1st of April, 1911.

2. $107,635.

[Mr. Devlin.]

3. The Department of Customs has no information.

HUDSON BAY TERMINALS.

Mr. DOUGLAS:

1. On which side of the Saskatchewan river at Le Pas are the terminals and yards of the Hudson Bay railway to be placed?

Mr. COCHRANE: It has been decided to place the terminals and yards of the Hudson Bay railway on the southerly side of the Saskatchewan river at Le Pas.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION COMMISSION.

*Mr. WILCOX:

1. What is the total cost of the Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education?

2. How many were on the commission?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. To January 1, 1914, $102,172.36.

2. Nine.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—BOX AND FLAT CARS.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

What is the capacity of the box and flat cars of the Intercolonial railway, and what is the capacity of the box and flat cars of the Prince Edward Island railway?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Intercolonial railway box cars, capacity: 1,050 40-ton cars; 6,556 30-ton cars; 837 20-ton cars. Flat cars, capacity: 793 40-ton cars; 1,040 30-ton cars; 1,065 20-ton cars; 207 15-ton cars; 63 10-ton cars.

Prince Edward Island railway box cars, capacity: 186 15-ton cars; 118 12½-ton cars; 7 10-ton cars.

Flat cars, capacity: 129 15-ton cars; 9 12½-ton cars; 16 10-ton cars.

SACKVILLE PUBLIC WHARF.

*Mr. EMMERSON:

1. When was the new public wharf at Sackville, N.B., completed by the contractor, and when was it accepted and taken over by the Government through the Public Works, or other department of the Government?

2. Has it been connected with the Intercolonial railway at Sackville station by means of a spur line? If not, why not?

3. Is it the intention of the Intercolonial railway department or of the Government to so connect it, to accommodate the railway, shipping and business interests? If not, why not?

4. What is the estimated cost of making such connection, and has a survey been made?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Completed in September and accepted by the Department of Public Works, on the 14th October, 1912.

2. No. It is not considered necessary, the

Intercolonial railway having connection with the old wharf at Sackville, N.B.

3. It has not yet been decided to make this connection.

4. A survey has been made showing two locations: Route A, estimated cost, $10,-949; route B, estimated cost, $12,611.20.

THREE RIVERS PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

*Mr. BUREAU:

1. When were the tenders opened for the public buildings at Three Rivers, Quebec?

2. How many persons tendered and what are their names?

3. What is the amount of each tender and the amount of the cheque accompanying each tender?

4. (a) Who was the successful tenderer, and (b) when was the contract signed for the construction of the building?

5. If no contract has been awarded, what is the reason of the delay?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. 10th November, 1913.

2 and 3.—

	Tender.	Security.
F. A. Verrette.....		
Geo. McLeod..	$163,495	$18,000 00
Wm. Ferron		
R. Ferron..		
J. J. Collins..	194,900	19,500 00
C. O. Baptist..		
C. E. Deakin..	198,000	21,000 00
Jos. Bourque..	215,000	21,500 00
Heon, Roy & McLeod..	224,800	22,480 00
John Quinlan..	235,000	23,500 00
T. Halley..	251,956	25,195 60

4. (a) F. A. Verrette, Geo. McLeod, Wm. Ferron and R. Ferron; (b) contract now being prepared for signature.

5. Answered as above.

HUMBOLDT HOMESTEAD INSPECTOR.

Mr. NEELY:

1. Is one Arthur Smythe still acting as homestead inspector at Humboldt, Saskatchewan?

2. If so, what salary does he receive?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.

2. $1,200 per annum.

ST. LEONARDS IMMIGRATION AGENT.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Was there an investigation held in reference to the dismissal of Epiphane Nadeau, formerly immigration agent at St. Leonards, N.B.?

2. If not, what were the reasons?

3. What are the causes for the dismissal of Mr. Nadeau?

4. Who recommended Fred. A. Roy to the position of immigration agent in the place of Mr. Nadeau?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No.

2. Not necesary.

3. Political partisanship.

4. The Minister of the Interior.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. When will that section of the National Transcontinental railway extending from the Quebec bridge to mile 203, be taken over from the contractors?

2. Is the section to be operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, or by the Government?

3. When will it be possible to get through rates?

4. Have there been any negotiations relative to through rates?

5. To whom must applications be made to secure freight rates?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. As soon as posible after completion by the contractor, which is expected to be some time next summer.

2. When completed, will be operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

3. As soon as the line is taken over by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

4. No.

5. Local freight rates may now be obtained from the Intercolonial Railway management from the Quebec and New Brunswick boundary west to St. Eleuthere, and from contractors M. P. and J. T. Davis from St. Eleuthere to St. Jean Chrysostome (near Lévis).

WOODSTOCK COAL SUPPLIES.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. How many tons of coal were furnished the Dominion building in Woodstock, N.B., in each of the years ending March 31, 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913, and the amount furnished during the present financial year up to this date?

2. Who furnished the coal in each of the above years and the price paid per ton?

3. Were public tenders called for in each of said years? If not, what method was adopted?

Mr. ROGERS:

1 and 2.

1909-10—W. F. Dibblee & Son, 35.79 tons at $8, $286.32.

1910-11—W. F. Dibblee & Son, 2 tons at $9, $18; 5.14 tons at $8.50, $43.69; 30.712 tons at $8, $245.69; total, $307.38.

1911-12—H. E. Burtt, 35 tons at $8, $280.

1912-13—H. E. Burtt, 35 tons at $9, $315.

1913-14—W. F. Dibblee & Son, 1,800 lb. at $9.40, $8.46; 35.100 tons at $9.15, $320.71; total, $329.17.

3. Yes. In 1910 and 1913, small lots were purchased in addition to quantity supplied under contract.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. How many tons of coal were furnished the armoury in Woodstock, N.B., in each of the years ending March 31, 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913, and the amount furnished during the present financial year up to date?

2. Who furnished the coal in each of the above years and the prices paid per ton?

3. Were public tenders called for in each of said years? If not, what method was adopted?

Mr. S. HUGHES:

1. For the year ending	Tons.	Lbs.
March 31, 1910	50	
" 31, 1911	48	880
" 31, 1912	72	1,477
" 31, 1913	66	1,975
January 1, 1914	51	1,740

2.

	Per ton.
1909-10—W. F. Dibblee & Son	$8 20
1910-11— " "	8 20
1911-12— " "	8 20
1912-13— " "	8 45
1913-14— " "	8 60

3. Tenders were invited by newspaper advertisement in each of these years.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Mr. NEELY:

1. What homestead entries, exclusive of preemption and purchased homestead entries, were granted in 1911, 1912 and 1913, respectively?

2. What number of patents for original homestead entries were granted in the same years respectively?

3. What was the number of homestead inspectors employed by the department on October 1, 1911, and what number are now employed?

4. How many employees were occupied in the collective Dominion Land offices on October 1, 1911?

5. What number are similarly employed now?

Mr. ROCHE: So far as the Lands Patents Branch is concerned:

1. 1911, 38,909; 1912, 35,538; 1913, 31,499.

2. 1911, 16,479; 1912, 21,211; 1913, 24,999.

3. Forty, on the 1st October, 1911; 60 at present.

4. Three hundred and thirty-two, including 83 sub-agents.

5. Three hundred and seventy-seven, including 87 sub-agents.

EXPENSES OF CONFERENCES.

Mr. STEWART:

1. Who accompanied the Hon. Sir Frederick Borden to England in connection with the Conferences of 1907, 1909, and 1911?

2. How many stenographers accompanied or were employed by him or his staff on each occasion, and at what cost?

3. How many servants or valets were in or were engaged for the party on each occasion?

[Mr. Rogers.]

4. How many ladies, including wives, daughters or other persons, accompanied the party on each occasion?

5. Were the expenses of the said ladies, or any portion thereof, paid by the Government of Canada, directly or indirectly?

6. What was the total cost to Canada for the whole party on each occasion?

7. What sums or contributions were paid by the Government of Great Britain and Ireland towards the expenses of the party on each trip?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES:

1. Conference of 1907—Sir Frederick Borden was accompanied by his private secretary and Major-General Lake.

Conference of 1909—Sir Frederick Borden was accompanied by his private secretary, Major-General Lake and General Otter.

Conference of 1911—Sir Frederick Borden was accompanied by his private secretary, Major-General McKenzie and Colonel Sam. Hughes.

2. No stenographers accompanied the party. Stenographers were employed whenever necessary.

3. Valets for the party were included in the hotel expenses paid by the Imperial Government.

4. Conference of 1907, two; conference of 1909, three; conference of 1911, three.

5. ———————

6. Conference of 1907, cost of whole party, $4,503.64; conference of 1909, cost of whole party, $5,005.16; conference of 1911, cost of whole party, 5,687.85.

7. Conference of 1907—The hotel expenses of Sir Frederick Borden, Miss Borden and private secretary were paid by the Imperial Government. A motor car was placed at the disposal of Sir Frederick Borden by the Imperial Government.

Conference of 1911—The hotel expenses of Sir Frederick Borden, Lady Borden and private secretary were paid by the Imperial Government. A motor car was placed at the disposal of Sir Frederick Borden by the Imperial Government.

YARMOUTH RURAL MAIL.

Mr. LAW:

1. How many rural mail delivery routes have been established in the county of Yarmouth, N.S.?

2. From what post offices do these routes originate?

3. How many post offices, if any, have been closed owing to the establishment of the said rural mail routes?

4. What are the names of said offices?

5. Are there any applications for additional routes in Yarmouth county? If so, what are they?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Five.

2. Carleton (this route being partly in Digby county and partly in Yarmouth county); South Ohio, 2 routes; Yarmouth, 2 routes.

3. None.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. Yes. Pleasant Valley Corner and South Deerfield, Tusket via Tusket Falls, Raynard's Bridge and Gavelton, Lake Annis and Cleland's Corner, Arcadia and vicinity.

EXPERT IN CURING AND HANDLING FISH.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Who is the expert in the curing and handling of fish in employ of the Marine and Fisheries Department?
2. What salary does he receive?
3. When was he appointed to this position, and upon whose recommendation?
4. What are his duties?
5. Has he made any official report in writing to the department?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. John J. Cowie.

2. $2,300.

3. 29th May, 1909; on the recommendation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

4. Up to the present time he has been engaged in improving the system of gathering and compiling fishery statistics.

5. His work is performed directly under the eye of the department and no report is needed.

FENIAN RAID BOUNTY.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Does the Fenian Raid Volunteer Bounty Act provide for the volunteers who were enlisted to repel the Fenian raid in Manitoba in 1871?
2. If so, have any payments been made to volunteers claiming under that service?
3. If not, what is the reason?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES:

1. No.

2. No.

3. Answered by No. 1.

PENITENTIARIES INQUIRY.

Mr. C. A. WILSON:

1. Has the Government instructed any person or persons to investigate in connection with the administration of the penitentiaries in Canada?
2. If so, who are the persons so instructed?
3. By whom and how has the appointment been made, and what are the salaries paid?
4. Has such investigation been held? If so, of what penitentiary or penitentiaries?
5. What report, if any, has been made to the Government?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes. Commissioners have been appointed under the provisions of Part II of the Inquiries Act, to investigate and report upon the following matter: (a) The state and management of the Kingston penitentiary; (b) the conduct of the officers and employees of said penitentiary so far as the same relates to their official duties, and (c) generally the subject of the conduct and administration of penitentiaries, including such methods as may conduce to the permanent reformation of the convicts without prejudice to the punishment which they should properly undergo and without undue burden upon the public funds, tend to mitigate as far as they may be found possible the sufferings entailed by their confinement upon those dependent upon them.

2. Georges Milnes Macdonnell of Kingston, Frederick Etherington, M.D., of Kingston, and Joseph Patrick Downey of Orillia.

3. By the Governor General in Council. The remuneration to be fifteen dollars per day to each while engaged upon the business of the commission, and in addition thereto transportation expenses and five dollars per day for living expenses when absent from place of residence.

4. The investigation is still in progress. Kingston penitentiary.

5. No report yet received.

ST. PETERS INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. How many parcels of land were sold on the St. Peter's Indian Reserve?
2. How many patents have been issued in respect to such parcels?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. 240. 2. 3.

RICHMOND COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. KYTE:

1. How much money has been expended on public works in the county of Richmond, N. S., since October 11, 1911?
2. Of the money so expended, how much of it was provided in the Estimates of 1911-12?
3. What amount was expended on the works for which money was not included in Estimates of 1911-12?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. $81,129.03.

2. Black Point breakwater, provided for, $5,000; L'Ardoise breakwater, provided for, $4,300; Little Anse breakwater, provided for, $10,000.

3. Arichat public building, $1,348.21; Arichat wharf, $993.49; Babin's Cove, $191.65; Charles Forest Cove, $84.75; D'Escousse (from general appropriations, dredging), $7,676.88; Fourchu, $117.12;

Little Harbour (Lower L'Ardoise), $2,262.90; Louisdale, $3.26; Petit de Grat (from general appropriations, dredging), $19,633.81; Port Richmond, $94.59; River Bourgeois (from general appropriations, dredging), $18,737.41; West Arichat, $2,708.78. And total expenditures at: Black Point, $4,996.44; L'Ardoise, $2,099.94; Little Anse, $20,177.80. Total, $81,129.03.

EUROPEAN IMMIGRATION.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Has the Government granted, or promised to grant a tract of land in Alberta for a scheme of European immigration?
2. If so, what townships are being granted?
3. What terms and conditions are they being granted?
4. What is the name of the organization with which the Government is dealing?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No.
2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

PICTOU—MAIL CARRIER.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who is the mail carrier between Pictou and Saltsprings, county of Pictou?
2. How long has the present carrier been performing this service?
3. How much is he being paid?
4. Is he performing the service under any contract?
5. Were tenders called for the service?
6. If so, who were the tenderers, and the amount of each tender?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. J. A. Meagher.
2. Since May 1, 1913.
3. $790 per annum.
4. In view of a possible extension of the rural mail delivery in the district supplied by this route, it has not been considered advisable to make a regular contract. The present contractor is employed temporarily pending the rearrangement which will be necessary should the department decide to establish rural delivery.

5 and 6. Answered by No. 4.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY PROVIDENT FUND.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Was William Harris, freight handler at Pictou, placed under the provisions of the Provident Fund of the Intercolonial railway?
2. If so, on what date and what is the amount of his pension?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.
2. (a) December 1, 1912; (b) $20 per month.

[Mr. Rogers.]

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT INDUSTRY.

Mr. NEELY:

1. What number of agricultural implement factories were in operation in Canada in the year 1911?
2. What amount of capital was there invested in these industries?

Mr. FOSTER:

1. 77.
2. $45,232,098.

CALGARY STORAGE ELEVATOR.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

Is it the intention of the Government to establish other than the internal storage elevator at Calgary, province of Alberta? If so, where?

Mr. FOSTER: Not at present.

ST. JOSEPH DE SOREL POST OFFICE.

Mr. CARDIN:

1. Has the Government been informed that the postmaster of St. Joseph de Sorel, Mr. Champagne, is reported to have changed the location of the post office at that place?
2. Was that postmaster authorized to make such a change?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Postmaster has made request to remove post office to a new store purchased by him.
2. Matter receiving consideration.

ANTIGONISH MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM:

1. Has the Post Office Department received any petition or petitions for a daily mail between Lower South River and South Side, Antigonish harbour?
2. If so, what action has the department taken thereon?
3. Is it the intention of the department to establish such daily service? If so, when?

Mr. PELLETIER: Applications have been made for a rearrangement and improvement of the mail service in this district, but so far the post office inspector has not been able to recommend an arrangement which would be suitable to all the people concerned. The matter is still under inquiry.

VANCOUVER ISLAND STRIKE.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. What date was the report of Commissioner Price on the British Columbia trouble given to the department or the Government?
2. When was it ordered printed?
3. When was it made public?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. A synopsis of the report, with recommendations in full, was received on August 14, 1913,, and the complete report was received August 21, 1913.

2. The departmental requisition for printing was sent to the Printing Bureau, October 9, 1913.

3. Distribution to the public began November 17, 1913.

ANTIGONISH IMMIGRATION AGENT.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM:

1. Was Colin F. McKinnon, of Taylor's Road, Antigonish county, in the employ of the Department of the Interior, as special immigration agent or officer, or in any other capacity, during any part of last year?

2. If so, when was he appointed, and when did he cease to be such agent or officer?

3 .Why were his services dispensed with?

4. What remuneration was he paid?

5. What was the total amount he received for services, including expenses?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes, as special Immigration Agent to Great Britain.

2. January 30, 1913; May 10, 1913.

3. Appointment was for three months only.

4. $100 per month and actual travelling expenses.

5. $729.48.

ROSTHERN CUSTOMS COLLECTOR.

Mr. McCRANEY:

1. On what grounds was Tobias Unruh dismissed from the position of sub-land agent and collector of customs at Rosthern, Saskatchewan?

2. By whom was Mr. Unruh's dismissal recommended?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. Tobias Unruh was dismissed from the position of sub-collector of customs at Rosthern, Saskatchewan, because he had never been permanently appointed to the position in which he was temporarily acting from August 4, 1911, and because information was received from Donald Maclean, candidate in the last Dominion election, that he had taken an active part in the last provincial and Dominion elections.

2. Answered by 1.

HEATHERTON, INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM:

1. When did, or does, the lease for the so-called Indian gardens in the Indian reservation at Heatherton, N.S., expire?

2. Has any application been made for a renewal of said lease?

3. Is it the intention of the department to renew said lease?

4. If not, will the Indian gardens be let by tender?

5. When will tenders be invited?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. First of June, 1914.

2. No.

3. Not yet considered.

4. Do.

5. Do.

ROSTHERN LANDS AGENT.

Mr. McCRANEY:

Who is sub agent of Dominion lands at Rosthern, Saskatchewan, and what is his salary?

Mr. ROCHE:

E. St. G. Hodgson; $600 per annum.

ROSTHERN CUSTOMS COLLECTOR.

Mr. McCRANEY:

1. Who is collector of customs at Rosthern, Saskatchewan, and what is his salary?

Mr. J. D. REID:

Mr. E. St. George Hodgson is the sub-collector of customs at Rosthern, Saskatchewan. His salary is $600 per annum.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION.

*Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Has any change been made in the character of the structure on the National Transcontinental Railway over the Little Mistongo, river at station, 1040, east of Cochrane?

2. If so, what is the character of the change?

3. Who is responsible for the change?

4. Was the change made necessary by reason of previous defective work?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.

2. Substituting a 100 foot steel girder span for a six-foot arch destroyed by clay slides.

3. The chief engineer.

4. No.

NORTH SHORE-HUBBARD MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Who is the present mail contractor for the mail route between North Shore and Hubbard's railway station, Halifax county, N.S.?

2. When was the same awarded?

3. Were tenders invited for the said service? If so, in what manner?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. L. W. Dauphinee.

2. On 7th June, 1913; the contract commenced 1st July, 1913.

3. Mr. Dauphinee offered to perform the service at a price lower than any previous contract, and as the amount was under $200 per annum, the department did not consider it necessary to invite tenders.

RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS AND SUPERANNUATION.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

Is it the intention of the Minister of Railways and Canals, when consolidating the Railway Act, to introduce into the said Act a section authorizing the Governor in Council to provide superannuation allowances for retiring members of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada?

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

THE IRRIGATION ACT.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

Is it the intention of the Government to amend the Irrigation Act so as to provide for the putting in of a system of underdrainage by settlers of irrigable land?

Mr. ROCHE: The question is under consideration.

RANCHING AND GRAZING INVESTIGATION COMMISSION.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. What recommendation of the Ranching and Grazing Investigation Commission is it the intention of the Department of the Interior to adopt?

2. If no decision has yet been reached, when can a decision be expected, and will it be submitted to Parliament?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Matter now under consideration.

2. In near future. Yes.

OTTAWA RIVER LIGHTKEEPERS.

*Mr. BOYER:

1. Who were the lightkeepers on the Ottawa river in 1908, at Rigaud, St. Placide, Pte. aux Anglais, Cadieux island, Graham, Vaudreuil, Ste. Anne de Bellevue and Ile Perrot?

2. What was the salary of each of them?

3. Who are the present keepers and what is the salary of each?

Mr. HAZEN:

1 and 2. (a) Rigaud, A. Malette, $150 per annum. (b) St. Placide, Jos. Lafleur, $170 per annum. (c) Pte. aux Anglais, L. H. Masson, $240 per annum. (d) Point a Cadieux,, S. Poirier, $180 per annum. (e) Graham Front, Wm. Graham, $75 per annum. (f) Graham Back, X. Sicard; $75 per annum. (g) Vaudreuil *. (h) Ste. Anne de Bellevue, J. L. Stocker; $150 per annum. (i) Ile Perrot, Andre McNab; $130 per annum.

3. (a) O. Malette, $210 per annum; (b) H. Dubreuil, $230 per annum; (c) A. Labrosse, $275 per annum; (d) S. Poirier, $260 per annum; (e) Situation vacant; (f) E. Lavigne, $90 per annum; (g) *; (h) E. Pilon, $180 per annum; (i) O. D'Anjou, $140 per annum.

* There is no light designated as Vaudreuil. If the hon. member will give further particulars, including the name of the present keeper, this part of the question will be answered later.

In all cases larger salaries are now paid than in 1908. This is due to the fact that on January 1, 1911, the salaries attached to the several classes of light stations were increased.

RIGAUD AND VAUDREUIL WHARFS.

*Mr. BOYER:

1. What revenue has been derived from Rigaud and Vaudreuil wharf for the years 1908-09, and 1910-11?

2. What agreement has been arrived at between the Government and the parties entrusted with the care of these wharfs?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Rigaud, collections 1908-9, $68.83; 1910-11, $105.39. Vaudreuil, collections 1908-9, nil; 1910-11, $48.07.

Wharf at Vaudreuil was only transferred in 1910 to the Marine and Fisheries Department.

2. The remuneration allowed the wharfinger at Vaudreuil is 50 per cent of the collections.

The remuneration allowed the wharfinger at Rigaud is 50 per cent of the collections.

UNOPPOSED AND UNDISCUSSED MOTIONS.

Mr. Law.—For a return showing the amount expended by the Government on wharfs, breakwaters, public works and dredging in the county of Yarmouth, since October, 11, 1911, and to whom the amounts so expended were paid.

Mr. Verville.—For a return showing the number of woollen industries which are being operated in the country; where they are situated, in which province, and in what city, town, or vilage; the number of hands employed in each, and the output of each during the year 1913.

Mr. Sutherland.—For a return showing the number of farm labourers and domestic servants respectively, placed by the Government employment agents during the years 1912 and 1913; also the counties where placed and the amount of bonus paid.

Mr. Sutherland.—For a copy of all reports made by the Inspectors of Agents for placing farm labourers and domestic servants in Canada during the calendar years 1912 and 1913?

Mr. Graham.—For a copy of all correspondence and documents in reference to the matter submitted to Sir William Whyte by the Government, the Transcontinental Commission or the commission appointed to investigate the construction of the National Transcontinental railway, between the Government or any member or official thereof, and any official of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company; and also of all correspondence between any member or official of either the above named commissions and the Justice Department, concerning the said matter.

Mr. Emmerson.—For a copy of all papers, letters or other correspondence, instructions, reports, valuations, appointment of valuators, or appraisers, appraisements, abstracts of titles, deeds or other conveyances, in any department of the Government or in the railway office at Moncton, relating to, or in any manner connected with, the purchase of the Intercolonial railway of a property in Moncton, N.B., at the corner of Archibald and Main streets in said city, formerly owned in his lifetime by the late P. S. Archibald, C.E., and now occupied by the General Superintendent of the Intercolonial railway, F. P. Brady, as a residence; together with a copy of all bills, accounts and statement of expenditures for repairs made on the buildings of said property; and also of all accounts, commissions and bills paid to solicitors, attorneys or other agents, for searches, conveyances, and a statement of all moneys paid for charges and expenses in connection with such purchase or the procuring of a deed of said property.

Mr. Emmerson.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, reports, correspondence and other documents on file in any department of the Government, or in the possession of any member of the Government, relating to, or in any manner connected with, the proposal to have a spur line or siding to connect the new public wharf at Sackville, N.B., with the Intercolonial railway at that place, and of all letters, telegrams and other correspondence passed between any person or persons and any member of the Government.

Mr. Neely.—For a return showing the names, date of appointment, length of service, remuneration and office held by each of all the employees of the Department of the Interior in the outside service since January 1, 1912, to December 31, 1913, not given in the Civil Service list of 1912 or 1913.

Mr. Neely.—For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents relating to the removal of Jas. T. Richardson as sub-collector of customs at Humboldt, Saskatchewan, and the appointment of a successor.

Mr. Neely.—For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, and other documents relating to the removal of T. J. Oliver, as Dominion lands agent at Humboldt, Saskatchewan, his appointment to his present position, and the appointment of his successor at Humboldt.

Mr. Neely.—For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, letters of instruction, or other documents relating to the removal of W. S. McKechnie, as Dominion lands agent at Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, and the appointment of his successor.

Mr. Seguin.—For a copy of all reports, memoranda, correspondence and documents of every nature, relating to the construction of a wharf in the town of L'Assomption, and of all petitions and correspondence in favour or against such construction to date, and the reasons why the construction of such wharf, authorized in the estimates of 1911-1912, has not been proceeded with.

Mr. Seguin.—For a copy of all correspondence, reports, petitions and documents exchanged by and with the Department of Public Works since the 1st of September, 1911, to date, with the reasons why the construction of the public building, authorized in the town of St. Lin Des Laurentides, county of L'Assomption, as per the Estimates of 1911-1912, has not been proceeded with.

Mr. Kyte.—For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, petitions and memorials received by the Right Honourable R. L. Borden, Premier of Canada, or any other minister of the Crown since the first day of October, 1911, from J. A. Gillies, Esq., Sydney, N.S., or any resident of the county of Richmond, N.S., relative to expenditure of public money on public works in the said county of Richmond.

Mr. Kyte.—For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, petitions and memorials received by the Right Honourable R. L. Borden, Premier of Canada, or the Minister of Railways and Canals, from J. A. Gillies Esq., Sydney, N.S., or from any resident of the county of Richmond, N.S., relative to the purchasing of the Cape Breton railway by the Government and the building of a line of railway from St. Peter's to Sydney and Louisburg, and of the replies thereto.

Mr. Neely.—For a copy of all letters, papers, homestead inspector's reports, declarations and of all other documents connected in any way with the entry and concellation proceedings against the homestead entry of James Bruce for the south east quarter section 36, in township 49, range 27, west second Meridian.

Mr. Emmerson.—For a return showing the proportion of comparative through passenger traffic from Montreal to Maritime eastern points, and from intermediate points eastward, and from eastern points westward to Montreal, and for points west of Montreal, by the Intercolonial and Canadian Pacific railways respectively, during the years 1911, 1912 and 1913 respectively; and also for a copy of all returns, reports, tables, statements, correspondence or other documents on file in the Department of Railways and Canals, or in the railway office at Moncton, showing such comparative traffic or any division thereof, taken by said railways respectively during the periods named, or during any other period within the last seven years, during which the so-called Maritime Express, the so-called Ocean Limited, and the Atlantic Express, or the so-called Canadian Pacific Express, were all being operated and run over the respective lines of railway; and also showing what proportion of such traffic was being carried by each of said trains respectively?

Mr. Graham.—For a copy of all advertisements, tenders, contracts and correspondence in conection with the proposed New London branch of the Prince Edward Island railway.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all advertisements. tenders, contracts, documents, letters and correspondence relating to the supply of coal for the Government public buildings at Lunenburg, N.S.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all documents, Orders in Council, correspondence, telegrams, tenders, accounts, vouchers, etc., in connection with the construction of a bridge or work between the mainland and an island known as Boutilier's island, at South West Cove, Lunenburg county, N.S.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all petitions, memorials, letters, telegrams, papers and documents received by any department of the Government of Canada, or any minister of the Crown from any company, corporation, person or persons, requesting the removal of any customs duties upon wheat or wheat products entering Canada, or protesting against any diminution or removal of such customs duties and any replies thereto.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all tenders, contracts, pay rolls, vouchers, letters, correspondence, papers and documents relating to the following public works recently performed in Shelburne county, N.S., viz.: breakwater and wharf at Froude's Point; breakwater at Jordan East; wharf at Shelburne, wharf at Port Clyde; breakwater at Blanche Point; wharf at Centreville; wharf at West Head; cribwork, etc., at Matthew's lake, and clearing channel at Round bay.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all accounts, bills, receipts and vouchers in connection with the services of N. W. White, during 1912 and 1913, as commissioner to inquire into Indian lands in the province of British Columbia.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a return showing the amounts in detail paid to Ward Fisher, of Shelburne, N.S., fishery inspector, for the years 1912 and 1913 for salary, office expenses, travelling expenses, and all other expenses.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a return showing the number and particulars of commissions appointed or issued under the Inquiries Act since Otcober 1, 1911, the purpose or object thereof, the name of the commissioner or commissioners, and the cost of each to the present time.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all papers, documents, correspondence, etc., since October 1, 1911, relating to the appointment of a postmaster at Upper Ohio, Shelburne county, N.S.

Mr. Robb.—For a copy of all correspondence, including letters, telegrams, and accounts, regarding the purchase during year 1913, of all horses, cattle, sheep and swine for the Department of Agriculture in the provinces of Quebec for experimental farms, or for the improvement of stock, together with a return showing the commission and fees paid, and to whom paid, for and on account of said purchase.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a return showing: 1. The names and post office addresses of all Fenian raid veterans in Inverness county who have applied for bounty under the Fenian Raid Volunteer Bounty Act, with dates of such applications.

2. The names and post office addresses of all widows and heirs in Inverness county, N.S., who have applied for bounty under said Act, with dates of such applications.

3. The names and post office addresses of such veterans' widows and heirs in Inverness county, N.S., who have been paid said bounty, with dates of such payments.

4. The names and post office addresses of all widows and heirs of veterans in the county of Inverness, N.S., whose applications have been rejected or postponed by the Department of Militia and Defence, with reasons for such rejection or postponement.

Mr. Truax.—For a copy of all correspondence and other documents in reference to the erection of a customs building in the village of Chesley, riding of South Bruce.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a return showing the names and addresses of all applicants resident in the county of Pictou, N.S., for the Fenian raid bounty, designating those who have already received the same, the applications refused, with the cause assigned, and the applications yet to be dealt with; also a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other communications had by the department with Mr. C. E. Tanner, of Pictou, N.S., in reference to same.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a return showing the number of criminals released on parole from the various penitentiaries of the Dominion for the year ending March 31, 1913; the offence for which each prisoner so released was convicted, and showing at the same time whether such such offence was a first, second, or subsequent offence.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.—For a copy of all arrangements made between the Government and the various provinces under the Agricultural Instruction Act.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.—For a copy of all petitions from British Columbia sealers for compensation for claims resulting from the cessation of Pelagic sealing, and of all correspondence with regard to the same.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.—For a copy of the Order in Council appointing a commission to investigate the cost of living.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.—For a copy of all Orders in Council since the 1st of June last in any way altering the rates of duties existing under the Customs Act.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.—For a copy of all correspondence since the 1st of January last with regard to the calling of an Imperial Conference on the subject of naval defence.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.—For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, and other documents relative to the report and recommendations of the board appointed under the Combines Investigation Act to investigate the methods adopted by the United Shoe Machinery Company.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.—For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to industrial disputes during the year 1913 between the operators and employees of any of the companies operating coal mines on Vancouver island, and disturbances arising out of the same; and of any correspondence, either before or since the year 1913 with respect to any of the said disputes. And in particular of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, and other documents to or from the Prime Minister, the Honourable the Minister of Labour or any of the officers of the Department of Labour, respecting attempts at conciliation in connection with these disputes, and to or from the Honourable the Minister of Militia, or any officers of the Department of Militia and the Honourable the Minister of Justice, or any officers of the Department of Justice, respecting the calling out and services of the militia in connection with said disputes; and a statement of the arrests made and of convictions, if any, for infringement of the laws. Also a copy of the evidence taken and reports of investigations made by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, Mr. Samuel Price, Commissioner appointed by the Department of Labour, and of the Deputy Minister of Labour; together with a detailed statement of the expenses of all such investigations and expenses otherwise incurred by any of the departments of the Government in consequence of said disputes or difficulties arising out of same.

Mr. Wm. Chisholm.—For a copy of the advertisement for tenders, and of the tenders received last year for the carrying of the mails between Merigomish and Malignant cove, and of all letters, telegrams, and correspondence and documents in any way relating thereto.

Mr. Wm. Chisholm.—For a copy of the contract entered into last year for the carrying of the mails between North Lochaber and Collegeville, and of all letters, telegrams, and corre-

spondence referring to said service and the awarding of said contract.

Mr. Law.—For a return showing the names and post office addresses of all parties from the county of Yarmouth, N.S., who have applied to the Department of Militia and Defence for a bounty under the Fenian Raid Volunteer Act, indicating the date on which each application was received, the names and addresses of the parties to whom such bounty has been paid; and also the names and addresses of the parties to whom the bounty has not been paid, with the reason, if any, for non-payment thereof.

Mr. Wm. Chisholm.—For a copy of the advertisement for tenders, and of the tenders received, and of the contract awarded last year, for the carrying of the mails between Antigonish and Livingston's cove, and of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and documents in any way relating thereto.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.—For a copy of all protests, if any, by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, against changes in grades of the National Transcontinental railway from Winnipeg eastward, and terminal facilities at Quebec; of all subsequent approvals of such changes, if any, by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and of all correspondence on the above subject.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a return showing the names and addresses of all applicants resident in the counties of Halifax, Hants, Kings, Annapolis, Digby, Queens, Shelbourne, Lunenburg, and Colchester, Nova Scotia, respectively, for the Fenian Raid Bounty, designating those who have already received the same, the applications refused with the cause assigned, and the applications yet to be dealt with.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.—For a copy of the Order in Council appointing a commission for the purpose of beautifying the city of Ottawa and vicinity, of all correspondence with regard to the same, and of all reports made by the commission up to date.

Mr. Turriff.—For a copy of all letters and telegrams in connection with the dismissal of the postmaster at Fletwode, Saskatchewan, and the changing of the location of the said post office.

Mr. Robb.—For a copy of all papers, documents, correspondence, letters and telegrams relating to the dismissal of Jos. H. Lefebvre, postmaster at Howick station, county of Chateauguay, and the appointment of his successor.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a copy of all agreements made and entered into between the Department of Marine and Fisheries or the Government and railway and express companies, including the Intercolonial railway, relating to the transportation of fresh fish by fast freight or express, since the year 1906; also a copy of all guarantees given to railway and express companies by the Government or any department thereof, relating to such transportation, together with a statement of all disbursements made by the Department of Marine and Fisheries each year under the terms of such agreements or guarantees, distinguishing between disbursements made on account of fast freight and disbursements made on account of express shipments; also the number of refrigerator cars, subject to guarantee, by Department of Marine and Fisheries, forwarded by fast freight from Mulgrave or Halifax to Montreal, each calendar year since 1906, and the number of tons of freight carried by such cars each year. Also number of refrigerator express cars forwarded from said points, Mulgrave and Halifax to Montreal, up to December 31, 1913, under the terms of an agreement made since 1911, between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the railway or express companies or both. Also the number of tons of fresh fish carried by express companies, prior to December 31, 1913 under the last mentioned agreement; and the amount paid up to December 31, 1913, by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, under the last mentioned agreement. Also the number of tons of fresh fish carried by express companies from Mulgrave and Halifax to points west since 1906, on which the Government paid one third, but not under the terms of the said agreement made as aforesaid, since 1911.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a copy of all letters telegrams and correspondence of all kinds relating in any way to the applications for Fenian raid bounty in Guysborough, N.S., or relating to or touching in any way the claims of such applications.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all papers, documents, correspondence, &c., in connection with the dismissal of Mr. Hicks, of Bridgetown, N.S., from the customs service in 1913.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all tenders, contracts, documents, papers and correspondence in connection with tenders and contracts for the carriage of mails between Bridgetown and Port Lorne, Hampton and Parker's Cove, in 1912.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all papers, reports, documents, correspondence, plans, &c., in reference to a proposed Government public building at Bear River, N.S., and the purchase of a site for the same.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all applications, documents, papers, correspondence, &c., in connection with the application of Edward Walker of New Ross, Lunenburg county, N.S., for the Fenian raid bounty.

Mr. Oliver.—For a copy of all papers in connection with the disposition of the S. E. ¼ section 16, township 25, range 5, west fifth meridian.

TRANSATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, papers, telegrams, memorials, petitions, etc., and a statement in writing of the substance of oral interviews, negotiations and conversations, by and between the Department of Trade and Commerce, or any department of the Government, any Minister of the Crown, or any officers of any department of Government, and the Canadian Northern railway, or any of its directors or officers or servants, the officials or managers of the Royal Line of Steamships, any board of trade, person or persons, in connection with the adoption of the Port of St. John, N.B., as the port of call of the mail subsidized transatlantic steamers, Royal George and Royal Edward for the winter season of 1913-14.

He said: I desire to avail myself of this opportunity of discussing briefly the matter of the contract for the transatlantic mail service, the selection of the winter ports for this mail service, and what I believe to be the unjustifiable interference of the Gov-

ernment in connection with the selection of the winter mail ports.

Some few months ago it became necessary, under a contract made about a year ago with certain steamship companies for the performance of the transatlantic mail service, to select or designate the winter port at which the mails would be received and from which they would depart. This matter was, of course, of very considerable interest to the only two Atlantic ports suitable for the winter mail service, namely Halifax and St. John. The matter was the occasion of a great deal of local interest in these two ports, but I did not wish to accentuate local feeling in the matter. I do not propose discussing this matter purely from the point of the merits of these two respective ports. That can better be done when discussing the next contract. The transatlantic mail service, performed at a cost to this country of $1,000,000 is consequently a matter of interest to Canada generally. The various sections of the country are very much interested in the promptitude with which transatlantic mails are received and distributed throughout Canada. From my knowledge of occurrences during the past few months in connection with this matter, I desire to say that there has been an unnecessary and unjustifiable interference on the part of the Government with the transatlantic mail contract, in so far as it affects the winter service, which calls for some explanation. I may point out to the House that prior to last year, when the existing contract was concluded, it was the practice for the contracting steamship companies to embark mails at Halifax on going to British ports, and land mails at that port on returning to Canada. This method has prevailed for a number of years, not to the entire satisfaction, I believe of the steamship companies. Last year, however, a new contract was entered into with certain steamship companies by the Postmaster General on behalf of the Government of Canada, providing for a more frequent mail service, and leaving to the contracting companies the selection of Canadian ports of arrival and departure for the summer and winter service. For the summer service the contracting steamship companies were to select either Montreal or Quebec, or both; in any event, I think the mails were to be landed at Quebec. For the winter season it was at the option of the contracting companies to adopt either of the ports of Halifax or St. John. When the terms of this contract were presented to the House by the Postmaster General last year, he said, respecting the ports to be selected for the winter service:

The ships can start from whatever port the companies please provided they do not start from any but a Canadian port, namely, Montreal or Quebec in summer, and St. John or Halifax in winter.

Mr. Pugsley: Not both?

Mr. Pelletier: Halifax or St. John at the option of the contractors, which means that each of the ports will stand on its own merits. We undertake to deliver the mails through whichever of the ports the companies will choose, for both the winter and the summer services.

It will be observed that this is a very clear and explicit declaration of policy on the part of the Government that, having regard to the winter mail service, the contracting steamship companies were at liberty to make selection of whichever port they chose. This clearly was the intention of the Government, and the same idea was reiterated by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) in a speech delivered at St. John some time in November last in which he dealt with this particular matter, which was of very great interest to the people of his city and constituency. On this occasion the Minister of Marine and Fisheries spoke as follows:

4 p.m.

The question of the carriage of mails from Canada to Great Britain has been one that has caused for a good many years past a great deal of discussion, and with a view to having more frequent carriage of mails and a better service upon the Atlantic, the Postmaster General entered last spring into a new arrangement by which eight steamers belonging respectively to the Allan Line, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Steamship Companies, would undertake this work, giving more frequent mail connection between Canada and Great Britain, during both summer and winter. Under contracts which have hitherto prevailed, the mail steamers of the Canadian Pacific Railway and Allan Lines have been compelled to leave their mails at Halifax and then come on to St. John. St. John was in no sense a mail port so far as the contract for the carriage of the mails entered into by the Liberals was concerned. The general demand in St. John was that each port should stand on its own merits, and that it should be optional with the contractors to select whichever port they chose on the Atlantic for the reception and discharge of the mails that they carried across the ocean. Under the contract for an improved mail service entered into by the Postmaster General in April last, which is to continue for one year and which called for three sailings each week in summer and two in winter, this provision was inserted, and mails will be delivered to and taken from steamers at Halifax and St. John at the contractors option, and it was generally felt that the result would be to

fairly test the merits of the two ports so far as mails were concerned.

So, here again, there was a very clear and plain declaration of policy in respect to the selection of ports by the contracting steamship company. According to the statement of the Minister of Marine, the optional feature of the contract was inserted for the purpose of testing the relative merits of St. John and Halifax as winter mail ports, or for the purpose of permitting the contracting steamship companies to be arbiters on this point, thus relieving the Government of this difficult duty. The optional features of the winter mail service contract was also agreeable to the Boards of Trade of the cities of St. John and Halifax, although at first there was, I think, some opposition at Halifax to this suggestion owing, I suppose, to the fact that for a long period transatlantic mails were embarked and landed at the port of Halifax. So far as I was personally concerned, at last session of Parliament when this contract was before us for consideration, I considered on the whole the proposition eminently fair, although a great deal might have been said, for an express stipulation that the port of Halifax be selected as the winter mail port because it afforded the shortest route and its merits for such purpose had been well established. Now, under this feature of the contract, namely the right of selection by the contracting steamship companies, the Canadian Pacific railway steamship line, the Allan steamship line, and the Royal line of steamships, selected Halifax as their port of arrival and departure in connection with the mail service. In addition to that the White Star line which was to substitute in the event of any of the ships of the contracting steamship companies being out of commission at any time during the life of the contract, had also selected the port of Halifax under the contract. I believe the selection by the contracting steamship companies was made without any political influence whatever. Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, president of the Canadian Pacific railway, stated publicly in an interview that the selection was made by his company without suggestions on the part of the Government, and that in no respect was the Government a factor in the selection of that port. They intimated that one of the reasons for the selection of the port of Halifax was the lack of sufficient facilities at the port of St. John, besides, they disliked the two-port call as under previous contracts. But, at any rate, I think I am justified in saying that the selection of the port of Halifax by the Canadian Pacific railway company was made strictly on the merits of that port. This naturally caused a great deal of opposition in the city of St. John. So pronounced was the dissatisfaction against the selection made by the contracting steamship companies that the political friends of the Government were most pronounced in their denunciation of the Government whom they charged with responsibility for permitting the port selection which had been made. In the city of St. John there is a political club named after the Prime Minister of the country, and so antagonistic were they to the selection which was made by the Canadian Pacific railway steamships particularly, and the complicity of the Government therein as they imagined, that the officers of that club saw fit to resign from office.

Mr. HAZEN: They did nothing of the sort. My hon. friend is simply misinformed.

Mr. MACLEAN: Surely I have not been misinformed. At least a statement to that effect appeared in the newspapers of St. John and Halifax, and I do not remember ever seeing it contradicted; but I suppose the Minister of Marine will admit that a great deal of hostile opinion was expressed by members of that club in connection with this particular matter. Whether the officers carried their hostility to such an extent as to resign, is not, after all, a matter of very much importance, and I am quite satisfied with the minister's statement that they did not resign. That is a matter of not very great importance, and I think we may continue to disagree about it Public opinion was so hostile in St. John as to the action of the contracting steamship companies that a request, it is also said, was made by some of the political friends of the Minister of Marine that he should resign his seat.

Mr. HAZEN: That is not true at all.

Mr. MACLEAN: I simply made the remark that this was said. A great many things were perhaps said by the newspapers during the heat of the controversy over this matter that were not strictly accurate. It was charged that the Minister of Marine was actively engaged negotiating with the Canadian Pacific railway for the purpose of inducing them, if possible, to make a change in the port which they had designated under the transatlantic mail contract. I suppose the

Minister of Marine will hardly undertake to deny that. However, the point I wish to emphasize here is that the steamship companies, whose names I have already mentioned designated the port of Halifax as the port from which and at which they would perform their transatlantic mail contract. The selection occasioned a great deal of opposition in the city of St. John, and I think there is evidence that the Government or individual members of the Government intervened and sought to nullify the right of selections which had been exercised by the contracting steamship companies for purely political purposes.

As I have already said, it was rumoured that negotiations were conducted with the Canadian Pacific railway by members of the Government for the purpose, if possible, of inducing them to revert to the port of St. John instead of the port of Halifax. But it would appear that the Canadian Pacific Steamship Company were invulnerable, and declined to recede from the selection which they had previously made of the port of Halifax. It is unfortunately correct, however, that another steamship company, namely the Royal Line, owned by the Canadian Northern railway, which had also designated Halifax as its port under the contract, subsequently receded from that selection and designated St. John; and it is that particular matter which I desire to bring to the attention of the Government. I believe it is absolutely correct, and beyond contradiction, that this change was made owing to pressure brought to bear upon this company by the Government of Canada, or by some members of the Government. I say, and I say without fear of any successful contradiction, that this change would not have been made except under the greatest pressure possible or imaginable. The Royal Line of steamships had operated from the port of Halifax for three years preceding this. Sir William Mackenzie, the president of the Canadian Northern railway, on many occasions publicly and privately stated that Halifax would continue to be the port of the Royal Line. At the time, rumours began to float about, that in consequence of the selection of the port of Halifax by the Canadian Pacific Steamship Line the Royal Line would be forced to select the port of St. John in order to pacify party interests there, enquiries were made of the officials of the Canadian Northern railway by the two papers published in Halifax—the Morning Chronicle and the Halifax Herald —and also by the Halifax Board of Trade, as to whether such a change was contemplated by the Canadian Northern railway. To each of these three inquiries, a very prompt, specific, and emphatic answer was given by Mr. Hanna, first vice-president of the Canadian Northern railway, that no such change was contemplated by that company, that Halifax was the port of the Royal Steamship Line and they proposed to continue it as such. The fact is, however, that shortly after this the Royal Line did officially announce that their two steamships, the Royal George and the Royal Edward, would sail from the port of St. John during the winter of 1913-14, and would perform its part of the transatlantic mail contract from that port. I have not the slightest hesitancy in saying that the officials of the Royal Steamship Line and the directors of the Canadian Northern railway protested against leaving the port of Halifax and adopting the port of St. John. I make this statement boldly, and emphatically, and challenge any member of the Government to say whether or not I am correct in this regard. Shortly after the adoption of the port of St. John, Sir William Mackenzie landed there from England, and was interviewed by a representative of one of the St. John newspapers. He was naturally interrogated as to the mail contract and the adoption of the port of St. John by his company, and he is reported to have spoken as follows to the reporter:

> With regard to the probable terminus of our Atlantic steamship line in winter, we have been working from Halifax and were quite satisfied with the route. I am not yet familiar with the reasons which led to the change this winter, and do not know that it will be continued. At any rate we have not made any plans for sending our steamers to St. John another winter, and it is impossible to say where they will go.
>
> 'But, Sir William, the rail haul is considerably less from St. John,' said the reporter.
>
> 'Well, we have been working with the Intercolonial railway and would be quite satisfied to continue to do so,' was the reply.

Therefore I say that so far as the official head of the Royal Steamship Line is concerned, it is evidently clear that he at that moment knew little of the reasons which operated to bring about a change in the port of departure for the Royal Line. It is also quite clear that he was perfectly satisfied with the port of Halifax which they had adopted and constantly used for the preceding three years, and I think, Mr. Speaker, this is some evidence, at least, of pressure of some kind or another having been exerted by some person upon this particular steamship company. The St.

John Standard, a newspaper favourable to the Ministry publicly stated that this change made by the Royal Line was at the request of the Government. I am of course unable to say whether there was justification for that statement or not. The Halifax Herald, another journal sympathetic to the Administration, stated that tremendous influences must have been exerted upon the Royal Line in order to induce them to abandon the port of Halifax. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries was evidently very much interested in the state of feelings which prevailed in the city of St. John. That was only natural, and any hon. gentleman I think would naturally sympathize with him in the circumstances, which were most uncomfortable. I think it was just immediately before the adoption of the port of St. John by the Royal Line was made public that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries went to that city, accompanied by the Minister of Public Works, and there publicly made the statement that the Royal Line of Steamships would for the present season use the port of St. John. I think I may fairly say that when the Minister of Marine went to the city of St. John for the purpose of making this announcement, he evidently intended to take to himself the credit for the change made by this particular steamship line, and it is a very fair inference I think for me to make that the change was made through the interference and influence of the Government, and in that change the Minister of Marine played quite a part. I think there is also no doubt whatever but that some members of the Government endeavoured to influence the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to revert to the port of St. John. That company was invulnerable. Failing in this respect, the Government, or members of the Government, I suppose thought they would then attack that steamship company which was the most vulnerable, and naturally they selected the line of steamships operating under the name of the Royal Line, and owned by the Canadian Northern Railway Company. Just here, one might fairly protest against the pressure brought on this particular steamship line. If the Government were entitled to exercise any influence, it might well have been directed against the Canadian Pacific Railway Steamship Company. They were a strong, independent, and powerful railway and steamship company, and if there were any merits in the claims that were being made by the members of the Government for a reversion to the port of St. John by that steamship line, the Canadian Pacific railway officials were perfectly competent to decide whether that request possessed merits or not. On the other hand, as everybody knows, the Canadian Northern Railway Company have been for years —they were last session and probably will be in the future—suppliants for Government financial favours, and pressure could very easily be exercised, and very unfairly exercised, upon this particular railway company which owned the Royal Line of Steamships. I say that interference by the Government in connection with this matter was objectionable in any event, but particularly when directed against a company who frequently were supplicants for financial aid from this Government and from Parliament.

It is not necessary that I should say much more. It has been urged by the press in St. John and Halifax, and by friends of the Government, that the Royal Line of Steamships adopted the port of St. John because there was not at the port of Halifax sufficient terminal facilities. In answer to that, I have to say that I do not think the facts will substantiate that position. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company were quite satisfied to adopt the port of Halifax, and the head of that steamship company stated that the facilities at the port of Halifax were sufficient for their purposes, while he was not satisfied with the port facilities at St. John. The Canadian Northern railway officials were quite satisfied with the facilities afforded them at the port of Halifax. There was no contention made on the part of anybody, when, and for some time after the four steamship contractors had made a selection of the port of Halifax under the terms of the contract, that the facilities were inadequate or insufficient. In fact, St. John newspapers friendly to the Government, when the selection made by the contracting steamship companies was first announced, declared that in respect to facilities Halifax enjoyed a stronger position than did St. John, although in neither case perhaps were the facilities up to actual requirements. I do not believe for one moment that any evidence will be forthcoming from any of the contracting steamship companies, or from the Government or any members of the Government, to the effect that a change of port was made by the Royal Steamship line of its own volition, without interference and pressure on the part of the Government, or because

they considered that the port facilities at Halifax were inadequate.

I shall repeat two or three facts which are, after all, the salient facts in connection with the remarks I have been making, and which are most important in connection with the whole matter of the transatlantic winter mail service contracts. When the present contract was entered into a year ago, it was expressly stipulated that the contractors had the right to select their winter port, namely, Halifax or St. John. It was stated by the Postmaster General when announcing this contract to Parliament, and it was stated by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries speaking only in November last in the city of St. John, that this optional feature of the contract would settle the merits of the ports of St. John and Halifax for winter mail service purposes. This feature of the contract was in many respects commendable, and should not have been interfered with by the Government. I say that there was interference on the part of the Government or some of its members; I say the Royal Line of Steamships did make a change in their selection of port because of the intervention of the Government; and I say further, that this intervention was unfair and unjust to the steamship company itself, and to the port of Halifax as well. For this transatlantic mail service, the country was paying $1,000,000 a year. Time was the essence of the contract, and it was in the interests of every portion of Canada that that port should be selected by the contracting steamship companies which gave Canadians their British mails in the quickest time possible. The port which should be selected was that which was quickest for this purpose and which was also the safest. As a member of this House, and as representing a constituency much interested in this matter, I desire to register my protest against the intervention of the Government, and their apparent violation of the spirit of the contract negotiated and entered into by them on behalf of the people of Canada. I am very anxious indeed to hear from some one on behalf of the Govenrment as to the nature and extent of the interference they made in this matter, and the defence therefor. I trust that all the papers in connection with the subject, including the substance of the oral negotiations, will be presented to Parliament for our information.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.): I am very sorry indeed not to have some reply vouchsafed by the Minister of Marine, if by no other member of the Cabinet, because this is a matter of great importance to his own constituency; it is probably equally as important to his constituency as it is to the constituency of the Prime Minister. The Minister of Marine knows that we might as well discuss this question here for a little while this afternoon, and try to get all the light we can on the subject, because the end has not yet been heard of this matter in the Maritime provinces. The people in the Maritime provinces do not at the present time understand the true significance of this juggling with business affairs and the great transportation interests of this country, which has been taking place during the last six or eight months between the Government, the Intercolonial railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Steamship Company. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has gone into the matter so exhaustively that it is not my intention to discuss it to any great extent from the standpoint of what took place in Parliament.

I would like, however, to refer to the statement made by the Postmaster General when this matter was before Parliament in the month of April last. I remember very distinctly, when the vote of $1,000,000 for mail subsidies was under consideration, the question being asked, from what port these vessels would sail. The answer was given by the Postmaster General as follows:

> Mr. Pelletier: Halifax or St. John, at the option of the contractor, which means that each of the ports will stand on its own merits. We undertake to deliver the mails through whichever of the ports the companies will choose, for both the winter and the summer services.

I am not here to speak for the port of St. John; that is the business of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Neither am I here to say a word for or against the port of Halifax; that is the business of the Premier and my hon. friend from Halifax. These three gentlemen are perfectly capable of looking after their own interests. I am here to try to point out to the House and to the country the real sufferer in this unfair and unbusinesslike transaction between the Government and their friends, the Canadian Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern railway and all the other parties concerned. In my opinion, the real sufferer in this transaction is the Intercolonial railway. As a citizen of this country, as a member of this House, I am interested in the question as to whether or not the Inter-

colonial railway is being properly handled. Coming as I do from the Maritime provinces, I am interested in the matter probably to a greater extent than would be a member from the western portions of Canada. Nevertheless we are all interested, and I think we could very profitably discuss this matter from that standpoint for a few moments.

When I say that about the 3rd or 4th of October last consternation reigned in the city of St. John over this matter, I am stating the case very mildly indeed. The answer given by the Postmaster General in the month of April last, that the steamship companies would have the right to choose whichever port they preferred from business reasons, was absolutely satisfactory to every man in the province of New Brunswick. From the evidence of my hon. friend from Halifax, I believe it was equally satisfactory to the people of Halifax. I am willing to admit that during the last ten or fifteen years there has been far too much bickering, backbiting and saying of unkind things by people in the cities of St. John and Halifax. Too much parochial politics has been indulged in by the people representing both of the cities—I do not mean by their representatives in this House, but by the people of these communities in general. This country is big enough and there is sufficient business in it to justify a broader stand being taken, and I for one have never been guilty of taking any part in these debates, and I do not think they tend to the benefit of either port or of the country as a whole.

In April last we thought we had finally got down to the business proposition that the steamship companies would be allowed to choose whichever port they thought was the better from a business standpoint; and both cities apparently were satisfied. I do not want to say anything unkind about any member of the Government, because it does not do any good. The matter is serious enough in itself without my saying anything that will make it more unpleasant or more serious. We in the province of New Brunswick are asking where the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was when this trade was going on. If I understand my hon. friend from Halifax aright this afternoon, he is now asking where the Premier was when the latter trade was made whereby Canadian Northern boats were switched from Halifax to St. John. I must take the Minister of Marine and Fisheries at his word; he is a gentleman whom I know very well and I am satisfied that every person in the province will take the minister at his word. When this matter first came up, a telegram was sent by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the President of the Board of Trade. The substance of that telegram is that the people of St. John must not get excited over this matter because, as far as the minister knew, there was no intention of taking the Empress steamers away from St. John.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. gentleman had better read the telegram.

Mr. CARVELL: This is the telegram. I am reading now from the Daily Telegraph of October 7, 1913:

October 4, 1913.

Dear Mr. Robinson:

I am in receipt of yours of the 3rd instant. I have been very much surprised that the Canadian Pacific railway have decided to send the Empresses to Halifax, and can understand the expressions of disappointment that have been given utterance to. The feeling, however, that undue influence has been used to force the shipping people to this action is absolutely and entirely without any foundation whatever. They are perfectly free agents in the matter. The contract entered into was along the lines which St. John has wanted for so many years, namely, that mails should be delivered to the ships either at Halifax or St. John and that they should be at liberty to use whichever port they pleased.

I am more than surprised at the action in view of the statement attributed to Sir Thomas Shaughnessy to the effect that the Empresses would not call at Halifax at all had they not been compelled to do so. It was unfortunate that when a contract has been entered into in exactly the terms and conditions the people of St. John have so long desired that the result should not have been more satisfactory.

Sir Thomas Shaughnessy wired me yesterday that the Victorian and Virginian, together with all the other Allan and Canadian Pacific railway steamers would go direct from St. John, and that that would be all the steamers that the port could possibly accommodate.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) J. D. Hazen.

Probably that does not refer to the Empresses. My statement then was not probably exact.

Mr. HAZEN: Undoubtedly that has reference to the Empresses.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think so.

Mr. HAZEN: I think so.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think the minister intended to convey to the people of St. John that the Empresses would go from St. John.

Mr. HAZEN: No, all the other Canadian Pacific railway steamers, and the Victorian and the Virginian.

Mr. CARVELL: That is right.

Two or three days after that a delegation

came from St. John to Ottawa to interview the Government. In view of the statements made in that telegram by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and made to the delegation later on, I am bound to assume that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not know of the agreement that had been made between the Intercolonial railway and the Canadian Pacific railway, or what is known in New Brunswick as the Gutelius agreement. I am bound to assume that it was made behind his back, and perhaps he will not consider me discourteous if I say that he did not at that time appreciate the true significance of it after it had been made. If I wanted any evidence of that, I would simply take the statement made by the Premier himself when a delegation met him in Ottawa, I think on the 9th of October.

The Prime Minister practically told the delegation that he did not know the terms of the agreement; he understood it had been made between the two companies but it was purely a business agreement, one into which politics did not enter and in which no members of the Government had taken any part. I do not know that he went so far as to say that no member of the Government had been consulted or considered, but I think we might almost fairly assume that much from the general tenor of his statement to the delegation. Now, if these statements be true—and I give them for what they are worth, and I will allow these hon. gentlemen to explain them as they wish to—we come down to this: The Canadian Pacific railway had been coming to St. John with their Empress boats for three, four or five years. They wanted to continue coming to St. John. It was their home port. The waters of St. John harbour had been found deep enough and broad enough to accommodate the Empresses in the past, and there is no evidence that the waters were more shallow at St. John in 1914 than they were in 1913. Therefore, so far as physical conditions go, there was no reason why the boats should not continue to come. The Victorian and Virginian also had been coming, and there was no reason why they should not continue to come—and it was agreed, I understand, that they should continue to come. The Royal boats had been going to Halifax for three years. They had all the accommodation they wanted, and did not wish any change. The Allan boats had been going to Halifax. I have no strong evidence as to whether they wanted to change or not. As the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows, the Canadian Pacific railway had made arrangements and published advertisements of the sailing dates of their steamships from St. John during the winter season. He knows also that they had made contracts in St. John for the delivery of supplies for the whole season. He must know that; or, if he does not know it, he can easily learn it by going to St. John. All arrangements that a steamship company could make had been made for carrying on their business during the season 1913-14. Then, the right hon. Prime Minister knows, the Royal steamships had made arrangements to go from Halifax and wanted to go from Halifax during the winter; it was to their interest to sail to and from Halifax. But suddenly, as if by magic, without anybody asking these people to make the change, the whole thing was turned upside down, the Canadian Pacific railway steamers were sent from St. John to Halifax. And then, in order, as I say, to try to assuage the wrath that was piling up on the head of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Royal steamers were taken away from Halifax and sent to St. John. I say, wrath was being heaped upon the head of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I am reminded by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) that this feeling of anger and opposition reached such a point that certain members of the Borden Club of St. John resigned their positions. I have here a newspaper clipping giving a copy of the resolution which they passed, and, I think in view of the dissent expressed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to what my hon. friend from Halifax, perhaps I had better read this resolution:

> Whereas a great injustice has been done to the port of St. John by the agreement entered into by the Government railway and the Canadian Pacific railway which agreement plainly discriminates against St. John, in that by it the Canadian Pacific railway is enabled to take away its mail boats, and the mail boats of the Allan line, after they had been advertised to sail from St. John direct, and as the hon. R. L. Borden has stated, that it required the approval of the Minister of Railways before becoming effective, we the undersigned members of the R. L. Borden club, feeling that the ratification should be refused, wish to resign from any active participation in the affairs of the club until this matter has been settled by the cancellation of the Gutelius and Bosworth agreement. We do this as a protest to show that while we are Conservatives, we cannot support a Government if it persists in carrying out this discrimination agreement.

Mr. W. J. Brown, one of those who signed this resolution, had been the Con-

servative organizer for Kings-Albert. I understand that about twelve or thirteen signed this resolution and resigned. I have not the names at hand. This resolution gives you an idea of the pitch to which feeling had arisen in St. John at this time. This was some time in the month of October—the 29th or 30th, I think. When the delegation came to Ottawa about the 7th or 8th October, the Premier told the delegation that he could not give them the exact terms of the agreement, because it was a matter of business between the two railroads, but that later on would send them a copy of it. My recollection is that the delegation remained here for two or three days, but failed to get anything more than the mere headings of the agreement. They then went to Montreal and saw Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, but got very little satisfaction from him. Now, to bear out the statement which I made a few minutes ago that the Canadian Pacific railway wished to remain in St. John, let me read an extract from the St. John Daily Telegraph, of October 6, in which Sir Thomas Shaughnessy is reported to have made the following statement:

St. John, he remarked, is the Canadian Pacific's winter port, and traffic handled to and from Halifax is by grace of the Intercolonial railway. The Atlantic mail service during the past few years has been most satisfactory, the call at both Halifax and St. John involved—

I think that should be 'unsatisfactory,' but I read it as it is.

—undue risks to the vessels in making the trip between the two ports along the coast of Nova Scotia in all sorts of weather, and eastbound passengers who embarked at St. John were necessarily subjected to a delay at Halifax of from twelve to twenty hours each voyage. The company would have sacrificed its interest in the mail subsidy rather than make the two calls again.

According to that, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy would rather even give up the mail subsidy than to call at these two ports. He wanted the mail contract to come to St. John.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Why did he sign the agreement which took him to Halifax? Can the hon. gentleman explain that?

Mr. CARVELL: I am coming to that. Of course, I can only give my own version of it. Now, the condition of affairs which I have been trying to describe—perhaps at a little too great length—was absolutely satisfactory to all the people of St. John, to the people of Halifax, so far as we can see, and to the railway and steamship companies as well. The Royal people wanted to go to Halifax; the Canadian Pacific railway and the Allans—which I understand are about the same thing—wanted to come to St. John and had all their arrangements made accordingly. Now, in order to break up that harmonious condition of affairs between all parties, one of the most memorable agreements in the annals of the Intercolonial railway was prepared and signed on the 30th of September, which, I think, we have from an answer given by the Minister of Railways and Canals this afternoon; and while I have not the agreement in full, I have the substance of it as furnished to the delegation from St. John, which I propose to read. I think this must be practically accurate, because it has been published in the newspapers. My hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has been trying to get the agreement, or a copy of it, ever since this session opened in January, but has failed to do so. Therefore, I do not think the Government can object to my reading the copy furnished the delegation from St. John, which is as follows:

Memorandum of agreement between the Canadian Government Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company covering the transportation of freight and passengers between Halifax and St. John over the Intercolonial railway in connection with the Canadian Pacific and Allan Line steamships, carrying British mails, making Halifax the terminal port (four ships).

The following rates will govern the transportation of passengers:

Passengers and their baggage between Halifax and St. John in either direction, on special or regular trains, $2. first-class, and $1.50 second-class for each adult passenger, with a maximum earning on this traffic on any one train of $300.

It is understood that when special trains are run they shall handle, if necessary, up to twelve cars, making same time as regular through trains.

The Canadian Pacific to supply a reasonable proportion of the necessary equipment and the Intercolonial to undertake without charge such deadhead movements as may be necessary to properly care for the traffic; it being agreed that the Canadian Pacific will not be asked to hold their cars in Halifax for more than seven days at any one time.

The Intercolonial will assume the cost of transfer of baggage between cars and shed floor.

The Intercolonial will pay the same rental and other charges on cars in this service as at present paid on Canadian Pacific equipment handled over the line between St. John and Halifax.

The Canadian Pacific shall pay the same charges for cleaning, supplies, etc., as now paid the Intercolonial.

Freight of all classes, in either direction, 75 cents per ton of 2,000 lb. with the exception of flour and grain which will be carried at the rate of 60 cents per ton of 2,000 lb. The maxi-

mum earning for this traffic on any one train to be $300.

The Canadian Pacific will assume the cost of transferring freight between ships and cars at Halifax.

All grain handled—

There are a few words here which I cannot make out.

Mr. EMMERSON: It means all grains handled through Halifax elevators.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, and it goes on:

—shall pay the usual elevator charge current at other ports.

The Canadian Pacific will assume the clerical work, checking, way-billing and accounting.

The Intercolonial will pay the usual per diem or other charge on freight car equipment engaged in this business, and also all loss or damage which may occur to the freight while in transit between Halifax and St. John.

The Intercolonial will provide the necessary berthing accommodation for the Canadian Pacific and Allan Line ships, and will make no greater charge for wharfage and dockage dues than is charged other steamship lines.

This arrangement will remain in effect from November 15, 1913, to May 15, 1914.

Sgd. G. M. Bosworth,
for Canadian Pacific railway.
F. P. Gutelius,
Canadian Government railways.

Montreal, September 30, 1913.

We have to analyse this agreement in order to see the unfair treatment which has been accorded the Intercolonial railway and the city of St. John. It is hard to figure out what it is costing the Government or the country to handle this traffic, but it is very clear that the Canadian Pacific railway is not paying the Intercolonial railway anything like what it actually costs to handle the traffic—unless all statistics as to the cost of railway transportation which have been given out by railway officials in the past are absolutely false and absurd, and unless freight and passengers can be hauled on railway trains for about one-half or one-third the amount we have been led to believe they can be hauled for. We find that passengers going from St. John to Halifax, or vice versa, shall pay $2 a head for first-class and $1.50 for second-class accommodation. The distance is 275 miles. I do not know what the rate would actually be, but putting it at two cents a mile—and the hon. member for South York (Mr. McLean) can tell me whether or not the Intercolonial railway is giving a two-cent rate—the rate one way would be $5.50, and the Government are hauling Canadian Pacific railway first-class passengers for $2 and second-class passengers for $1.50. If the matter stopped there, it would be bad enough, but nothing like as bad as it is, because it is expressly agreed that the Government railway shall haul trains up to twelve cars in a train, and that the total cost of that train shall not exceed $300. We know that the average railway car to-day, such as is used by the Canadian Pacific railway on through trains, carries at least 75 and perhaps 100 people. I refer not to Pullman cars, but to first-class and second-class coaches. At the rate of only 60 passengers to a car, a train consisting of ten passenger cars and two baggage cars would carry 600 passengers, and at that rate you are only getting fifty cents a passenger instead of $2. If 300 passengers are carried, you are getting only $1 a passenger, because, although it is agreed that the rate shall be $2 a passenger, it is stipulated that the maximum earning on any one train shall be $300. When you read it in that light, you commence to see some of the remarkable conditions of this agreement in so far as passenger traffic is concerned. When you come to the question of freight the conditions are equally as bad, if not worse. The freight rate, the agreement says, shall be seventy-five cents a ton of two thousand pounds, but the same conditions prevail; the total cost to the Canadian Pacific railway on any train shall not exceed $300. I am not sufficiently versed in the doings of the Intercolonial railway to tell exactly how much freight they can handle, but I do know something about railway transportation, and I think I am well within the mark when I say that the average Intercolonial engine—what we call the 100 or 125 per cent engine—will haul at least 600 tons from Halifax to St. John. This 600 tons of freight is hauled for $300; instead of getting seventy-five cents the Government is getting only fifty cents a ton for hauling this freight. Except over heavy grades, such as the Folly Mountain, where a pusher might be required for a short distance, there is no reason why the larger engines running between St. John and Halifax should not haul 700, 800 or 900 tons to a train. If as much as 900 tons are taken on a train, they are getting 900 tons hauled for $300—about thirty cents a ton; and if you take the ordinary moderate estimate of 600 tons to a train, they get this freight hauled for fifty cents a ton. It would be interesting, I am sure, if any hon. gentleman in this House, particularly the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, would take up the freight schedules of the Intercolonial

5 p.m.

railway and see how far out of St. John he can have a ton of freight hauled on the Intercolonial railway for fifty cents. I am sure he would be amused to find what a short distance his freight would be hauled for that amount. But, if you take a carload of freight weighing say 30 tons—I think that is about the average—at fifty cents, the cost of hauling that carload of freight from St. John to Halifax would be $15. I wonder whether my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could have a carload of freight hauled from St. John to Hampton, a distance of some twenty-five miles, for $15. I tell him he could not, and I tell him further that he could not have that carload of freight hauled to Rothesay, a distance of twelve miles, for $15; yet this freight is being hauled to Halifax, a distance of 275 miles, at the rate of about $15 a car. That is not all. In this agreement it is agreed that the Intercolonial will

> Undertake without charge such deadhead movements as may be necessary to properly care for the traffic.

In ordinary language that means that they will bring back the empties free of charge. We do not know what proportion of those cars that go to Halifax will come back as empties, but we know that there will be a large number; we know that the outward freight is probably double or treble the inward freight. I think I am right in saying that probably one-half of these cars come back deadheads. I have made inquiries of competent railway officials, and I find that the railway companies can hardly distinguish the difference in cost between hauling an empty car and a full car. A little more coal may be used in hauling the full car, but all the other charges are practically the same. Even the extra coal may be offset by the fact that the train is longer in the case of empties, and that there is more wind resistance to be overcome. So you are hauling one-half of these cars back as deadheads, which will cost as much as hauling loaded cars. Even that is not all. They actually agreed to pay the ordinary per diem allowance for cars, the rental just as they would pay under other circumstances. I think the rate now is 35 cents a day. That is, if the Canadian Pacific railway hands a car over to the Intercolonial railway, the Intercolonial railway has to pay 35 cents per day until the car is returned to the owning company. This car of freight goes to Halifax and it is at least ten days before it gets back to St. John. Then there is a payment of $3.50, which the Intercolonial railway pays to the Canadian Pacific railway for the use of that car in hauling that freight practically for nothing.

Let us come back to the passengers. They say that passengers and baggage between St. John and Halifax will be carried on special or regular trains for $2 first-class and $1.50 second-class. I do not know how that will work out, because if they are carrying passengers on regular trains, as I figure out, if the regular train earns more than $300 between St. John and Halifax, the Canadian Pacific railway get the benefit of that on whatever proportion of passengers they may have between St. John and Halifax; so you might conceive an instance of the Intercolonial railway hauling passengers for nothing if you had sufficient regular business on the regular train. But I want to be fair, and I assume that the majority of these passengers will be handled in through trains. There might be many cases when a carload of immigrants would be attached to a regular train. As I understand it, you might assume a condition where the Canadian Pacific railway passengers would be actually hauled free of charge, and not only that but the Intercolonial railway would be actually paying rental for the car in which they travelled. This is the means by which they have been able to switch from St. John the traffic which rightly belongs to it. I do not believe, nor does the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or the Minister of Railways, that they can handle this trarffic at the price put down here. If you can haul a carload of freight from St. John to Halifax for $15 and bring that car back empty and pay 35 cents a day for that car while you are doing it, I can only say that the railway companies of this country have been robbing the people to an extent such as we never dreamed of before. But I do not propose to take that ground; I do not propose to say that the railway companies have charged much more than they should. Possibly the rates could be pared down a great deal and yet the railways could pay dividends; but there cannot be any such fearful difference in the actual cost of carrying freight and the rate the railways have been charging, as will be found in this Gutelius agreement.

In the newspapers and in Parliament, since the 7th of October last, we have been trying to ascertain the actual cost of carrying these trains, and the Government will

not vouchsafe one particle of evidence. Therefore I am bound to assume, from my little horse sense and knowledge of railway matters, that they are carrying this traffic at an immense loss. The result is that St. John is losing the business which naturally belongs to it, and the city of Halifax, in order to get around the political difficulties, was compelled to lose business which actually belonged to it. The Canadian Northern, as we all know, do not route their freight over the Canadian Pacific railway through the state of Maine; they do not want to. They want to utilize the Intercolonial from Montreal, and they are doing so, and they want to send their freight from Montreal to Halifax. They want to use Halifax as their port; but, in order to meet the political exigencies of hon. gentlemen—and here I may say the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, because he did get into the worst hole any man ever did in the province— in order to meet the political exigencies of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, they switched the traffic that actually belonged to Halifax away from it; and, in order to meet the political exigencies of the Premier, they switched from the port of St. John the traffic which actually belonged to it, and the Intercolonial railway is carrying that freight for one-half what it costs to operate it, let alone deriving any profit. Sir Thomas Shaughnessy said that this agreement was only made possible by the grace of the Intercolonial railway. If the Intercolonial railway did not haul this freight for less than it cost to do so, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy would not have taken advantage of it, and if he had not done so this switching of traffic would not have taken place.

Coming to the very pertinent question propounded by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), who wants to know why in my opinion all this was done if the railway companies did not want it and St. John and Halifax did not want it, I may say that if I gave the answer which was in my mind some of my friends might not consider it parliamentary. But I leave him to draw the only inference that can be drawn. I ask him if he believes Mr. Gutelius was allowed to make this one-sided agreement, so inimical to the best interests of the Intercolonial railway, without the knowledge and consent of the Government or at least of certain members of it. Has my hon. friend sufficient imagination to believe that that would have taken place? I cannot make myself believe that Mr. Gutelius or any other manager of the Intercolonial railway would make a contract such as this without some one giving him the wink and saying: Go ahead now, you cannot make it too strong for us. It is not possible; it is not reasonable. If I am right in my suggestions, is it not most remarkable that the Intercolonial railway, the one great public asset of the people of eastern Canada, has been prostituted in order to carry out or help smooth over the political exigencies of certain members of the Government?—because there is no other conclusion.

There is another side to this question. I was surprised in looking over the railway statistics recently brought down—I had only a hurried glance at them— to find that the Intercolonial railway was run at a loss last year of something like over $250,000. We were led to believe, during the last session of Parliament, that there was going to be a great surplus of about half a million dollars; but I am told that there was an actual loss. If that is the case, what is going to be the result this year? Oh, but, they say, we are going to have more revenue this year. They are hauling Canadian Pacific railway freight for one-quarter to one-third of what it actually costs, in order to play the political game of my friends opposite and in order to make up for that they have increased the freight rates from Montreal to Sydney.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL: There is not a member here representing a Maritime constituency, let him be Liberal or Conservative, but will say 'hear, hear' to that statement. Things got so bad that two or three members supporting the Government threatened to resign if something were not done to ameliorate the condition of affairs thrust upon the people by the action of Mr. Gutelius.

Mr. EMMERSON: Where is the Minister of Railways?

Mr. CARVELL: He will read what we are saying, and will be here to-morrow or later to answer these statements. I do not know whether the rates on the Intercolonial railway are above what they ought to be or not. I do not live along the Intercolonial railway, and I have nothing to do with that, but I read the newspapers, and I do know that practically every class of freight on the Intercolonial railway has been boosted up from fifteeen to twenty-five or thirty per cent. In other words, every man along

the line who has to earn a living by importing and exporting, every man who uses the railway in his ordinary business, is compelled to pay fifteen to twenty-five per cent more in freight rates than formerly, in order that the Government may be in a position to divert Canadian Pacific railway freight from one part of Canada to another part. They are compelled to haul this freight for less than it costs. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether this appeals to you as a business proposition, or something the Government of this country should have done, and I ask you and every other member of this House, if you do not think the Government deserves a very, very serious castigation for the manner in which they have handled the Intercolonial railway purely for political purposes.

I have just a word to say to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I hope he will not sit quiet during so important a debate as this. My hon. friend knows that his friends in the city of St. John, and when I use the word friends I mean every good citizen there, whether a political supporter of his or not—are looking to the Minister of Marine for an explanation of this most remarkable condition of affairs on the Intercolonial railway, which has made possible the switching from St. John of the traffic which rightly and naturally belongs to it; and they are looking for an answer to the statement which I made here this afternoon, that the Intercolonial railway is carrying freight for one-third to one-half of what it actually costs, and making every citizen of St. John who uses the railway pay greater freight rates in order to make this possible. I hope my hon. friend will tell this House, and the people of his constituency at the same time, whether he was a party to this unfair and unbusinesslike transaction. I hope my hon. friend will not think I am impertinent in putting this question to him. I admit it is a pretty straightforward question, but it seems to me the time has come when the question should be answered. Every elector in the province of New Brunswick wants it answered; his constituents and all the people of Halifax and Nova Scotia want it answered; and if my hon. friend does not feel like answering it now, I hope before this debate closes he will give us the true history of this matter and tell the people of St. John why Mr. Gutelius was allowed to make this most wonderful and most one-sided agreement. We had hoped in New Brunswick that this agreement would not be ratified. A delegation consisting of the Board of Trade and the leading members of the city of St. John, irrespective of politics, came here and urged upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Prime Minister that the agreement should not be ratified until the city of St. John had had an opportunity of protesting and showing up the iniquity of it even from a business point of view. They were put off with soft words and sent home practically with the promise that they would be given the opportunity. They retained the hon. member for St. John and Mr. Baxter, a member of the local legislature. These people were prepared to fight this matter out from an economical standpoint. They asked no favours, they were giving no favours, and I believe the people of Halifax felt the same. The people of St. John were preparing to have a fuller investigation into this matter, and all they asked the Government to do was to hold up the ratification of this agreement until they had an opportunity of presenting their views. They were led to believe they would have such an opportunity; but five or six days afterwards they were told, Oh, it has gone through, and that is the end of it. These are some of the points to which I would direct the attention of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I think he should give his constituents his true reason for remaining in a Government which has so discriminated against his constituents as this Government has in this notorious Gutelius agreement.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, while I am a member of the Government who got notice from my hon. friend the junior member from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) that this question would be discussed to-day, my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) has discussed the question and the situation mostly from the railway point of view. I am sorry I did not know that before, because I would have notified my colleague the Minister of Railways to be here so that he might have replied to certain parts of the speech of my hon. friend. My hon. friend has made a great effort to show that the bargain entered upon by the Intercolonial and the Canadian Pacific railway was a bad bargain from the point of view of the Government railway. I must confess that I was not prepared to discuss that part of the question, which

does no apply to my department. I do not know very much about it except this: the Canadian Pacific railway had occasion to speak to me in connection with my department, about this contract to which my hon. friend has referred, and far from being under the impression that this was a very bad bargain for the Intercolonial railway, which the hon. member for Carleton has tried to convey to the House, the Canadian Pacific railway were under the impression that if that bargain did not cover mail transportation they had made a very bad bargain for themselves. The question came up in connection with the special trains to take the mails from Halifax. The Canadian Pacific railway pretended they were entitled to handle those mails on their trains from Halifax to Montreal. I need not tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I gave the preference to our own railway.

Mr. CARVELL: We know that in New Brunswick.

Mr. PELLETIER: I suppose that is another complaint which my hon. friend has. Let him bring it up and I will deal with it to his satisfaction, which is not a very easy thing to do.

Mr. CARVELL: One thing at a time.

Mr. PELLETIER: Yes. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. The contract for the carrying of the mails from Halifax to Montreal was given to the Intercolonial railway, and then the Canadian Pacific railway complained very bitterly and very loudly. They said the contract should have been given to them, under the arrangement which has been referred to. Finally, however, the Intercolonial railway got the contract. The complaint by the Canadian Pacific railway was that they had made a very bad bargain indeed, if they did not have the right to carry the mails from Halifax to Montreal. However, I need not discuss the merits of the agreement entered into. I have been very much impressed with the speeches made by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) whom I see now sitting side by side. I never saw such a case of riding two horses, and, at the same time, riding two horses going in opposite directions, as these two gentlemen have performed today. It was a most wonderful performance.

Mr. CARVELL: Was it well done?

[Mr. Pelletier.]

Mr. PELLETIER: It was pretty well done, but I think it is being carried to such length that the people will understand it before long. These hon. gentlemen surely cannot have any reasonable expectation that the people of Canada will be fooled by the diverse attitudes taken by these two deskmates, one saying you have done wrong to Halifax, and another sayiing: you have done wrong to St. John. How could an injustice be done to St. John by the steamships going there, and at the same time an injustice be done to Halifax by the steamships using that port? However, my hon. friend from St. John says that what was done was wrong, and my hon. friend from Halifax says the same thing, so that an ordinary individual will find it pretty difficult to recognize the consistency of the attitude taken by these hon. gentlemen.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Argue the question and never mind that.

Mr. PELLETIER: I am trying to find out what these hon. gentlemen mean, because in order to argue the point they attempt to make, I must first know what their point is. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) says: 'You have taken away the steamships from Halifax to bring them to St. John.'

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I say you violated your contract.

Mr. CARVELL: I say so too.

Mr. PELLETIER: Then, when the hon. member for Halifax takes his seat, the hon. member for Carleton rises and says: 'You have wronged St. John.' Which of the two are we to believe?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Both.

Mr. PELLETIER: That is just the kind of policy pursued by my right hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: You are wrong both ways.

Mr. PELLETIER: The right hon. gentleman puts two absolutely opposite policies before the country and he tells the people that they must take stock in both of them. We have been told by the hon. member for Halifax and by the hon. member for Carleton, that we entered into a contract which they both agree was eminently fair, for they tell us that the contract which was made by the four steamship companies gave the ports of Halifax and St. John a chance to stand on their own merits, and they say further that every person in Nova Scotia

and New Brunswick was satisfied with that provision. I want to say that we have lived up to that contract. When I submitted the contract to the House, I stated that the companies objected very strongly to calling at both ports, because they said, it was a most dangerous and expensive voyage. They said we will go to one port, but we will not call at both. It was then provided that the steamship companies should call at whichever port they saw fit, provided it was a Canadian port, this being the only restriction which I, as Postmaster General, put in the contract. We are told by these hon. gentlemen opposite to-day that this was an eminently fair proposition. But can either of these hon. gentlemen contend for a moment that this contract has been changed? It has not been changed. It stands to-day just as it stood when it was entered into.

Mr. CARVELL: The minister says the contract has not been changed and that the companies have gone to the port they selected. Will he say that neither the Government, nor any member of the Government, used pressure on the Canadian Northern Railway Company to change from Halifax to St. John ?

Mr. PELLETIER: If the hon. member will allow me to make my statement, he will not find it necessary to ask such a question.

Mr. CARVELL: I only wanted to have the views of the minister on that point.

Mr. PELLETIER: My statement now is that the contracts have not been changed since they were signed; they are contracts only for the current year up to the first of May next. The companies were allowed, under the contract, to choose whatever port they wished. If there has been trouble over the matter it is due to a fact to which neither the hon. member for Halifax nor the hon. member for Carleton has referred, and which (while I do not want to unduly criticise any one), provoked a most unhappy situation. When the contract was entered into, I said to the contractors: I will state in the House that the ports are going to stand on their respective merits; that you can make your selection of either, and I did so. Then, at a given moment, when every one believed that each port would be given a fair test and a fair chance to stand on its own merits, the announcement was made that all the ships were going to St. John. This fact has not been referred to by either of the hon. gentlemen opposite, but they know it to be true.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Do you say that all the ships are going to St. John ?

Mr. PELLETIER: Yes, every one of them.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I never heard of that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Who made that announcement?

Mr. PELLETIER: The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the Allans.

Mr. CARVELL: We understood that the Canadian Pacific railway and the Allans were going to St. John, but not the Canadian Northern ships.

Mr. PELLETIER: I am not referring to the Royals now.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Nor the White Star.

Mr. PELLETIER: I refer to the announcement made about all the big ships; the Alsatian and the Calgarian were expected to be on the route and they were to go to St. John as also the Empresses, and the Victorian, and Virginian. There was no announcement made so far as the Royals are concerned. One fine morning this announcement was made to the public in St. John. I am not blaming any one for doing it, but I do say that it created trouble, and that all the trouble to which the hon. gentlemen opposite have referred, originated at that point. We found these contractors, using the full liberty they had under their contract, at a given moment changing their minds, and instead of all the steamers going to Halifax it was announced they were all going to St. John.

Mr. CARVELL: You were awfully surprised, were you not?

Mr. PELLETIER: I was awfully surprised, because I did not think it was fair treatment of the people. I say so now on the floor of the House, and I told the interested parties it was unfair for the steamship companies to let the people of St. John think they were going there, and then have men like the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) rising in this House, as he did to-day, and saying that it was the Government that was responsible for what occurred. We knew, considering the kind of political warfare that was being carried on, that we would be told, as we were told this afternoon, that we had power over the contractors to make them do as we wished. The Government were

no party to the change in any way, shape or form.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The companies had the power to select their port?

Mr. PELLETIER: Certainly.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What was the trouble, then?

Mr. PELLETIER: The trouble was that they had advertised that they were going to St. John, and then in twenty-four or forty-eight hours they changed their minds completely and stated that they were going to Halifax.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Amongst whom would that make trouble, and what was the nature of the trouble?

Mr. PELLETIER: The nature of the trouble should be very easily understood by a clever gentleman like my hon. friend from Halifax. Supposing the companies had advertised publicly that they were all going to Halifax, and the people of Halifax had been very much pleased over this, and then within forty-eight hours after the people of Halifax had had this good news, the companies changed their minds and all decided to go to St. John; would not the people of Halifax be disappointed. It stands to reason they would.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is what happened?

Mr. PELLETIER: That is what happened in St. John. The companies, after advertising publicly that they would go to St. John, changed their minds two or three days afterwards and, instead of having all their fine ships, the Alsatian, the Calgarian, the Victorian, the Virginian and the Empresses going to St. John as advertised, and after having made a timetable for St. John, they decided to go to Halifax. This was done without the intervention of the Government, in any way, shape or form. It has created the regrettable situation which now exists, and I have had occasion to tell the people who did it what I thought of them. It was done, however. After all this took place, the Royal boats, seeing that all these other ships were going to Halifax, decided to go to St. John. No undue pressure nor undue influence was brought to bear on the Royal line to go either to St. John or to Halifax.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What kind of influence was it if it was not undue influence? Will the hon. minister describe what influence was exercised?

[Mr. Pelletier.]

Mr. PELLETIER: Well, I cannot describe a thing which does not exist. My hon. friend will have to live a few years longer before he tries to catch me with such a question as that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I was not trying to catch the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PELLETIER: I was not born a few years ago.

Mr. CARVELL: It is information that we are after.

Mr. PELLETIER: None of the steamship companies which have entered into this contract has been forced by my department to change the terms of its contract or to enter into a new contract.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will the hon. minister deny that he had interviews with the Canadian Northern Steamship Company on this matter?

Mr. PELLETIER: I will not deny that I had interviews with all these railway companies and steamship companies in regard to this matter. I told them what I thought of this advertising which was changed later on and stated that it created a regrettable situation. My hon. friend would have done the same thing had he been in my place. No undue influence or pressure, however, was exercised to bring to Halifax vessels which were going to St. John. If it were true that the Government had taken the Empresses from St. John to put them into Halifax and had taken the Royals from Halifax to put them into St. John, we would have done a thing which would have compensated itself, but we would have created trouble for ourselves to no purpose. The Royals have been going to St. John under the terms of the agreement which has been signed and which has not been changed.

The whole situation can be summed up in the following way: Our friends, the Liberals in St. John, say that we are interfering in favour of Halifax, and the Liberals in Halifax say that we are interfering in favour of St. John. They are trying to create local prejudice in both cities against the Government, whereas the Government is trying to inaugurate a great public service in the interest of the country at large. They go to the city of St. John and say: Look at this Government; they are doing this for Halifax and they should do it for St. John. They go to the city of Halifax and say: Look at this Government; they are doing this for St.

John and they should do it for Halifax. The Liberals are doing this in order to create local prejudice and they expect the people to believe that the Government is doing these things. I have been disappointed at the way in which this matter has been treated. We have tried to give a good service to Canada. We are disappointed in some respects on account of the Alsatian and the Calgarian not being in service last summer. We hope to be able to improve the service next year, and have strong reasons to believe that we are going to do so. I think, however, that every member of this House should help us to make this a great public service rather than a question in which petty local prejudice will take first place and first rank.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If I understood my hon. friend aright, he said that all the trouble in this matter came from the fact that Canadian Pacific Railway Company, after having advertised that they would take their ships to St. John, within forty-eight hours changed their minds and decided to go to Halifax instead.

Mr. PELLETIER: I would not like to say that it was within forty-eight hours, but it was two or three or four days afterwards.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is not my point. The important point is this, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, after having stated to the people at St. John and to the country that their ships would go to St. John, changed their minds within a short time and said that they would take them to Halifax. Can my hon. friend explain how it is that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would have acted in that way? What was their reason for so doing?

Mr. PELLETIER: I cannot state what was their reason, but I told them that it was not fair treatment to the people of St. John to tell them they were going there, and then a few days later to change their minds, thus creating trouble for us. I did not mince matters with them. They said they thought it was in the interest of the company to make the change and they had done it. That is the answer I got.

Mr. CARVELL: Was it before the 30th of September, 1913, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company announced that they were going to St. John, and did they change their minds after the 30th of September?

Mr. PELLETIER: I could not say whether it was after or before, because I only came back from the West on the 30th of September. My recollection of the matter is what was stated to us at an interview which the citizens of St. John had with my right hon. friend the leader of the Government. I was present at that interview which took place about the beginning of October. They made the statement that these advertisements had been sent out by the Allan Line and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. After the meeting was over I went to these gentlemen and said that I would like them to show me these advertisements so that I could say that I had seen them. That is what justified me in speaking in regard to the matter later on.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Just because advertisements had been sent out?

Mr. PELLETIER: Because advertisements had been sent out and made known to the public.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: You think that that is important?

Mr. PELLETIER: Yes, I do.

Mr. CARVELL: My friend has not left it quite clear in my mind, but I understand that he comes to the conclusion, from what certain gentlemen from St. John told him, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company changed their minds within two or three days. Did he afterwards get the information from the Canadian Pacific railway, that they had changed their minds?

Mr. PELLETIER: I heard it in the first instance from the gentlemen who came here on the deputation. I think that the advertisements were published some time towards the end of September, when I was away in the West. I remember coming back to Ottawa on the 30th of September, and that interview took place some time in October. Then for the first time I heard that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Allan Company had done this.

Mr. CARVELL: The minister has not caught the point. Did he afterwards get information from the Canadian Pacific railway themselves that they had changed their minds?

Mr. PELLETIER: Yes. I put it up to the Canadian Pacific railway. I said: Why did you do that? They said they thought it in the interest of their own company, and

the contract, they said, allowed them to change their port.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister): As I may not have an opportunity to speak this evening, I would like to say a word on this subject in the short time allowed before the House rises. The facilities provided in the way of terminals both at Halifax and St. John have not been adequate in recent years for the traffic. In both cities new terminals are being constructed, and it is hoped that, within a very short time, at both these ports terminals will be provided which will enable them to handle traffic at least on equal terms with any other port on the Atlantic, or any port elsewhere in the world. The contract to which my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) has referred left it open to each company to select the port from which it should sail. I did not personally conduct the negotiations, but I understood that there was a decided objection on the part of the companies to having their ships call at both ports. The desire was that they should call at one port or the other; and we left it entirely open to the companies to select the port from which they should sail. Now the hon. gentlemen who have brought this matter forward have stated the terms of the contract and have said that by reason of some supposed action of the Government the contract has had a certain result. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) who made the motion, endeavours to create the impression that the result operates as a discrimination againt Halifax; and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) who seconded the motion endeavours to make it appear that the result is a discrimination against St. John.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not argue that.

Mr. BORDEN: That is the direct inference, as I understand it, from what my hon. friend has said; for he complained, in the course of his remarks, that certain steamships which formerly called at Halifax did not now call at Halifax but called at St. John. He attributed that result to the interference of the Government. But the gentleman who seconded the motion complains that certain steamships which formerly called at St. John now call at Halifax, and he, in his turn, attributed that result to the action of the Government. I do not think I have characterized the conduct of either of these gentlemen in terms to which he can take exception. So far as we were concerned, we left it open to these companies to select their own ports. A certain amount of discussion has arisen in Halifax and in St. John with regard to the action taken by the respective steamship companies. They were at perfect liberty under the terms of this contract to select the port from which they should sail, and the Government had no means, so far as I am aware, of compelling them or inducing them to go to either one port or the other. I have observed that it has been freely stated in the press which supports hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that some inducement was offered by the Government to one or the other of these companies to take the course they did take. I desire to say that any such statement or insinuation is absolutely without foundation. So far as concerns the terms of the arrangement with the Canadian Pacific railway, which my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), who seems to be something of a railway expert, considers absolutely unfair to the Intercolonial railway, the general manager of the Intercolonial railway never had any suggestion or instruction from any member of the Government, so far as I am aware—and certainly not from myself—to make any contract which was not fair and just and equitable to the Intercolonial railway on business terms. And when my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., undertakes to say that the terms are not fair to the Intercolonial railway, I do not propose to set myself up as a railway expert, but I would like to say to him that a little knowledge in these matters, as in some other matters, may occasionally be found a dangerous thing. It was perfectly agreeable to the Government that the terms of this contract should be submitted to the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and it was suggested, when complaint was made in regard to the terms that these terms should be submitted, but no effective step in that direction has been taken from that time to the present, because, as I understand it, it was not desired to press the proposal to that extent.

Mr. CARVELL: What would be the use?

Mr. BORDEN: I do not know what my hon. friend suggests by that question.

Mr. CARVELL: The contract was made and the ships had gone to Halifax; what was the use of the people of St. John bothering about the Railway Commission?

Mr. BORDEN: The contract made might be modified. It was made only for six

months. But it was perfectly agreeable to the Government to have the terms examined by any railway expert. It was suggested that the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada should be empowered to do so. My hon. friend says they have no jurisdiction. But they could be given jurisdiction, if necessary, by this Parliament, to investigate any such matter. I am not familiar with the terms of the contract. The hon. gentleman states that as I understand it, that the sum of $15 per car was fixed—

Mr. CARVELL: That is the way it figures out—$300 a train.

Mr. BORDEN: He calculates the rate at $15 a car from Halifax to St. John; and he declares this rate to be so absurd that it cannot be regarded as a business contract.

Mr. CARVELL: I am assuming twenty cars to the train, and that at $300 to the train, makes $15 a car.

Mr. COCHRANE: That is not the agreement.

Mr. BORDEN: I took my hon. friend at his word. I do not understand these questions of freight—do not profess to understand them. But I will tell him what the Minister of Railways in the late Government put before this House as a reasonable cost for the carriage of cars of wheat and grain from Montreal to Halifax, the distance being estimated at 828 miles. It was hauled at 2·15 cents per bushel. And it was stated in answer to a question by that minister on that occasion that the estimated cost per bushel for the service operated by the Intercolonial railway was 2·27 cents per bushel.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is my hon. friend reading from?

Mr. BORDEN: From an answer given by Hon. James Sutherland, then Minister of Railways, in this House, in the session of 1903. I am not aware of the exact date, but I can ascertain it. It was given early in the session of 1903, in answer to a question proposed by Mr. Kemp. If I understand correctly it is estimated that a carload is 1,000 bushels—that would be a large car. I am told that grain cars at that date carried only 600 bushels of wheat. But even at 1,000 bushels per car, if my arithmetic is correct, it would work out at $22.70 for the haulage of the car for a distance of 828 miles. For a 600-bushel car it would be only $13.62. The distance from Halifax to St. John is about 270 miles or less than one-third of that that distance, so that the same rate is applied to the haulage of grain spoken of by Mr. Sutherland, the acting Minister of Railways and Canals in 1903, would have brought the cost up to about $45 a car.

Mr. GERMAN: The right hon. gentleman neglects this point: In the agreement with Sutherland no maximum amount to be collected was mentioned; whereas in the agreement referred to on this occasion there is a maximum amount of $300.

Mr. COCHRANE: Not for freight trains.

Mr. BORDEN: I am dealing only with the point brought up by the hon. member for Carleton, namely, that the charge of $15 for the haulage of a car from St. John to Halifax was so absolutely absurd that the agreement should not be called a business agreement. I would point out that on the same basis the Intercolonial railway, for hauling a car from Montreal to Halifax, should have received more than $45 instead of $13.62 or $22.70.

Mr. EMMERSON: I would call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that the freight charges on the Intercolonial railway from here to Halifax are governed by the mileage on the Canadian Pacific, a competing road, and not by its own mileage.

Mr. BORDEN: I am dealing with the point raised by the hon. member for Carleton, and that point only. I do not profess to be an expert in these matters, as the hon. member for Westmorland is said to be, and as the hon. member for Carleton claims to be. The assertion was made that the price of $15 a car from Halifax to St. John was so absurd that the agreement could not be called a business agreement. I am pointing out that in the answer which was given by a member of the late Administration it was stated that a much lower rate was a reasonable charge for hauling a car from Montreal to Halifax, a distance of 828 miles, and therefore I would be inclined to doubt the absolute knowledge of my hon. friend from Carleton with regard to the subject.

I think that the interests of the country may, perhaps, be safely left in the hands of the gentleman who is at present the general manager of the Intercolonial railway, and who is familiar with these matters—certainly more familiar with them than any hon. gentleman in this House can claim to be. So far as the Government was concerned, the object and desire was to provide a better steamship service across the Atlan-

tic and a more speedy conveyance of the mails. In doing that, for the reasons which have been adduced by the railway companies themselves, we left it open to these railway and steamship companies to select their own port. It has happened that two of the Canadian Pacific boats which formerly went to St. John now go to Halifax, and that two of the Canadian Northern boats which formerly went to Halifax now go to St. John. That was a matter over which the Government had no control; that was a matter which under the terms of the contract was absolutely open to the railway and steamship companies themselves to settle—and they did settle it accordingly. Even upon the assumption put forward by the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who have discussed this subject, I do not consider that there has been any detriment up to the present time to the interests of either port. I entirely concur in what my hon. friend the Postmaster General has said, that it is not a desirable thing in this House to stir up and dwell upon local animosities or jealousies, but that the two ports, Halifax and St. John, should work together for a common purpose, namely, that of keeping, as far as may be reasonably possible, Canadian traffic, increasing as it is by leaps and bounds from year to year, for our own ports and our own transportation companies.

Mr. PELLETIER: Of course there is no objection to the papers in this matter being produced, but I decidedly object to that part of the motion in which we are called upon to bring down conversations. We have no detectaphones in our department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Lucky for you.

Mr. PELLETIER: I suppose my hon. friend will not mind my asking him to amend his motion to that effect?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not see why the hon. Postmaster General should not tell the House the substance of the personal interviews held between himself and officials of the Canadian Northern railway. I know that such interviews did take place.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmorland): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) and my right hon. friend the leader of the Government (Mr. Borden), in dealing with this matter, have confined themselves entirely to contending that this is a difficulty between two maritime cities and that the discussion of it is for the purpose of arraying the one against the other; and the Postmaster General, with a dexterity which is characteristic of him, dealt with it purely from that standpoint. I am not concerned with that aspect of the question. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has dealt with it from this standpoint, that the Government had dealt with the matter not merely to the detriment of the city of St. John or the city of Halifax, but had dealt with it unfairly and unjustifiably in affecting and changing the terms of a contract which had been entered into by the Government of Canada with respect to the carriage of mail. The hon. member for Carleton, N. B., (Mr. Carvell), was not seeking to array one city against the other. He was pointing out distinctly that the Government was doing a wrong to the Intercolonial railway and thereby injuring the interests of Canada at large, in doing as they did—bringing influence to bear to change, in the one instance, the terminals of the Canadian Pacific railway mail steamships, and, in the other instance, the terminals of the Canadian Northern mail steamships. I am interested in the discussion of this matter solely from the standpoint of the way in which it deals with and treats the Intercolonial railway. I think that this contract that was entered into between Mr. Gutelius as representative of the Intercolonial railway and Mr. Bosworth as representing the interests of the Canadian Pacific railway is one of the most outrageous contracts ever entered into between railway companies and one that never would have been entered into by two private corporations. I am sorry the Minister of Railways is not in his seat else I would remind him that last session he came down to the House and told of securing Mr. Gutelius upon a two years' contract at the rate of $20,000 a year; he said that he had secured his services as manager of the Intercolonial railway for that period, that he was so important a railway man and was considered as having such great qualifications that the Canadian Pacific railway had merely lent him to the Government for two years in order that he could serve the interests of the Intercolonial railway. We find that after he was engaged as general manager of the Intercolonial railway he entered into this contract, an old employee of the Canadian Pacific railway, for the time being in the employment of the Intercolonial

railway, which railway paid his salary—he entered into a contract with the Canadian Pacific railway with respect to traffic rates over the Intercolonial railway. If my right hon. friend the Prime Minister were in his seat I would ask him if it was true, as stated in the Halifax Herald, during September last, that he called upon Sir Thomas Shaughnessy and made the request of him that Halifax should be made the Atlantic terminal port for their steamships. It was so stated in the Halifax Herald and it was so represented, that Mr. Borden as leader of the Government and representing the city of Halifax, went to the Canadian Pacific railway, as represented by Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, and requested that this be done, that Sir Thomas Shaughnessy's answer was that he could not make Halifax the terminal point when he had St. John fixed for that purpose and that it would entail too serious a loss to the Canadian Pacific railway to change the terminal point and to go to Halifax instead of St. John, and that unless the loss was assumed by the Intercolonial railway he would not make such a change. That is a report of an incident which appears in the Halifax Herald, which certainly is not unfriendly to this Government or to the right hon. gentleman who leads it. We only have the circumstances as a guide to the interpretation of the change that was made. Now it is represented on behalf of the Canadian Pacific railway that going to Halifax would entail a very serious loss to them in the transportation of their freight and passengers to such a distance, particularly in the case of freight. It is recognized that the distance between Montreal and Halifax by way of St. John over the Canadian Pacific railway is shorter than the route over the Intercolonial railway and if the contention of the Canadian Pacific railway, as represented by Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, is correct, that they could not carry their freight to Halifax except at a loss and that that loss must be assumed by the Intercolonial if he was to be induced to go to Halifax over the rails of the Intercolonial railway, then it must be assumed also that by the longer haul, the greater mileage from Montreal to Halifax, the Intercolonial railway has been sustaining a very serious loss in its export business from Montreal to the port of Halifax. Herein we are face to face with this condition that the Intercolonial railway, if it is true that a loss is incurred by reason of using Halifax as a terminal point, must assume the burden of its own loss and at the same time, by this agreement, assume the burden of the loss of the Canadian Pacific railway. Evidently the Canadian Pacific railway insisted that the loss should be borne by the Government through the Intercolonial railway. The agreement entered into is evidence of that fact. My hon. friend from Carleton has referred to that agreement, I hold that it is an irregular and illegal agreement—and I am sorry that the Minister of Railways is not here. This afternoon, he brought down an answer to a question that was placed on the Order Paper, stating that the agreement was entered into on a certain date, and that it had not been made the subject matter of an Order in Council. I need only cite to the House and remind the Government—they must have known it—that under the 46th section of the Government Railway Act of Canada, the Governor in Council, alone, has the right to fix the tolls to be charged on traffic over the Intercolonial; that the Minister of Railway himself has not the power to fix tolls; that it can only be done on his recommendation under the authority of the Governor in Council. The 46th section reads:

> The Governor in Council may impose—
>
> 'May' is read in the statutes interchangeably with 'shall.'
>
> —and authorize the collection of tolls and dues upon any railway vested in His Majesty, or under the control or management of the minister, and, from time to time, in like manner, may alter and change such tolls or dues, and may declare the exemptions therefrom.
>
> 2. All such tolls and dues shall be payable in advance, if so demanded by the collector thereof.

The 47th section reads:

> All such tolls and dues may be recovered, with costs, in any court of competent jurisdiction, by the collector or person appointed to receive the same, in his own name or in the name of His Majesty, and by any form of proceeding by which debts to His Majesty may be recovered.

I hold that in the management of the Intercolonial railway all rates and tolls must first be fixed by the Governor in Council and that they are not collectable unless made by him; and in the history of the administration of that railway from the beginning down to the present day every tariff, every arrangement made with respect to even special tariffs, has been made under the authority of the Governor in Council, and under that authority only. Even in cases of urgent necessity, where the minister has been called upon to act, or direct

that his manager shall act, with respect to fixing certain special rates, these have always been made the subject matter of an Order in Council. I recall my own exrience in that regard. I know of the experience of other administrators of that department. I was amazed when I read the answer of the present Minister of Railways to the effect that an arrangement had been entered into between the Intercolonial railway and the Canadian Pacific railway, affecting so seriously the traffic of the Intercolonial railway, and that such agreement had not been made the subject matter of an Order in Council. It was not even known to the right hon. the Prime Minister in September or October last when he had that celebrated interview with the delegation from the city of St. John. It is evidently not known to the Minister of Railways and Canals, and I am not surprised at that, because things are going on, apparently, which are entirely unknown to him, such matters as the changing or discontinuance of trains, which he denies one day in Parliament, and about which he is compelled to give a correction on the next day, and acknowledge that he was wrong and that they occurred without any information on his part. It seems strange indeed that when that delegation from St. John questioned the right hon. the leader of the Government and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Postmaster General, at the interview held in Ottawa in October last, and asked what the agreement was, they one and all said they knew nothing about it. It was something that had been done by the general manager. At least they must have learned about it a very short time afterwards. If they did not do so, they were recreant to their duty. They must have learned of this traffic arrangement, and I think I have the right to complain, Mr. Speaker, with reference to this matter. We only have before us the heads of this traffic agreement. We have not the agreement itself. It has not been made, admittedly, the subject of an Order in Council. On the very first day of this session I moved for a return asking for a copy of the agreement. It has not been furnished, and no information has been given, as it could have been given this evening by the Minister of Railways, with respect to that contract. We are discussing a matter that affects vitally the trade and traffic of the Dominion and the interests of the Maritime provinces, and yet the Government has withheld—I do not know for what purpose—the full text of an agreement that was entered into by Mr. Gutelius, their servant, without authority. Mr. Gutelius told the people of the city of St. John that he had signed a contract and that it was fixed. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries apparently concurred in the idea, and he admittedly, by his silence, said that it was fixed. The right hon. leader of the Government assumed because Mr. Gutelius made this arrangement, that therefore it was fixed and binding upon the Government of Canada. I charge the responsibility upon the Government itself. If they were ignorant of the requirements of the law under which they were operating the railway, then that is inexcusable on their part. They should have known that no such agreement could be effective or legal unless it were made the subject matter of an Order in Council. But the agreement goes further—

Mr. PELLETIER: It is only a temporary agreement.

Mr. EMMERSON: I care not if it were only for one week. I say that the Minister of Railways himself could not enter into such an arrangement, much less could his general manager acting under him, and therefore it seems to me that while they are operating under this agreement they are doing it illegally, against the authority of the law. They must know with respect to the matter. I think my right hon. friend the leader of the Government and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries treated somewhat cavalierly the delegation from St. John. I think that their promise, that they should have the full text of the agreement—which has never been implemented—was just a piece of jollying. I am sorry to come to that conclusion, but I am bound to do so, and I think my right hon. friend in dealing with this matter this afternoon in this House was not treating the House in the way he should. He was not dealing with this matter seriously. He must know that the agreement is not a legal agreement and not binding; he must know that the Government of Canada cannot, His Majesty the King cannot, legally recover any freight charges made under that agreement. The Minister of Railways repudiated the idea that $300 was the maximum charge on a freight train which might contain 30 cars or 50 cars, between St. John and Halifax, but he admitted that $300 was the maximum charge on a 12 car

passenger train. Let me point out to him that the agreement says:

> Freight of all classes in either direction 75 cents per ton of 2,000 lbs, with the exception of flour and grain which will be carried at the rate of 60 cents per ton of 2,000 lbs; the maximum earning for this traffic on any one train to be $300.

It is not unusual that freight trains between St. John and Halifax may consist of 30 cars, or 40 cars, and even 50 cars; it is largely dependent upon the capacity of the cars hauled and the power of the locomotive used, and yet it is clear that $300 is the maximum charge no matter what the size of the train. I do not think it is opportune for me now to discuss the financial features of this arrangement, but there is no doubt that here we have an arrangement entered into between the Government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific railway, an arrangement not authorized by the Government by Order in Council but carried into effect by their servant and subordinate, and an arrangement which entails upon the Government of Canada the enormous burden of hauling between St. John and Halifax heavily loaded freight trains for the munificent sum of $300. This agreement involves further, the carrying of these empty cars back to St. John without charge; it involves the payment to the Canadian Pacific railway of a per diem and wheelage allowance on the use of these cars, because the Intercolonial railway is compelled to pay wheelage on these empty cars. What a magnificent contract! Can there be found for it a parallel in America or in the entire railway world? Can there be found anywhere on this continent a like arrangement between any two railway companies? It is not necessary for me to discuss the ulterior motives, if any, the parties had in executing such an arrangement; it only rests with me to state the facts. But, Sir, it involves more than the payment of a merely nominal charge for the carrying of this freight and passenger traffic between St. John and Halifax; it involves the cancellation of trains all over the Intercolonial railway. And why do I say this? I say it because in order to carry out the agreement entered into with the Canadian Pacific railway, the Intercolonial railway, short as it is of motive power, have been compelled to discontinue ordinary trains and take away locomotives for the transportation of special trains for the Canadian Pacific railway between Halifax and St. John. And all this has to be done on account of this nominal remuneration paid to the Intercolonial railway. More than that, and I have proof of the fact, the Intercolonial railway trains are held up repeatedly in order to allow the special trains of the Canadian Pacific railway to have the right of way, the Intercolonial railway trains being subordinated to the convenience of the Canadian Pacific railway trains. Not later than Saturday last, an important train to the business interests of that section of the country represented by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes), the train known as No. 83, running from Springhill to Moncton daily except Sunday, was filled with passengers, among them many from Amherst going westwards, and that train was held up for 27 minutes at Aulec station to suit the convenience of a Canadian Pacific railway special running under the terms of this agreement. That same train on the same day was held up for 20 minutes at Sackville, in order to accommodate another Canadian Pacific railway train, so that the large number of passengers on the Intercolonial railway train were delayed 47 minutes to suit the convenience of the Canadian Pacific railway.

But that is not all. The Intercolonial railway trains have been disarranged and cancelled to the disadvantage of the employees of the Intercolonial railway, and to their loss and damage. I am amazed that hon. members from the Maritime provinces, who support the Government knowing as they must know the inconvenience and loss and damage to the people of the Maritime provinces, do not protest against this agreement. It is not too late yet for them to protest. The Government has not ratified the agreement by Order in Council; they have been shielding themselves behind Mr. Gutelius; and who is Mr. Gutelius? I do not know that he is even a Canadian. At one time, I know that he was an importation from the United States, and he came to the Intercolonial railway after he had attempted certain work in connection with the Transcontinental railway, and perhaps we will have the evidence of that work this week as promised by the Minister of Railways. He came to the Maritime provinces and took charge of the Intercolonial. With what effect? With this effect that to-day there is not a man who has been trained on the Intercolonial holding a responsible position on the Intercolonial. The head of the department of maintenance and way, the head of the engineering department, the head of every responsible department of the Intercolonial, who heretofore have been

trained up from the ranks of the Intercolonial, almost every one of these men have disappeared either by way of dismissal or of retirement under the convenient provisions of the Provident Fund Act, and in some instances illegally retired under the provisions of that Act and disturbing its equilibrium. I could not speak too strongly with respect to this matter.

Where four years ago on the Intercolonial there were three engineers doing the work, to-day there are fourteen or fifteen men doing the same work. Where did these men come from? In almost every instance they came from the Canadian Pacific railway, where Mr. Gutelius came from. Not only that, but many of them have come there as relatives of Mr. Gutelius, the general manager of the Intercolonial. Intercolonial men displaced, sent out of employment in many instances in mid-winter, deprived of their livelihood! For what purpose? To make room for importations from the Canadian Pacific railway and from the United States.

A few weeks ago I was sitting in court in the county of Westmorland, and I heard the affidavit and application of the chief engineer of the Intercolonial for naturalization. He had been in Canada for some years; he had been in the employment of the Canadian Pacific railway, and his appointment at Moncton was brought about by the displacement of an old and retired Intercolonial engineer, a man against whom naught can be said, a man whose qualifications are the equal if not the superior of those of the importation to whom I refer. Mr. Brown, the chief engineer of the Intercolonial, made application for naturalization. I think it was in December, 1913, but a few weeks ago. At that time he had been in the employ of the Intercolonial for nearly a year. Others have not yet made application for naturalization. What is more, some of them were brought from the Canadian Pacific railway; they were pensioners on the Provident Fund of the Canadian Pacific railway, and they are receiving employment from the Government and being paid wages by the Government, while at the same time they are receiving pensions from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Many of these things are the result of this illegal, this improper agreement.

Mr. RHODES: Will the hon. member give the names of any men who are pensioners of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and at the same time employees of the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. EMMERSON: The names will appear in the returns that have been moved for. I cannot recall any names from memory; I only know the fact, and I know that the statements which I make cannot be successfully refuted.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Never denied.

Mr. EMMERSON: Never denied, and they are unfortunately too true, certainly to my regret and I presume to the regret of my hon. friend from Cumberland. I have said that the Intercolonial railway interests have been subordinated to the interests of the Canadian Pacific railway. I think that I can demonstrate the fact. In the first place I believe that the Canadian Pacific railway have their eyes on the Intercolonial to secure running rights that will be wholly to their advantage. I have had enough experience to justify me in making the statement that they are seeking such running rights that will give them practical control of the Intercolonial between St. John and Halifax and between Truro and Sydney. I believe that the manifest and ultimate determination of these gentlemen is that if they can have their way of the Intercolonial railway, it shall be so controlled and so manned. What are they doing to-day? Every turn of the screw, beginning in 1912 and not ending even on the 24th of April, 1913, has been to bring up, not always gradually, sometimes with a jump, the freight rates on the Intercolonial. With what object? In order that they may conform and harmonize with the freight rates on the Canadian Pacific railway, so that eventually when the Canadian Pacific railway have these running rights, they will not be under the necessity of imposing on the patrons of the Intercolonial and in the zone of the Intercolonial the rates which they charge over their system, because that will have been already accomplished by this Government under the dictation of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Why, they are even changing the standard rules on the Intercolonial. To do what? To suit the convenience of the Canadian Pacific railway. Every form in the offices, in the mechanical department, in the station houses, with reference to way bills and freight bills, with respect to all business transactions in the offices, along the sections and among the officials—all the forms that have been in use on the Intercolonial are being and have been discarded under

Mr. Gutelius, and forms adopted which are the counterparts of the forms in use on the Canadian Pacific railway. It may be that the latter are better. I am not going to say that they are or that they are not. One thing I will say is that, so far as the standard rules are concerned, and I say it on the authority of eminent experts, they are not better than the rules which have been in operation on the Intercolonial.

There is not a gentleman on the opposite side who will dare get up and deny these statements. I have in my hand some of the tariffs that have been put in operation on the Intercolonial railway, abrogating former tariffs. One, giving the tariff on flour, mill stuff, and so forth, was issued on March 30, 1908.

That was in existence until April 24, 1913, after Mr. Gutelius was given carte blanche to deal with the Intercolonial railway in the interest of the Canadian Pacific railway. And the comparison—I have no time to go into it at this moment, but I will do so on some more opportune and fitting occasion—will show increases in the local freight rates on the Intercolonial railway of forty, fifty per cent, and even higher. And we all know they have turned the screw with respect to passenger rates in the interest of the Canadian Pacific railway. We know that the Intercolonial railway from time immemorial, has given certain excursion rates on holidays—at Christmas, New Year's, Thanksgiving, Easter and other great holidays. And these rates were suddenly raised by thirty per cent—I was going to say fifty per cent, and I think I should be correct in so saying, but I will content myself with saying these rates were very greatly increased during 1913 to the disadvantage, as I believe, of the Intercolonial railway and the lessening of its earnings. I have here also the old and the new tariffs with respect to live stock, and I find that the increases have been exorbitant and beyond all reason. Now, here we have imposed upon the local patrons of the Intercolonial railway large increases of freight rates. Their burdens have been added to. With a twenty-thousand dollar general manager on the Intercolonial railway, and with importations of high-salaried men from the Canadian Pacific, we have the Intercolonial railway entering into a contract interfering with the public business of Canada, as I have stated, whereby the Canadian Pacific railway are permitted to convey traffic from St. John to Halifax at much less than would be charged by them if they were operating the railway, and a much less rate than is being charged by the Intercolonial railway to its ordinary passengers. Two dollars a passenger between St. John and Halifax, and less in carload lots, charged the Canadian Pacific; but if an individual wishes to go from Halifax to St. John, he has to pay more than three times the rate charged the Canadian Pacific. Is the Intercolonial railway dealing out equity in these rates? Are hon. gentlemen opposite prepared to justify this before the country? I am not speaking of this matter with respect to its effect upon one section or one city. I am not speaking on behalf of St. John nor on behalf of Halifax, nor have I in mind the interest of any other city or any other section; I speak of the whole country served by the Intercolonial railway; I am pleading for the Intercolonial railway itself, which is being made the pack mule to carry the burden of the Canadian Pacific. The Intercolonial railway has had to bear its own losses by reason of its long mileage, and yet in the face of this disadvantage it has earned a surplus. To-day, under this agreement, you are imposing additional burdens on the Intercolonial railway by compelling it to bear the losses of the Canadian Pacific.

I believe Halifax is a splendid port and harbour, and I believe that Halifax can stand on its merits and claim its share of the business. I believe St. John is a splendid harbour, and that on its merits it will get its share of the business. But I hold that the Intercolonial railway should not be made a donkey-engine in the interest of one port or the other.

The Government did not dare, a year ago, to settle the question as to St. John and Halifax in these mail contracts. Political exigencies would not permit that. They gave the choice to the steamship company to select one port or the other. In two instances, the steamship companies did select—the Canadian Pacific choosing St. John in the first instance, while the Canadian Northern made Halifax its selection. But in this the Government has changed and altered the intentions of these steamship companies. Through what agency? They did not act manfully, above-board and courageously, but shielded themselves behind an agreement entered into by a servant of their own who had no more right to enter into that contract than had I or any other member of this House. They have not been manly, they have not been plucky, they have attempted to shield themselves in this way from responsibility

for an action which is disadvantageous to the people of Canada, to the trade of Canada as a whole and to the Intercolonial railway itself. The very discharge of men on the Intercolonial railway and retirement under the Provident Fund provisions disturbs the equilibrium of a great fund provided for the protection of the employees. More than that, it imposes burdens on every young man called into the employ of the Intercolonial railway during this year or in future years. The present administration of the Intercolonial railway is working havoc with its business. The discontinuance of the 'Ocean Limited' will disturb the traffic between here and the eastern provinces to such an extent that that traffic will not be recovered when the Intercolonial railway begins running the Ocean Limited next spring, if it does begin to run that train. We all know that men get into the habit of going to certain hotels and travelling by certain routes. I believe the Intercolonial railway route is by all odds the best. I am anxious to see the Intercolonial railway succeed in every possible way. But this Government, apparently, seeks to undermine the business of the Intercolonial railway, business that belongs to it properly in view of its location and circumstances. The Government, I say, are chargeable with disturbing that traffic and injuring the Intercolonial railway to that extent.

My right hon. friend the Prime Minister made reference to a statement made by Mr. Sutherland, who was acting Minister of Railways in 1903, in respect of freight charges. My right hon. friend knows—and if he does not he should know—that the through traffic over the Intercolonial to St. John and to Halifax is governed by the mileage of the Canadian Pacific railway; that is to say, the shorter mileage of the competing route governs the freight charges. Although it is upwards of 800 miles over the rails of the Intercolonial between Halifax and Montreal, the freight rates are computed not on that mileage, but on the mileage between Montreal and Halifax by the shortest rail route—that is over the Canadian Pacific railway via the city of St. John. If you take the Intercolonial at Montreal and go to the city of St. John, you travel many more miles, but you pay the same as you pay on the Canadian Pacific railway, which follows a much shorter and more direct route. So that it is the rule of all railway companies to base their charges on the shorter mileage of a competing route; therefore the reference that was made by my right hon. friend does not apply and is no guide in this instance. In brief, the matter stands this way: This Government, in order to disarrange its mail contract, and void its terms; in order to go behind the ordinary selection that would be made by the steamship companies; in order to render nugatory the binding contracts entered into by them one year ago in respect of mails and transportation, have illegally, improperly and surreptitiously entered into a contract with the Canadian Pacific railway, through a servant of theirs who had no authority whatever to execute such a contract without the approval of the Governor in Council—which latter authority has never been given—and they are seeking to shelter themselves behind that agreement. I wish that this motion were one involving the condemnation of the Department of Railways and Canals and the Government for even permitting to continue an agreement so outrageously wrong and so absolutely without a parallel in the history of railway contracts.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I do not intend to go into the discussion of the rival claims of St. John and Halifax in this matter. I was glad to hear the Prime Minister say that new and first-class terminals, the very best in the world, were to be constructed at St. John and at Halifax in connection with the Intercolonial and with Atlantic transportation from those ports. But there is a view of this matter which has not yet been presented to the House, and for a few moments I intend to ask the attention of hon. gentlemen to that special view. I think I am well in order, inasmuch as the motion calls for a copy of the agreement between the Canadian Pacific and the Intercolonial, and in that agreement is involved the question of transportation charges generally. Four great steamship companies are involved in this discussion and in the motion, and the Government of Canada is to-day dealing with these four great Atlantic transport companies in the matter of the carrying of our mails. But there is also involved in this discussion, as I say, an agreement between the Intercolonial and the Canadian Pacific. The farmers of the Canadian west are complaining very much of the enormous freight charges upon the wheat and other products of the Canadian west and the most serious charge—and the one to which the attention of this country has been called recently with great vigour—is that of the enormous increase in ocean freight rates that took place within the last two or three years.

We even sent the chairman of our Railway Commission across to the old country to try to find the source of that great increase in ocean freight rates, and the origin of that most serious tax on the wheat and the flour of the Canadian west. Arrived in the old country, the chairman found that there was a great increase in charges

9 p.m. —I believe he has made a report in the matter. The impression has gained ground in this country that in some way the powers of this Parliament or of the Railway Commission are not sufficient to reach whoever is at the head of this great Atlantic combine which has doubled the rates on ocean freight. To my mind the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in this country is the head of that great ocean combine. The White Star Line, which figures in this contract, is also in that combine, as well as the Canadian Northern's Royal Line, and the Allan Line, which to-day, so far as I can gather, is owned by the Canadian Pacific railway. The only chance I see of reaching that combine is not by going to England; not by appointing international commissions to investigate the matter, and then going round the world and asking France, Germany, Great Britain and the United States to regulate this ocean combine, but the way to reach it is by trying to regulate it in our own country. My view of it—and it has always been my view in this House—is that if we find any corporation in this country which has been created by Parliament and is treating the Canadian public unfairly, then we ought to do business no longer with that company. I contend that before this agreement was made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, giving it very substantial advantages in connection with the Intercolonial Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should have been compelled to explain its connection with the combines affecting Atlantic transportation and freights on the Atlantic, and we should have had no further dealings with the Canadian Pacific railway until it declared its willingness to dissolve that pool. The Canadian Pacific railway, the Allan Line, the Royal Line and White Star Line, doing business with the people of Canada to-day, are all in that great combine; they are the people who are doing most unfairly by the farmers of the West. I charge it here that the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk railway and that company that came here last year, the Richelieu and Ontario, for the purpose of securing additional legislation, are all in another combine, the details of which will be unfolded in a few days, to control absolutely every boat doing freight business from Duluth right down to the city of Quebec. And all these are being put into another great pool, so that this great combine will control the ocean freight, the river and lake freight, and the railroad freight; in that way one combine will dominate this whole country from the Pacific clean across to the market for our produce, Great Britain. If that is the case, and I challenge any one in this House to deny it, then Parliament should have no dealings with any corporation in the way of giving that corporation increased privileges on our great national railway, without demanding from it an explanation and insisting on that corporation withdrawing from that pool. The Prime Minister this afternoon, in discussing the great port development and the great terminals in connection with the Intercolonial railway at St. John, Quebec, Halifax and Montreal, said that these were to be great ports and great terminals. Are they to be given to the use of the Canadian Pacific railway and the Allan line and the Royal line and the White Star line, while these same companies are in a pool to uphold freight rates to twice what they were two years ago, and who, if allowed to continue this policy, can put the rates up still higher? Freight rates are the greatest issue in this country. The development of the West turns absolutely on that question. We have had delegations down here asking for free wheat. The movement for free wheat into the United States, to my mind, turns on the question of freight rates more than any other question, and by free wheat competition in freight rates and competition in prices might be secured. And certainly low freight rates will never come if we shut our eyes to the fact that the great railways of this country are the head of the Atlantic pool and that the greatest sinner of all is the Canadian Pacific railway. This same Canadian Pacific railway has been given substantial advantages over the line of the Intercolonial, and I think the time has come to call a halt in this matter and to have no dealings with any corporation that will enter into a combination of that kind. Certainly no more relief, no more legislation of any kind ought to be given to these great corporations without first insisting upon their presenting a clean bill of health that they are not in that com-

bine, whether on the lakes and rivers or on the ocean. There is no other way to reach them. It was suggested to me to-day that it would be a fine thing to get another great big commission and to send it abroad and to get all the facts about this ocean combine and create international legislation regarding a thing which we can regulate here at home and in this House of Parliament. There is only one way to do it and that is to refuse to have any relations with these railways or to give them any rights and to refuse them any further legislation. I call the attention of the people of the Northwest to the fact that as long as we give them legislation or other substantial relief in the way of money grants or loans or anything, or give them rights over the Intercolonial railway, we will be showing ourselves incapable of taking care of ourselves. We are making them the rulers of this country, we are not making them serve the country as they ought. That is a point that comes home to me in this discussion in regard to transportation questions which demand so much attention in Canada at this moment. While this seems a small agreement and a simple agreement, and it can be terminated, from what I heard to-night, at very short notice, it cannot be terminated too soon for me in view of the fact that the Canadian Pacific railway is at the head of the ocean combine, and of the further fact that directors of the Canadian Pacific railway are now lining up this great inland navigation deal. I spoke about it here last session when the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company were here for legislation and when they did not get what they wanted, they resorted to other means. It shows that if you take advantage of these men when they come here and insist on them doing what is fair by the Canadian people, you can control these things. I presented the idea to the right hon. leader of the Opposition on several occasions when he was in office that any time these people came as petitioners asking for aid of any kind, asking for legislation and most of all asking for running rights over the Intercolonial railway, they should be denied and should not be listened to in any sense whatever unless they explained their connection with this Atlantic pool, explained their connection with this inland navigation combine and expressed their willingness to withdraw from it. I say it is absurd that a country like Canada cannot control these people, and that the view is going out to the country now in all directions that somehow we cannot control them. There is a constitutional cure for every grievance in this country within the walls of our own legislature, within the covers of our own statute book, if we care to use it. When these railways come here as suppliants for money or legislation, for privileges, we must insist, first of all, on asking them to explain their conduct in the past and to explain, as these railways and steamship lines ought to explain, why they are subjecting the Canadian people to this unfair treatment in regard to freight rates. As I said, the question of freight rates is of interest to all Canada. The farmers in the West now are up against it. A commission has been sitting in the West and that commission has found that a farmer can hardly make money out of wheat when he gets 64 cents or 65 cents a bushel, which was the average in Saskatchewan last lear. That commission says it costs over 60 cents to raise wheat. There is no profit in it for the Canadian farmer; if he does not profit 25 cents a bushel on wheat he cannot succeed. This Parliament, if it wishes to protect the rights of the people of this country, must stop making agreements with corporations, and if this agreement with the Canadian Pacific railway can be cancelled in a very short time I say it ought to be cancelled for the simple reason that the Canadian Pacific railway is the head of the Atlantic pool, it is to-day the head of the inland transportation pool, and it controls the freight rates in the West.

Mr. MACDONALD: What inland transportation pool?

Mr. MACLEAN: Every inland navigation company on the St. Lawrence and on the lakes, clean up to Duluth or Fort William, or Port Arthur, is being consolidated to-day, and if you read the financial reports from London to-day you will see the first flotation of bonds is being put on the market. If you look at the names connected with it you will see boats called after directors of the Canadian Pacific railway, you will see directors of the Canadian Pacific railway on some other companies that are being consolidated into the combine; and wherever you go you see this enormous combine—and you see it taking the last dollar out of the farmers of the Canadian West. They are committed to what was discarded in the Western States years ago. The principle of the railways in arranging their freight rates in the Western United States some years ago, before the establishment of the Interstate Commerce

Commission, was to take as much out of the farmer for freight rates as would keep him a poor man on the land. That is what we are doing with this vaunted West of ours, we are putting the farmer at the mercy of the transportation companies. We would not even let him have access to the United States market because the competition of the American roads and of the ships going out of the city of New York would perhaps compel a reduction in these freight rates and perhaps the Americans, before we do it, might find a way of breaking up these combines and we might get the benefit in that way. My contention is, and I present it with all respect to the House, that it is time we quit talking about these things in the direction of going outside of our own country and getting outside aid to discipline these roads. It is time to quit dealing with any of these companies that have been proved to be an outlaw in any way, and least of all should we give a road that is an outlaw—and I contend that every company in that steamship combine on the Atlantic is an outlaw—any rights over the property owned by the people of Canada. To my mind the Intercolonial is the greatest asset Canada has, and it ought to be kept intact, and if we give the Canadian Pacific railway running rights over the Intercolonial why should not we get the same terms from the Canadian Pacific and extend the Intercolonial to Toronto, Winnipeg and British Columbia. I would like to see the Canadian Pacific giving the Intercolonial reciprocal terms over their line!

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Sign a similar contract to the one we have now?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, if they will sign it. I would be glad to endorse that if the Intercolonial could go over the Canadian Pacific on equal terms, I am not against all the roads in Canada having running rights over the Intercolonial if they will reciprocate. That would be a good thing for the Intercolonial; it would get built up in that way. But I do not like a one-sided bargain, and I do not like trading with a corporation that to-day is maintaining freight rates away above what they ought to be, and away above the rates that would be imposed upon them if we had some jurisdiction over them. I believe the steamship companies come under our jurisdiction by the powers conferred in the Railway Act, and if that Act does not give us power over these companies we can revise it, so as to reach this ocean combine. But I am against dealing with these corporations at the present time or giving them any privileges over the national property or at the national ports. What good would the Minister of Public Works do this country if he spent $50,000,000 in great terminals at Halifax and St. John and if he allowed the Canadian Pacific to use them and that company charged what it liked on the ocean. We are always doing something new, giving some advantage to somebody, but we are not getting the advantage ourselves and if we are to have the same experience with the railways as we have had in connection with ocean freight rates the benefit of our national ports will go to these railways and all they will do is to take advantage of them and put increased rates on the farmers and business men of the West. That is not good policy. It has got to stop and it must be stopped right away. And that contract, if it can be withdrawn—and I believe it can—ought to be withdrawn in the interests of this country unless the Canadian Pacific can show the Government that they have a clean record in regard to the Atlantic combine in the matter of freight rates. Otherwise, they should not have that contract for a day longer than is necessary to cancel it. I have said what I have to say and I think I have presented this question in a new way. I do not present it in a partisan way at all. I do not want to place any criticism on either side of the House, for what has taken place in the past, but I do want to show this House and all the people of Canada the connection between these railways and these ocean lines and the high freight rates prevailing in this country. The time has come when there must be no dealing with a transportation company that seeks to control the freight of the railways, to control the cartage agencies even, the lake and river freight and ocean freight, and the farmer who grows the grain and the miller who grinds the flour; and it is the western miller who is complaining most bitterly about the Atlantic combine. I say that once for all we ought to stop having dealings with these corporations in the way of giving them running rights and special rates as long as they give the people of Canada most unfair, most unjust and burdensome freight rates in connection with the ocean, in connection with the inland lakes and the railways.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester): I did not expect to discuss this evening the question of ocean rates, but I must say that the argument of my hon. friend who

has just taken his seat has appealed to me very much, and I think if the Canadian Pacific railway were to come into contact with the many companies operating on the Atlantic that an arrangement more satisfactory to the people of Canada would be effected. I think I may say to my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) that in my estimation he can expect but little relief in that respect for the farmers of the West, and the importers on the other side of the Atlantic, at least so long as the Conservative Government and the Canadian Pacific railway are in existence in this country. I am not a resident of St. John, nor am I a citizen of Halifax, and therefore I cannot be accused of being actuated by jealousy. I belong to the north shore of New Brunswick, about equidistant from Halifax and St. John, and I look on this question from the broad standpoint of a Canadian citizen, more particularly as a Canadian of the province by the sea, and we in those provinces know that the immense harbours we have at Halifax and other places have been placed there not so much for the benefit of the citizens of St. John and Halifax, but more particularly they have been put there by Providence to aid in the great development of the West and the ports of Canada generally. Not only the people of St. John, but the people of New Brunswick as well, were simply astonished when those reports came last fall that the Canadian Pacific railway would terminate its business with St. John without any further declaration. This uneasiness of mind was not confined to the people of Halifax or St. John at that time, but permeated the brain of every citizen of New Brunswick and the Maritime provinces. We know that from the Canadian standpoint we should encourage the shortest route possible for bringing passengers to our ports; more particularly does this apply to the transportation of mails. Every possible hour that can be saved the people of the West in getting their mails should be saved. The American people have always been on the lookout for anything tending to a quicker mail delivery. Years ago I advocated in this House and elsewhere a fast mail service between Ireland and St. John's, Newfoundland, and if ever the day comes when that service is put into effect, we shall have the ideal fast mail service for this country. The Postmaster General has explained that it was left to the steamship companies to select between St. John and Halifax as a winter port, and the Canadian Pacific railway and the Allan Line chose St. John while the Canadian Northern Steamship Line selected Halifax. We know that both harbours are equally well equipped and that improvements are going on daily; but I maintain it was to the advantage of the commercial interests of Canada that the steamers should continue to call at St. John. However, without explanation from the Government or from the steamship companies, the change was made, and the steamers were withdrawn from St. John, and everybody in the Maritime provinces began naturally to inquire into the cause. The Postmaster General told us that the Canadian Pacific Railway Steamship Company changed its mind as to the port of call, but it must be remembered that while probably the representatives of the Canadian Pacific railway were giving this information to the Postmaster General, at that very moment the Gutelius agreement was in existence. The Postmaster General has not yet told us that he was ignorant of the agreement, and the people of New Brunswick have been greatly impressed with the co-existence of this agreement and the appointment of Mr. Gutelius as General Manager of the Intercolonial railway. Neither the Postmaster General nor the Prime Minister has yet told us whether any legal agreement was made between the Government and the Canadian Pacific railway. We know that when the agreement was mooted, the Board of Trade of St. John, composed of citizens of all political parties and of probably more Conservatives than Liberals, appointed a delegation to interview the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways, with regard to that matter, and they were told that so far as these ministers were aware no agreement was in existence. The delegation of the St. John Board of Trade returned to their city in the hope that no such agreement would be brought into force, but almost at the very moment that the delegates were in Ottawa, to protest against the agreement made between Mr. Gutelius for the Intercolonial railway and Mr. Bosworth for the Canadian Pacific railway, Mr. Gutelius was laying it down in the language of a Russian czar to the people of St. John that the agreement would be put in effect. When he was asked if the agreement would be cancelled, the answer he gave to the council of the board of trade was: 'I would not say that, but if you think an agreement signed by the vice-president of one company and by the

general manager of the other is not binding, then you had better go ahead. We know now that Mr. Gutelius put this agreement into operation without even the consent of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada. We are told to-day that this agreement is only for six months, but that is long enough for the Intercolonial railway to lose its traffic between St. John and Halifax, and if we did not object to it, there is no doubt that it would possibly be renewed for so long as this Government remains in power.

An hon. MEMBER: That will not be long.

Mr. TURGEON: I know it will not be long, but in the meantime it is our duty to endeavour to remedy the conditions existing along the line of the Intercolonial railway. As representing a northern New Brunswick constituency, I may say that we have always feared that the construction of other railroads would take away some trade from the Intercolonial railway and reduce that part of it in my district to the position of a local road. That fear has been renewed in our minds by the conduct of this particular official of the Intercolonial railway who has been so severely criticised by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), who was able to speak as an expert. For the information of the Prime Minister and the Postmaster General, who have told us that the agreement was only for six months, I wish to point out that there is an immense discrepancy between the rates charged by the Intercolonial railway to the shippers of the Maritime provinces and the amount charged under this agreement to that wealthy corporation the Canadian Pacific railway, for this traffic between St. John and Halifax, the result of which agreement will be to divert from St. John that traffic which legitimately belongs to it in the winter months.

The freight rates charged by the Intercolonial to the ordinary shippers of freight are ten or fifteen times more than those charged to the Canadian Pacific railway under the Gutelius agreement. The people of the Maritime provinces along the north shore wish this matter rectified just as much as the people of St. John and Halifax do. Here is a comparison of the rates existing at the time of the Gutelius agreement given at the meeting of the St. John Board of Trade.

The freight charges to the general shipper on flour and grain between St. John and Halifax in carload lots is fourteen cents per hundred pounds or $2.80 per ton as compared with the Gutelius agreement with the Canadian Pacific railway of three cents per hundred pounds or sixty cents per ton.

The charges to the general shipper on general freight range from thirteen to thirty-five cents per hundred pounds in carload lots as compared with three and three-fourths cents per hundred pounds or seventy-five cents per ton under the Gutelius agreement with the Canadian Pacific railway.

General freight charges, so far as the general shipper is concerned, are divided into ten classes ranging from 35 to 12 cents per hundred pounds. For example the rate for class 1, which includes groceries and glassware, is 35 cents per hundred pounds; the rate for class 5, which includes molasses, sugar etc., is 17 cents per hundred pounds; the rate for class 10, the lowest class, which includes lime, etc., is 13 cents per hundred pounds.

Thus the lowest charge for general freight to the general shipper is 13 cents per hundred pounds, as compared with the rate of 3¾ cents per hundred pounds under the Gutelius agreement.

The Gutelius agreement states that no train of twelve cars is to exceed in earnings to the Intercolonial railway more than $300. Under ordinary circumstances, a train of twelve cars, carrying 500 people, at $6.25 a piece,—the lowest priced ticket issued between St. John and Halifax, commercial travellers' rates—would exceed in earnings $3,000 for the people's railway, or, if the train were a freight train of twelve cars, which would be 720 tons, the ordinary rate of $2.80 per ton would mean a revenue to the Intercolonial railway of $2,016, as compared with the $300 under the Gutelius agreement.

Should the cars used be Canadian Pacific railway cars, that would, of course, make some difference in the value of the service.

This shows the difference between the charges which the people of the Maritime provinces are called upon to pay to the Government and the charges to the Canadian Pacific railway under the Gutelius agreement. If it is necessary to impose these charges upon the people of the Maritime provinces, it is nothing else but robbery to make the people pay for the advantage given to the Canadian Pacific railway. I hope my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) is interested in these figures. They will appear in 'Hansard' tomorrow for the study of the people of Canada.

My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean), my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) and my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) have given the true state of affairs, and therefore I need not spend more time on this question. I simply wish to emphasize what they have said, and to state that members on the other side of the House must not think for a moment that the people of St. John and

Halifax are actuated by motives of jealousy. There is no jealousy for either one port or the other. This matter affects not only the people of St. John and Halifax, but all the people of Canada. The Intercolonial is not merely the railway of the Maritime provinces but of Canada as a whole. Therefore, it is to our interest not to have the road used for the benefit of one company or another.

The people of New Brunswick are watching with interest the development and consequences of this agreement, familiarly called the Gutelius agreement. There seems to be a coincidence between the appointment of Mr. Gutelius at the immense salary of $20,000 a year and this agreement, and that, besides this injustice in regard to freight and transportation from the cities of St. John and Halifax, a general increase has been made of 35 to 40 per cent in the rates of freight for local traffic over the Intercolonial, which would have to be paid only by the users of the Intercolonial on the sections between Montreal and Halifax and St. John. Our farmers dealing along the Intercolonial from one place to another, twenty-five, thirty or forty miles distant, have to pay, in certain districts, thirteen to eighteen per cent and in others from twenty-five to thirty-eight per cent more than formerly. In my division it is nearly thirty-eight per cent. Our farmers engage in lumbering during the winter along the Intercolonial in the district between Chatham and Bathurst; they go with their sons, bringing their own supplies for the lumber camps. For carrying these supplies from Bathurst to Red Pine or other stations in that section, they have to-day to pay 40 per cent more than they ever did before. The only possible explanation that we can think of is that it is in order to try to balance the account of the Intercolonial railway, so that the deficit brought about by that special traffic between St. John and Halifax may be covered up by the local traffic and be paid by the farmers and fishermen and poor people of the Maritime provinces.

After the papers have been brought down, other occasions will arise when members will be able to discuss these questions.

Mr. ROGERS: I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: Before the motion is put, I should like to say a word or two, not with the idea of prolonging this discussion at too great length, but certain remarks have been made in the course of this debate with which I do not quite agree. I am somewhat surprised that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has made no statement in regard to this matter, and that the hon. Minister of Railways is not in his place to discuss it. Although the Postmaster General nominally has to do with the mail contract, every one knows that the two ministers whom I have named have more to do with the working out of the matter than the Postmaster General has.

What are the facts? The Canadian Pacific railway made up their minds that they were going to bring their large steamers to Halifax this year and to sail them from that port. In order to do so, they had to get running rights over the Intercolonial from St. John to carry the passengers to and from their steamers. I am not one of those who regard it as unfortunate that the Canadian Pacific railway want to run their steamers from Halifax or that the Canadian Pacific railway want to run their trains into Nova Scotia. But when the hon. member for York comes here and wants to dictate what is to be done in regard to the Intercolonial railway, I must tell him that I come from a province where the only railway of any kind which enables us to maintain communication with the rest of the transportation facilities of the country is the Intercolonial railway, and that railway to-day, run with excessive freight rates, without any competition whatever, is a great and onerous charge upon the business interest of that province. We want the Canadian Pacific railway, we want the Grand Trunk Pacific when it is completed, and like all the other provinces we have our right to desire every one of these transportation systems within our borders. These systems should not be precluded from going to that province; and, speaking for Nova Scotia, I claim for our people the benefits of competition. When the Canadian Pacific railway decided to come to Nova Scotia, having no railway communication, it was a fair business proposition to go to the Intercolonial railway and ask their permission to came in on fair terms. And when I recall the position taken by the St. John Board of Trade and other gentlemen in regard to this agreement, I recall that there was a lot of talk about what St. John was going to do about it. But why did they not go to the Railway Commission and ask that the agreement be reviewed? I would like to ask the people of St. John, who, as everybody knows, are complaining of the way they are dealt with, why they did not have that agreement reviewed.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Does the hon. gentleman contend that it is within the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission?

Mr. MACDONALD: I know it is not, as a matter of fact, but I saw it stated at the time on reliable authority that the Railway Department were willing to submit the terms of this agreement to the Railway Commission, waiving any legal or technical objections.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Would it not be an unfair discrimination, and thereby come within the purview of the Railway Commission?

Mr. MACDONALD: I am not discussing the technical question whether they could go there or not, because it was understood that they could go there. But what I say is, that the people of St. John should have acted upon their opportunity to go before the Railway Commission and have that agreement reviewed. I was not here when that phase of the subject was under discussion, and do not care now to discuss whether it was too much or too little. Every one in the Maritime provinces knows that the Government in that matter were playing politics. The Canadian Pacific railway wanted to come to Halifax with their big steamers. They decided to come there, no matter what happened. To placate St. John, the influence of the Government and of the Prime Minister, who represents Halifax, was exercised with his particular friends Mackenzie & Mann to take their steamers away from Halifax and send them to St. John. That is the cold English of the situation.

Mr. CARVELL: He says no.

Mr. MACDONALD: If he did not do it himself, he got somebody else to do it. So far as the facts are concerned, one does not need to have state papers brought down to make clear what any man of ordinary common sense knows to be the fact; as I venture to say that whatever diplomatic denials may be made, it is regarded as a fact.

Mr. ROGERS: I am sure the hon. gentleman will accept the word of the Prime Minister.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am bound to accept his word in this House. It may be that some other member of the Government went and did this thing behind his back. But in the city he represents he is held responsible for the fact that some one in his Government arranged the deal under which these two boats of Mackenzie & Mann were taken from the city of Halifax. The idea that they went of their own free will and accord is absurd. Sir William Mackenzie said so. Mr. Hannah kept wiring the people of Halifax day after day up to the eve of the withdrawal of the boats that he was not going to take them away and could not be induced to take them away. That is the situation—the Government is playing off one port against the other. But some day they will have to come out of the woods and settle what they are going to do. Up to that time, I suppose, they can fool the people of St. John and they can fool the people of Halifax.

Mr. CARVELL: No, they cannot fool St. John any more.

Mr. MACDONALD: They are making a brave effort to do so; and the same with Halifax. That is the whole thing with regard to this discussion concerning the removal of these steamers. But my purpose in rising is to emphasize the fact that we want the Transcontinental lines in Nova Scotia, and we do not propose to be the only province in the country that is tied up to one railway system. Look at British Columbia. In a few years that province will have every one of our great transcontinental lines in it; and in that province the natural trade flowing to the Pacific through Vancouver does not begin to be as great as that which flows in winter to the Atlantic seaboard. But when we come to the Prime Minister and ask for even necessary railway accommodation, he declines to give it.

Mr. MICHAUD: Will the hon. gentleman explain to the House how the freight rates have increased now that the Canadian Pacific railway has the right of running over the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. MACDONALD: The freight rates, under the Administration of this Government, have increased by leaps and bounds. Within the past year they have increased by almost fifty per cent on staple articles. Representations were made by the business interests of Nova Scotia, and as a result a reduction of this high increase was made, but the average freight increase paid by those interests last year is at least 25 per cent higher. And when we go to the Minister of Railways and ask him to give us merely reasonable railway improvements, we cannot get them. He gives the Prime Minister a road in his own constituency, but he will do nothing for

anybody else. So, I go on record for Nova Scotia as being anxious, for the purpose of competition and increasing of business, to have these transcontinental lines in our province. Under the Liberal Administration, we could send our coal, our iron, our steel, to Montreal in winter at rates that enabled the interests engaged in the production of these articles to make money. To-day, under this Government, through the increased freight rates imposed, it is impossible to send these products, which are staple products in our province, to the centres of industry of Canada. To the question as to what this Government should do in regard to the winter ports, it is time they stopped their shuffling. Every one in the Maritime provinces knows that they have been playing a game, and the sooner they stop it the better.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It was understood with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) that he would expedite the conclusion of this debate at the first opportunity.

Mr. ROGERS: I understood from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is unavoidably absent this evening, that he was anxious to take it up at the first opportunity. That is why I moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

10 p.m.

MINISTERS' TRAVELLING EXPENSES.

Mr. PROULX moved:

For a return showing the total amount of the travelling expenses of the members of the Government since their advent to power; the number of trips to other countries, Europe included; the names of the ministers who have travelled at the expense of the public treasury; the total amount so expended by each of the ministers who have so travelled; the objects of these visits, and how long each one lasted.

Mr. CROTHERS: I would like to suggest to my hon. friend a slight amendment to this motion. I would like him to add after the word 'Government' in the second line, the words, 'including those of their private secretaries'; and that the first four words of the third line 'their advent to power' be stricken out, and the words 'January 1, 1897' be inserted in lieu thereof; and after the word 'ministers' in the fifth line that the words 'and by their private secretaries' be added.

Mr. PROULX: I have no objection to that, but I do not think we should go back to 1897. My motion concerns the present Government.

Mr. CROTHERS: We will let it stand if there is to be any controversy about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: It can be moved by way of an amendment now, if it is agreeable.

Mr. ROGERS: We had an understanding that we were to go on with these resolutions this evening, and if there is any trouble about it, and my hon. friend will not allow it to stand, we will let it pass.

Mr. PROULX: I will consent to add the words 'and by their private secretaries' but that is the only thing I will consent to change.

Motion stands.

On motion of Mr. Rogers the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Tuesday, February 10, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Telegraph statistics of the Department of Customs for the year ended June 30, 1913.—Hon. F. Cochrane.

Telephone statistics of the Department of Customs for the year ended June 30, 1913.—Hon. F. Cochrane.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Bill No. 56, respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. Michael Clark.

Bill No. 57, respecting the British Trust Company.—Mr. Baker.

Bill No. 58, to incorporate the Sudbury, Kepawa and Bell River Railway Company.—Mr. G. V. White.

Bill No. 59, respecting the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 60, to incorporate the United Empire Loyalists' Association of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. M. J. DEMERS (St. John-Iberville) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 61, to amend the Railway Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to make more explicit section 298 of the Railway Act, and to avoid any ambiguity which might arise in future in the interpretation of that section in its

present form. Section 298 of the Railway Act refers to the setting fire by locomotives to crops, lands, fences, and so on. It reads in part as follows:

> The company making use of such locomotive . . . shall be liable for such damage.

If we were to interpret this section strictly to the letter, the remedy given would be of no value whatever. In many cases, it is absolutely impossible for the claimant to know what company is using the locomotive. For instance, in the county of St. John and Iberville, the Delaware and Hudson railway has running rights over the Grand Trunk railway; so has the Central Vermont from Montreal to Iberville. The Rutland railway has also running rights on the Canadian Pacific railway from Montreal to Iberville. Now, suppose that a locomotive set fire to crops along one of these lines, action would naturally be brought against the company which owns the line, and the reply in every case would be that the company was not using that particular locomotive—that it was used by another company operating over its line. That is the defence that is always put up, and under these circumstances I think it is urgent that the law be made more explicit.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 62, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons. He said: As it has become necessary, under the terms of the British North America Act, that the representation of the various provinces in Canada should be readjusted, perhaps it would be convenient at the moment to review briefly the legislative provisions which have been made in that regard, and to state the results up to the present time. By section 37 of the British North America Act, 1867, it is provided as follows:

> The House of Commons shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, consist of one hundred and eighty-one members, of whom eighty-two shall be elected for Ontario, sixty-five for Quebec, nineteen for Nova Scotia, and fifteen for New Brunswick.

That fixes the representation of the various provinces up to the year 1871, and from that date the representation of the various provinces is to be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 51 of the same Act, which is as follows:

> On the completion of the census in the year one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, and on each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such a manner, and from such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules:
>
> (1) Quebec shall have the fixed number of 65 members.
>
> (2) There shall be assigned to each of the other provinces such a number of members as will bear the same proportion to the number of its population (ascertained at such census) as the number 65 bears to the number of the population of Quebec (so ascertained).
>
> (3) In the computation of the number of members for a province a fractional part not exceeding one-half of the whole number requisite for entitling the province to a member shall be disregarded; but a fractional part exceeding one-half of that number shall be equivalent to the whole number.
>
> (4) On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards.
>
> (5) Such readjustment shall not take effect until the termination of the then existing Parliament.

There is another provision of the British North America Act, 1867, which might be alluded to in this regard; it is section 146:

> It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, on addresses from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada, and from the Houses of the respective legislatures of the colonies or provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to admit those colonies or provinces, or any of them, into the union, and on address from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada to admit Ruperts Land and the Northwestern Territory, or either of them, into the union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the addresses expressed and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act; and the provisions of any Order in Council in that behalf shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

It will be observed that the enactments to which I have called attention, and particularly section 51 of the British North America Act, 1867, provided for representation according to population, and provided also for the readjustment of the representation of the various provinces of Canada at intervals of ten years, and upon results determined by the decennial census. It is not absolutely accurate to say that the representation shall be entirely based on population, because the fourth subsection of section 51 provided a saving

clause in case the proportion of the population of a province to the whole population of Canada should not be diminished by one-twentieth.

The terms which were then fixed between the four original provinces undoubtedly constituted a compact between those provinces, and up to the present time they have, of course, been carried out according to the true intent and meaning of the statute.

British Columbia came into the Confederation under the provisions of section 146 on the 16th day of May, 1871. The provision in regard to the representation of British Columbia in Parliament is to be found in the eighth clause of the resolutions which were embodied in the Order in Council. That clause is in the following terms:

> British Columbia shall be entitled to be represented in the Senate by three members, and by six members in the House of Commons. The representation to be increased under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867.

Prince Edward Island came into the Confederation under the special provisions of section 146 on the 26th day of June, 1873. The relevant clause of the resolutions which were embodied in the Order in Council constituting that province a part of the Canadian Confederation, is in the following terms:

> That the population of Prince Edward Island having been increased by fifteen thousand or upwards since the year 1861, the Island shall be represented in the House of Commons of Canada by six members, the representation to be readjusted from time to time under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867.

In the year 1871 the British North America Act was amended by an enactment of the Imperial Parliament, which is known as the British North America Act, 1871. By the second section of that enactment it was provided as follows:

> The Parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any province thereof, and may, at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and administration of any such province, and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of such province, and for its representation in the said Parliament.

It did not appear that there was any special provision for representation in Parliament of the territories which did not form any part of the several provinces, and so another amendment to the British North America Act was enacted in 1886, which is known as the British North America Act, 1886. By the first section of that Act it is provided as follows:

> The Parliament of Canada may, from time to time, make provision for the representation in the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, or in either of them of any territories which for the time being form part of the Dominion of Canada, but are not included in any province thereof.

I have given in this brief way a sketch of the legislative provisions which constitute the charter of this country as far as representation in Parliament is concerned.

Next, it may be worth while that I should place before the House, in a succinct form, the results which have obtained from time to time under the enactments to which I have alluded. I have pointed out that the original Confederation consisted of four provinces, the representation being fixed as follows: Ontario, 82 members; Quebec, 65 members; Nova Scotia, 19 members; New Brunswick, 15 members; a total of 181 members.

In 1872, after the decennial census of 1871, a Redistribution Bill was passed, which provided that the representation of the House of Commons should consist of 200 members, distributed as follows: Ontario, 88 members; Quebec, 65 members; Nova Scotia, 21 members; New Brunswick, 16 members; Manitoba, 4 members; British Columbia, 6 members.

In 1882, after the decennial census of 1881, a further Redistribution Bill was passed, which provided that the representation of the House of Commons should consist of 211 members, distributed as follows: Ontario, 92 members; Quebec, 65 members; Nova Scotia, 21 members; New Brunswick, 16 members; Manitoba, 5 members; British Columbia, 6 members; Prince Edward Island, 6 members.

In 1892, after the decennial census of 1891, a further Redistribution Bill was passed, which provided that the representation of the House of Commons should consist of 213 members, distributed as follows: Ontario, 92 members; Quebec, 65 members; Nova Scotia, 20 members; New Brunswick, 14 members; Manitoba, 7 members; British Columbia, 6 members; Prince Edward Island, 5 members; the Northwest Territories, 4 members.

In 1903, after the decennial census of 1901, a further Redistribution Bill was passed, which provided that the representation of the House of Commons should consist of 214 members, distributed as fol-

lows: Ontario, 86 members; Quebec, 65 members; Nova Scotia, 18 members; New Brunswick, 13 members; Manitoba 10 members; British Columbia, 7 members; Prince Edward Island, 4 members; the Northwest Territories, 10 members; the Yukon Territory, 1 member.

After the establishment of the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and after the quinquennial census of 1906, the representation of these two provinces was fixed by chapter 41 of the Statutes of 1907 at 7 and 10 respectively, giving a net increase of 7 members and bringing the total representation of the House of Commons up to the number of 221, at which it stands at the present time.

In passing, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1872 the membership of the House had increased from 181 members, the number at which it was originally fixed, to 200 members. Of these 200 members, 10 came from the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia, leaving the membership from the four original provinces of Confederation at 190. So it will be borne in mind that, according to the increase of the population up to that time, the province of Quebec, which was the pivotal province of Canada, had lost relatively in its membership. It is perfectly true that it retained a fixed membership of 65, but originally it had 65 members out of a total membership of 181. In 1872 it had a fixed membership of 65 out of a total membership of 200; or, taking the four original provinces of Confederation, it had a fixed membership of 65 out of a total membership of 190. In 1882 the total membership of the House of Commons was 211. Quebec still retained, under the terms of the British North America Act, its fixed membership of 65. The membership allotted in 1882 to the four original provinces of Confederation was 194, so the relative membership of Quebec at that time had decreased in that proportion. In 1892 the membership of the House of Commons had increased to 213, and the membership of the four original provinces of Confederation had decreased to 191, or just ten more than the number assigned to those provinces by the British North America Act. In 1903 the membership of the House of Commons had increased to 214, and the membership of the four original provinces of Confederation had decreased to 182, or just one more than the number allotted to those provinces by the British North America Act. Since that time, as I have already pointed out, by the readjustment in Alberta and Saskatchewan which took place after the quinquennial census of 1905, the membership of the House had been increased to 221, Quebec still retaining the fixed number of 65.

In 1903, when this subject was under discussion in the House of Commons, the question was raised as to the representation of the Maritime provinces. Eventually the Government of that day submitted certain questions for the determination of the Supreme Court of Canada. The answers of the Supreme Court of Canada upon those questions were eventually carried by appeal to the Privy Council, which affirmed the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Two questions were thus submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada and to the Privy Council. One related to the Maritime provinces in general, and the other had special reference to the province of Prince Edward Island. The question argued on behalf of the Maritime provinces generally was as to the meaning which should be placed upon the word 'Canada' in subsection 4 of section 51 of the British North America Act. The Supreme Court of Canada and the Privy Council held in effect that the word 'Canada,' as used in subsection 4 of section 51 of the British North America Act, must be ascertained by reference to section 4 of the British North America Act, which is in the following terms:

> The subsequent provisions of this Act shall, unless it is otherwise expressed or implied, commence and have effect on and after the union, that is to say, on and after the day appointed for the union taking effect in the Queen's proclamation; and in the same provisions, unless it is otherwise expressed or implied, the name Canada shall be taken to mean Canada as constituted under this Act.

The importance of that provision, from the standpoint of the Maritime provinces, was this: If it should be determined that Canada in subsection 4 of section 51 was to include only the four original provinces of Confederation, then obviously those provinces, which were losing representation in the House of Commons by the Act then proposed and afterwards passed, would stand in a very much better position, because in that case no account would be taken of the rapidly increasing population of those portions of Canada which had been added since Confederation. The judgment of the Supreme Court and of the Privy Council in effect was this, that inasmuch as Canada was constituted originally by an Order in Council, passed under the authority of the British North America Act, and inasmuch

as the other provinces of Canada subsequently added were also constituted a part of Canada by Order in Council passed under the provisions of the same Act, the definition in section 4 necessarily implied that all the provinces constituting Canada in 1903 must be taken into account in determining the proportion to be ascertained under the provisions of subsection 4 of section 51 of the British North America Act.

So, the contention on the part of the Maritime provinces failed. There was a separate contention made on behalf of the province of Prince Edward Island, to which I need not especially call attention at this moment, except to say that such contention was also decided adversely to the claim of the province. It will be observed by the statistics which I have placed before the House that in 1872 both Nova Scotia and New Brunswick increased their representation in the House. In 1882, they retained their representation. In 1892 the representation of Nova Scotia was reduced by one, still leaving it one in excess of that fixed by the British North America Act of 1867. The representation New Brunswick on the same occasion was reduced to fourteen, leaving it one below that fixed in 1867. The question was debated in 1903, and was mooted last year and again this year, as to whether or not some relief could be given to the Maritime provinces in this regard. The members of the Government had the advantage a few weeks ago of hearing the subject discussed, both from the general standpoint of the Maritime provinces and from the special standpoint of Prince Edward Island; and I am bound to say that I do not think the case either for the Maritime provinces generally or for Prince Edward Island in particular could have been put more thoroughly, more exhaustively, more eloquently or more cogently than it was by the Prime Minister of New Brunswick and the Prime Minister of Prince Edward Island. I think that everything was said that could be said on behalf of the Maritime provinces generally, and on behalf of Prince Edward Island in respect to the special circumstances which were brought to the attention of the Government with regard to that province.

Let us for a moment give consideration to the case of the Maritime provinces generally. Without going into the claim of these provinces exhaustively, I shall take the liberty of laying upon the table of the House, and, if the House will permit, of having printed for the use of members, the memorandum placed before the Interprovincial Conference on behalf of the Maritime provinces generally and the memorandum placed before the same conference, and afterwards before the Government, on behalf of the province of Prince Edward Island; and in doing that, I shall relieve the House from listening to a fuller statement of the claims put forward. While the case on behalf of the Maritime provinces generally was put cogently, exhaustively and thoroughly, still one could not disguise from one's self the fact that in the first instance, when these provinces came into Confederation with a certain representation in this House, it was the expectation of the fathers of Confederation that they would gain and not lose. It is perfectly true that in the past twenty years their expectations have been disappointed in that regard, but it is also perfectly true that two of the fundamental considerations which had to be taken into account by those who made the compact upon which Confederation was based were the representation of the several provinces in Parliament and the distribution or division of legislative and executive powers as between the Dominion on the one hand and the provinces on the other. Speaking for myself, I do not see how it would be posssible for this Parliament to attempt any alteration in the representation of the provinces without the consent of the provinces themselves. It was in that connection that the question was taken up before the Interprovincial Conference held last autumn in the city of Ottawa, and the result of the proceedings of that conference amounted to this, that the conference declined to take any action on the subject, saying that the matter was one for the consideration of Parliament. It is absolutely, in one sense, for the consideration of this Parliament, although this Parliament has no power to amend the British North America Act. On the other hand, if I apprehend the situation correctly, so far as the four original provinces are concerned, it was also a question for these four original provinces to say whether or not any change could or should be made in the compact under which the first provinces entered into the Confederation. The province of Quebec having been fixed as the pivotal province for representation retains the exact number of sixty-five members in this House under all conditions. But as I have pointed out, it is possible for the relative representation of Quebec to be changed as it was changed in the early days of Confederation. It has also been changed in another sense and from another consideration through the admission

of new provinces and the increased membership of the House of Commons. Under these circumstances, as the provinces at the conference to which I have alluded had declined to take any action or pass any resolution on the subject—although I understand there were a good many expressions of sympathy—it did not seem possible for us to come to this Parliament and propose any remedy for the unfortunate situation with which the Maritime provinces find themselves confronted. It might, however, be said, and I think with a good deal of truth, that in the Canadian Parliament the representatives of the Maritime provinces, like those of other provinces of Canada, do not act as a body for their provinces. To quote from a well-written editorial on this subject published in the Maritime provinces some ten years ago:

> On almost every question they divide according to their attitude towards the government of the day. Perhaps it would be wiser to say that in their minds their view of what is best for the Dominion as a whole is paramount. Further than this, the influence of a province in the great council of the Dominion does not depend nearly so much upon the number of representatives as in the ability, skill, experience, intellectual power and genius of these representatives. And it can fairly be said that in this respect the Maritime provinces have not been at all subordinate, no matter which party was in power.

Now, with regard to the case of the province of Prince Edward Island. It will be observed that the province of British Columbia had provision made, in the Order in Council which brought it into Confederation, that its representation then fixed should be increased under the provisions of the British North America Act. In the Order in Council passed nearly two years afterwards which brought the province of Prince Edward Island into Confederation the expression used was 'readjusted,' instead of the expression 'increased.' The case for Prince Edward Island is argued very cogently indeed upon the point that for many years it had refused to come into Confederation except upon a fixed representation which exceeded that to which it was entitled on the basis of population alone.

It declined for many years to come into this confederation with only five members in the House of Commons, but eventually six were conceded to it, when it had a right to no more than five. It is argued that the construction of the Order in Council to which I have called attention was understood by those who carried on the negotiations on the part of Prince Edward Island, as meaning a readjustment by way of increase and not a readjustment that would decrease the number of representatives to which Prince Edward Island was entitled under the Order in Council in question. It is also urged on behalf of the province of Prince Edward Island that that province, not being one of the four provinces which created among themselves the original compact of Confederation, could be dealt with in this regard by the Dominion as a whole, because the compact, in the case of Prince Edward Island, was made not between province and province, but between this Dominion as a whole and the province of Prince Edward Island, then a sovereign province, possessing plenary powers of self-government. It has been urged upon us with great vigour by the Premier of Prince Edward Island and by Mr. Stewart, a member of his Government, that steps should be taken to fix a minimum representation for the province of Prince Edward Island of six, the number originally mentioned in the Order in Council passed under the provisions of the Confederation Act. It has been noted that in 1882 the Redistribution Bill did not diminish the representation of the province of Prince Edward Island, although, according to the census of 1881, Prince Edward Island was at that time entitled to no more than five members. At first I was very much impressed by this circumstance, but I observed that in a speech made by the hon. member for Kings, Prince Edward Island, in 1903, who argued strongly and forcibly against the claims put forward on behalf of the province at that time, he attributed this result to the fact that there was no previous census with which the census of 1881 could be compared for the purposes of subsection 4 of section 51 of the British North America Act so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned; and probably that accounts for the result in 1882. In the Bill which I am asking permission to introduce, I have left blank the number of members for the province of Prince Edward Island, and therefore the total number of members, for the reason that I desire that question to be left open for consideration by the committee to whom I shall ask to have the Bill referred.

The province of Prince Edward Island has in the Senate of Canada a representation of four members. If the terms of the British North America Act were applied strictly to the province of Prince Edward Island, it would have under the Bill now to be passed by this Parliament, a representation in the House of Commons of not more than three. It is somewhat incon-

gruous that a small province like Prince Edward Island, or, indeed, any province of Canada, should have a smaller representation in the House of Commons than in the Senate. I shall have occasion at a later stage in the session to speak of the principles which seem to have guided the fathers of Confederation in establishing the representation of the various provinces in the Senate. For the present it is sufficient to say this: that there does not seem to have been any very fixed principle in their minds, and that the arrangement as to representation in the Senate appears to have been almost purely an arbitrary one. In the United States, as hon. members of this House know, each state of the Union has a fixed representation of two in the Senate. In other federations the membership is determined not in that way, but according to the population, but I am not aware of any federation in which the membership of any province or state is less in the lower house than in the upper house. If I remember correctly the provisions of the Australian Commonwealth Act, the basis fixed in the Commonwealth of Australia is that each province shall, as nearly as possible, have two members in the lower house for each member that it has in the upper house.

There is another consideration, not of a legal character, and not one of controlling or determining influence, which might possibly be taken into consideration in this House in regard to the province of Prince Edward Island. I shall speak a little later of the reasons that have led both political parties in this country to fix a higher unit of representation in cities than in rural communities. That principle, of course, gives a larger representation to those who live upon the land in this country than it does to those who dwell in cities. The reasons for that I will come to a little later, but so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned it has to be borne in mind that the population of that province is almost wholly a rural population, and that upon any basis laid down by either political party in this country, and upon the basis which I hope will be laid down by the committee to whom this Bill will go, if the population of Prince Edward Island, although less than 100,000, were situated in any other province of Canada, it would have the right to a membership of at least four in the House of Commons. I do not know whether I make absolutely clear to hon. gentlemen of this House what lies in my mind, but that, I think, is the fact. If without being limited by the terms of a constitutional act, as we are to-day, we were to take into consideration a rural population of nearly 100,000 in any of the other provinces of Canada, we would, I think, upon any basis that has ever been accepted or is likely to be accepted, give a representation of not less than four members to that population.

It is my duty next to lay before the House —and I do it purely for the purpose of convenience—the results of the census of 1911. I may say that there was a slight error in the census figures as at first published, and the figures here given are from the second and corrected edition of the census returns. Taken in alphabetical order, the population of the different provinces according to the last census is as follows:— Alberta, 374,663; British Columbia, 392,480; Manitoba, 455,614; New Brunswick, 351,889; Nova Scotia, 492,338; Ontario, 2,523,274; Prince Edward Island, 93,728; Quebec, 2,003,232; Saskatchewan, 492,432; Yukon, 8,512. Taking the population of Quebec, 2,003,232, and dividing it by 65, we obtain the unit of 30,819.

Applying this unit to the population of the various provinces of Canada, we find that Alberta is entitled to a membership of 12.12. The decimal is disregarded, and Alberta receives a membership of twelve. In the case of British Columbia, the number is 12·70. The decimal being in excess of 50, British Columbia receives a membership of 13. In the case of Manitoba, the number is 14·78. The decimal being in excess of 50, Manitoba will receive a membership of 15. In the case of New Brunswick, the number is 11·42. The decimal being less than 50 is disregarded, and New Brunswick receives a membership of 11. In the case of Nova Scotia, the number is 15·97. The decimal being in excess of 50, Nova Scotia receives a membership of 16. In the case of Ontario, the number is 81·87. The decimal being in excess of 50, Ontario receives a membership of 82. In the case of Prince Edward Island, the number is 3·04, and, if the provisions of the British North America Act are strictly observed and the considerations to which I called attention a moment ago are not regarded, the representation of Prince Edward Island would be 3. In the case of Quebec there is a fixed representation of 65. In the case of Saskatchewan, the number is 15·97. The decimal being in excess of 50, Saskatchewan will receive a representation of 16. It is not proposed to interfere with the representation of the Yukon Territory.

It will be observed that, according to what I have proposed, the representation of On-

tario will be decreased from 86 to 82. That of Quebec remains at the fixed number, 65. That of Nova Scotia will be decreased from 18 to 16. That of New Brunswick will be decreased from 13 to 11. That of Manitoba will be increased from 10 to 15. That of Saskatchewan will be increased from 10 to 16. That of Alberta will be increased from 7 to 12. That of British Columbia will be increased from 7 to 13. Prince Edward Island, according to the letter of the British North America Act, would have its representation decreased from 4 to 3.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I thought that was left blank.

Mr. BORDEN: So it is, but I am speaking of the result under the letter of the British North America Act.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: And the total would be what?

Mr. BORDEN: In the one case, if we should leave the representation of Prince Edward Island as it is at present, the total would be 235; otherwise it would be 234.

Not only has the proportion of population as between the various provinces of Canada been greatly varied by the last census, but the distribution of population within the provinces has also greatly altered in some instances. On the second reading of the Bill I shall probably lay on the table of the House an exact statement as to this, comparing the previous census with the present census; but for the present it might be of interest to the House to know that in Ontario, for example, the population of constituencies as they are constituted at present varies from 13,737 in North Middlesex to 105,291 in West Toronto. In Quebec it varies from 9,400 in Soulanges to 170,978 in Maisonneuve. In Nova Scotia it varies from 11,962 in Antigonish to 53,352 in Cape Breton South. In New Brunswick it varies from 15,687 in Restigouche to 44,621 in Westmorland. In Manitoba it varies from 23,501 in Lisgar to 128,157 in Winnipeg. In Saskatchewan it varies from 28,695 in Saltcoats to 87,725 in Moosejaw. In Alberta it varies from 34,504 in Macleod to 70,606 in Medicine Hat. In British Columbia it varies from 31,660 in Victoria to 123,902 in Vancouver.

As I have already stated, we propose on this occasion to follow the course pursued in 1903 by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and therefore I am introducing the Bill without the schedules, which are to be prepared by a conference or committee of members representing both parties. It is my intention, subject to any observations that may be made by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, to have that conference or committee constituted of the same number and in the like proportion as in 1903. It was then constituted of seven members, of whom four represented the Government and three represented the Opposition. My right hon. friend, in 1903, spoke of this as a conference, but when we came to deal with the report of the so-called conference, it was rather regarded, at all events by my hon. friends who are now on the other side of the House, as a committee. I imagine that the converse is true, and that we were inclined in the first instance to speak of it as a committee and to say

4 p.m.

that it should have been a conference, and afterwards we were inclined to take the ground that, properly understood, it was a conference. It was not a conference precisely in the sense implied by the British precedent which was invoked by my right hon. friend. Yet, on the whole, I think it did its work fairly well. There were undoubtedly differences of opinion, strong differences of opinion, and these were threshed out both in the committee and in the House; and doubtless there will be differences of opinion on this occasion. But I venture to state that a small committee of that kind will be better able to reconcile, as far as possible, those differences of opinion, and to reduce the basis of representation to some fixed principle than it could possibly be done in this House. Therefore I am entirely disposed to follow the course which my right hon. friend pursued in 1903.

The differences which are likely to arise will probably be those which will result from an endeavour to work out principles which, when applied on the one hand or the other, may bring about divergent results. In Great Britain, according to the principles laid down by the conference to which allusion was made, if I remember correctly, a good deal of emphasis was laid upon equality of population, upon the retention in borough divisions of population of an urban character, upon compactness in respect of geographical position, and upon community of interests. In Canada stress has been laid upon various considerations upon which I shall dwell for a moment in order that I may invite the consideration of hon. members of the House to

the subject, and in that way have an interchange of views which, I trust, may be of use in bringing about a fair redistribution in 1914. Emphasis has been laid by members on both sides of the House, perhaps more particularly by hon. gentlemen opposite, upon the observance of municipal boundaries. This principally concerns the provinces of eastern Canada, and the municipal boundaries alluded to are of a varying character in these provinces.

There are the boundaries of parishes, of villages, of towns, of cities, of townships, of counties divided into two municipal districts, of municipal counties, and of counties united for municipal or judicial purposes, or both. It is a very desirable principle, to be followed as far as possible; but there is another principle also to be observed, and the difficulty which will confront the committee this year, as it confronted the committee in 1903, will be to say in any particular case how these two principles can best be worked out, and, in case they are absolutely inconsistent, which one of them is to prevail.

The other principle to which I alluded is a certain equality of population. This principle, of course, will constantly be brought into opposition to the first principle. It must not be too seriously disregarded, as it is the basis of the whole scheme of representation as between the provinces; and I observe that in the principles laid down in Great Britain at the conference to which I have alluded, equality of population was placed well to the forefront. My right hon. friend himself, in 1892, in speaking of this subject, at page 3970 of 'Hansard, used these words, which express very well what is in my own mind and I think in the minds of all hon. gentlemen in this House:

> The guiding principle should be as far as possible to equalize the population in all the constituencies.

Then, there is the question to which I alluded a moment ago; a greater unit for urban constituencies than for rural constituencies. Both parties have accepted this, although possibly it may have been emphasized on one side more than on the other. There have been various reasons given, some of which may be pertinent and cogent, and others of which may not be entitled to a great deal of weight. It is said that in a city constituency there ought to be a higher unit for the reason that it possesses greater solidarity and compactness; that its interests are more uniform; that its interests can make themselves felt more effectively and cogently than the interests of a rural constituency. It is said also that many men who represent rural constituencies reside in cities, and in that way the cities throughout Canada, or in many portions of Canada, have a certain voice in the legislature which is denied to rural constituencies.

Importance has been laid by some members of this House upon the fact that there is perhaps a more stable interest in those who dwell upon the land, and whose forefathers have dwelt upon it for many generations, than is to be found in the case of a certain floating element of city population. In Ontario for a century or more, in my own province for a century and a half, and in the province of Quebec for three centuries at least, men have been dwelling on the same land from generation to generation. Those who cultivate it now can look back to their forefathers who were pioneers, say a century, a century and a half, or three centuries ago; and if I am not mistaken it was this consideration, coupled also with that to which I alluded in connection with the cities—a certain floating element of population—which impressed itself more than any other upon Sir John A. Macdonald in giving effect to this consideration. I hope that the committee will not depart from the principle which has been accepted by both political parties in that regard. It is impossible to fix or to suggest any defined percentage. There was no defined percentage fixed or suggested, I think, in 1903, or at any previous redistribution; but it seems to me that reasonable consideration should be given to this principle, which has almost come to be a part of our constitution, and I have no doubt that the committee to which this Bill is to be referred will give the consideration which is due to that principle.

Then, the English principles of community of interest and compactness in respect of geographical position may very well also be considered in this country as in Great Britain.

I thought it desirable, Mr. Speaker, in introducing this Bill, to give in this way a brief history not only of the legislation but of the principles, as I understand them, which have actuated both political parties in dealing with this question. I shall be very glad to take up the second reading of the Bill on a date as early as may be convenient to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, and to have the Bill committed to seven members, as suggested, in order that they may enter upon their conferences and deliberations at the earliest possible moment.

Motion agreed to.

On the motion that the Bill be now read the first time:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: Before that motion is formally agreed to, I would like to say one word.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I understand it, it is not permissible to debate on a motion for the first reading, but it is permissible to debate on the motion to introduce the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN: We will consent.

Mr. MACDONALD: It is not for the purpose of debating any controversial subject, but to ask for certain information and to make suggestions to the right hon. gentleman, that I ask the consent of the House to speak at this time. The right hon. gentleman, in introducing this measure, read in the course of his lucid explanation a clause of the British North America Act which has always given rise to considerable discussion in dealing with the question of representation. I refer to clause 4 of section 51, which says:

> On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards.

I would like to ask if the right hon. gentleman would lay upon the table of the House before the second reading of this Bill, the computation which I assume was made for him in connection with this fractional difference spoken of in this Act. I want to call his attention to the fact that, taking the word 'one-twentieth' as it is found in that section, and interpreting it in the ordinary way as being one-twentieth of a unit, we have these results as regards the province of Nova Scotia: In 1901 the population of Nova Scotia was 459,574, and the population of Canada 5,371,315; that is, in the proportion of 1 to 11; or if it is placed as a fraction, the fraction would be 1-11.6876.

It may be remarked that this section should be interpreted in accordance with a comparison between the relative proportions of the two decennial periods, and it is the difference between the proportions the statute speaks of and not the difference in the populations. The proportion after the last census was the proportion which existed as between 492,338 and 7,206,643, which was the population of the whole of Canada. That proportion, to give it in short language, was in the relation of 1 to 14, or, taking it as a fraction, you have a proportion of 1-14.6876. When you come to make a comparison between these two proportions as a mathematical proposition, you find that the second proportion is 1-58th less than the proportion made in the first instance. Thus the difference between these two proportions which the statute says you have to make is a difference of 1-58th.

Mr. BORDEN: One fifty-eighth of what? My hon. friend is aware that it is a question of the reduction of the proportion?

Mr. MACDONALD: Quite so; there is that difference between the proportions. It is 1-58th of the unit. This is less than 1-20th. I am submitting to my right hon. friend the question whether this 1-20th is 1-20th of the unit or 1-20th of the original proportion of the previous ten-year period. How is the statute to be interpreted? The matter was called to my attention by an hon. member of the Senate from St. John, who was very much interested in it, and I have no doubt that he discussed it with my right hon. friend. The position of affairs is this, that if you take 1-20th of the unit as being the difference which the statute contemplates, the difference between the two proportions is a difference of 1-58th, and that difference is less than 1-20th, and consequently we should suffer no reduction in representation. My difficulty in considering this question was increased to some degree by reason of the fact that you can find in the books no definite or accurate statement as to how this matter has been dealt with in the past. I find that in the Supreme Court representation case the Chief Justice of Canada, who was then Minister of Justice, made this statement—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member seems to be starting in upon a practice which is not in consonance with the English practice or with our practice. Our practice is that when the motion is made that a Bill be now read the first time, it shall be adopted without amendment or debate. There may be on the proposal to introduce and an amendment, but not on the motion for the first reading of a Bill. In attempting to override that rule the hon. gentleman would be establishing an inconvenient precedent for the future.

Mr. MACDONALD: I quite understood that I was only speaking with the consent of the House and of the Prime Minister. I will not enter into any debate, and I do

not want to make any argument. I simply want to put for the consideration of the Government a question in regard to this matter, which has been a serious question to hon. gentlemen who have looked into it, and I think this is the most convenient time for me to do so, before the debate on the second reading takes place.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must see that whatever information he may give will invite explanation or argument; it is likely to do so.

Mr. MACDONALD: Either I have the consent of the House or I have not. If I have not the consent of the House, of course, I cannot go on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand that my hon. friend is speaking with the consent of the House.

Mr. BORDEN: I think the hon. member for Pictou is nearly through anyway. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and with the consent of the House, he might be allowed to proceed. I would like very much to know what his point is.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member have its consent to proceed?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. LANCASTER: Get to the point.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am getting to the point. I am afraid that my hon. friend would require the statute before him to enable him to see the point. The only place I can find any record of any public statement as to how this computation has been made is at page 527 of chap. 33, Supreme Court of Canada Reports. There the present learned Chief Justice, arguing in the representation case, when Minister of Justice, made a statement as to how this computation was made up both in regard to Ontario and Nova Scotia at that particular period. It seems to me that there is a statement from which one is not able to get any very clear deduction as to the view which I am presenting as being an incorrect one. On the contrary, viewing this purely from the mathematical standpoint, I think the reason which he gives as to why this computation is made up in that way is incorrect. I thank the House for its courtesy. I merely wanted to put this consideration, or this suggestion which has come from hon. members on both sides of the House from the Maritime provinces, before the Government, as under it we are entitled to maintain our representation unimpaired. I think we ought to have that point settled and that we should have the matter thoroughly discussed. I would like to have an assurance from the Prime Minister that this data will be brought down.

Mr. BORDEN: I am very glad that the hon. member for Pictou has brought this matter to my attention. I may say that I examined the computation to which he alludes and I regret to say that I do not find much consolation in it for the Maritime provinces. I would be glad to find any assistance in a computation of that kind. The question is: What was the proportion at the last census and what is the proportion now, the proportion in question being that of the population of a particular province to the population of the whole of Canada. If you take either Ontario or Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick, and find the proportion of the population of the province to the whole population of Canada in 1901, and the proportion of the population of the province to the whole population of Canada in 1911, a very simple mathematical calculation will, I think, show that the proportion, as I understand it, has been decreased by more than one-twentieth.

Mr. MACDONALD: By one-fifty-eighth, which is less than one-twentieth. I have it from an actuary.

Mr. BORDEN: If my hon. friend will come to me I will explain that mathematical calculation to him. I regret that I could not find much consolation or assistance in it. However, I have the calculations already prepared, but I would like to have them verified, so that they will be accurate beyond question, and I had intended, even if my hon. friend had not brought the subject to my attention, to have placed them on the Table before the debate upon the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Carried.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. SPEAKER: Carried. I must rule that at this stage there cannot be any debate. Either the rules are for a good purpose, or they are for no purpose, and my only desire is to maintain the rules.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PARCEL POST AND THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. PROULX: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) this question: Do the new parcel post regulations affect the privilege of franking parcels posted at the post office in the House of Commons?

Mr. PELLETIER: The Postmaster General himself will not have the right to frank a parcel. Everybody will have to pay postage.

Mr. PROULX: Until to-day we were able to frank parcels up to five pounds. I wanted to send books to-day from the House, and I was refused permission.

Mr. PELLETIER: You had better pay for them.

Mr. PROULX: So much the worse for the parcel post system.

PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS AND DOMINION OFFICIALS.

On the motion of Mr. Foster for Committee of Supply:

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt): Before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I wish to speak for a few moments on a matter which I proposed to bring before the attention of the House yesterday when the Orders of the Day were called, but which at your suggestion, Mr. Speaker, I deferred until to-day. From the answers to some questions which were answered yesterday, with reference to the number of homestead entries that had been made within the last three years, 1911, 1912 and 1913, I discovered that the number had very considerably decreased during those three years. On the other hand I discovered that the number of officials in the outside service in the Department of the Interior had been very greatly increased. Taking for instance the one item of homestead inspectors alone, the number, which on the first day of October, 1911, stood at 40, has been increased to 60, an increase of fifty per cent, although the homestead work has very greatly decreased so far as entries are concerned. With reference to the staffs of the various land offices in the West, the number of officials on the different staffs, which on the first of October, 1911, stood at 332, has been increased to 377. From personal observation I am of the opinion that the Government have appointed a large number of officials in the West, not because they are required in the public service, but in order that they may devote their superfluous time to canvassing votes for the political party which to-day holds power in this country. Far from it being the purpose and intent of the Government that public servants, paid out of the treasury of this country, shall not be partisans, shall not take an active part in politics while in the service of the country, it would appear on the contrary that it is the intent and purpose of this Government that officials of the various departments, at least in the outside service, shall render assistance to the political party which to-day holds office.

In support of that view and in reference to the particular matter which I propose to bring before the House, I question very much if the individual concerned is nearly as much to blame as is the Government which he serves. From what I have seen and from what I know, the offence of partisanship in the public service is an offence, not only condoned but regarded as an object of merit by this Government. As proof and evidence of what I say, I wish to take the case of one Mr. Arthur Smythe, who was appointed homestead inspector for the district of Humboldt, by the present Government. From the answer received yesterday to my question, I discovered that this Mr. Arthur Smythe, who was appointed, I believe, early in the year of 1912, is still in the public service as homestead inspector. I have already brought to the attention of the House and of the Government the fact that in July, 1912, during the progress of a provincial election in the province of Saskatchewan, this Mr. Arthur Smythe was haled before the court on the charge of intimidating voters in that election, of attempting to coerce voters to vote for candidates of the Conservative persuasion. Not only was he haled before the court but he was fined fifty dollars and costs. Evidently the proof against him was absolutely conclusive. My inquiry of the Government as to whether or not this Mr. Smythe was still in the public service was answered in the following laconic and emphatic manner: 'Yes, still in the employ of the Government.'

In view of that fact, what can any public servant in the outside service consider is his duty from the viewpoint of the masters whom he serves? An instance such as this is evidence of the fact that from their public servants this Govern-

ment not only condone active partisanship in the discharge of their public duty, but apparently consider it to be one of the cardinal virtues.

Of the large army of new officials that have been created by this Government since coming into office, there is one official to whom I propose to give some particular attention. We have, of course, in the West and in the East, a department of Indian Affairs. When the late member for Dauphin, who was defeated by his constituents in 1911 by a large majority, found that he was out of public life, this Government undertook to provide him with a position in the public service. In order to do that, they created for this gentleman the new office of Chief Inspector of Indian Agencies. In the fiscal year ending March 31, 1913, this Government paid to this official $4,434.63, $450 of which was paid while still being unaccounted for, I suppose in the form of vouchers, receipts or something of that sort. It was put in under the bald statement of expenses. I believe that of the total amount, $3,000, is salary and the balance is travelling expenses, etc.

I am not speaking of this gentleman with any personal animus or feeling, whatever. I have not any question or doubt as to the attainments and qualifications of this gentleman for the position to which the Government have appointed him. I presume he has the necessary qualifications, if he so wills, and if the Government wishes it, to give faithful service in the position to which he was appointed. But I have this complaint to make of this gentleman, that, so far as my information goes, from the day of his appointment he has been as acutely and actively partisan as he ever was when he was himself a candidate for public office. Just as an illustration of this I find in the Dauphin Press of the 5th of this month, in the general news columns, an item to this effect:

> A Conservative convention is to be held on January 16, to select a candidate. Hon. George Lawrence, Minister of Agriculture, will be present with Glen Campbell and others to address the electors. Opposition speakers are invited.

Three thousand dollars a year and expenses! And he is billed in the constituency of Swan River to be one of the public speakers at a convention to be held—to which, of course, opposition speakers are invited. That is only an illustration of the kind of work that this gentleman has been carrying on in the constituencies of Manitoba, and not of Manitoba alone but of the provinces further west. I have just received information from the provincial constituency of North Qu'Appelle in which there is a by-election pending that again the hand of this high-salaried official is shown in his capacity of public servant of this country by participating actively in the contest. I say the by-election is pending. Though the writs have not yet been issued, yet both political parties expect the writs to be issued very shortly and, as a matter of fact, the Liberal party put their candidate in the field in the month of December last, while the Conservative candidate was placed at the end of November. The by-election in the constituency of North Qu'Appelle is occasioned by the resignation of Mr. John Archie McDonald, ex-member of the Legislative Assembly, against whom charges of corruption were laid on account of his election in July, 1912. Before his case was proceeded with in the courts, Mr. McDonald saw fit to resign his seat and is not himself again a candidate in the election. Mr. John Archie McDonald, I may say, is the brother-in-law of Glen Campbell, Superintendent of Indian Agencies—or, if any would prefer it that way, Mr. Campbell is Mr. McDonald's brother-in-law. But while Mr. McDonald is not a candidate, he is exceedingly anxious that the seat he vacated shall be filled by a Conservative in the local legislature. Consequently, we find Mr. Campbell and Mr. McDonald have recently been making a tour of the constituency, with what object in view the members of this House can guess.

The particular matter I wish to bring to the attention of the House and the Government is contained in a letter from Mr. William Penny, of Balcarres, to which is attached an affidavit signed and sworn to by Michael Poitras a half-breed voter in the North Qu'Appelle constituency. I shall just read the letter of Mr. Penny, and as for the affidavit, I will give the substance of it, and the Minister of the Interior who is responsible for the conduct of this official will be welcome to peruse it after I have dealt with it here. The letter from this justice of the peace is addressed to myself and is as follows:

> Dear Sir,—I have the honour to enclose herewith affidavit of Michael Poitras, a half-breed, living near Fort Qu'Appelle, Sask.

I may say in this connection that I understand that one of the duties of the Superintendent of Indian Agencies, and of every Indian agent also, is to prevent the Indians who are the wards of this Government and this country, from having access,

if preventable to intoxicating liquors. The half-breed is not a ward of the Government, but he is in the same position as the Indian so far as his weakness along these lines is concerned.

This man is in destitute circumstances, as a result of becoming intoxicated and lying outside on the frozen ground without any protection from the weather, all night. He has a wife and a family of young children depending on him for their support.

My object in bringing this matter to your attention is with the idea that you may persuade the Dominion Government authorities to render this unfortunate family some aid in their dire distress, which, as you will note in the affidavit, was the result of liquor supplied him by one Glen Campbell, inspector of Indian Agencies. I understand that Campbell resides in Dauphin, Man., and is a brother-in-law of John Archie McDonald, former M.L.A. for North Qu'Appelle, who resigned recently, when charges of corruption in connection with his election were coming before the court.

Trusting that you may be successful in your worthy endeavour to secure aid for this unhappy family.

I remain,
Your obedient servant,
Wm. Penny,
A Justice of the Peace in and for the
Province of Saskatchewan.

Attached to this letter is the affidavit of Mr. Poitras. As I have said, I will not go into the details of this affidavit, but will hand the document to the Minister of the Interior and he will see just how reprehensible was the conduct of Mr. Campbell on this occasion. This half-breed, as all men will, drifted into a bar-room one day—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Not all.

Mr. NEELY: As some men will—drifted into a bar-room one day in January, and there he was met by Mr. John Archie McDonald, and a little later by Mr. Glen Campbell. The affidavit goes on to say that Mr. Glen Campbell insisted on his drinking whisky of which he bought him not one but a great number of drinks until the poor man became intoxicated. The man went out of doors and slept on the prairie—this is in the month of January. And any one who knows anything of the weather of the West in January will know what that means. The result was that when he was discovered in the morning, one foot was entirely frozen, so that the man probably is crippled for life as a result of this experience, and his family, because of his inability to support them, found themselves in destitute circumstances. Now, I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this House, and to the Prime Minister and the Government, whether or not they consider that this sort of conduct on the part of an official of this Government should or should not go unpunished.

I have instanced the case of Mr. Smythe. His was a political offence and perhaps on that account is more leniently regarded by the Government. But here is a case of an agent whom they have appointed to the responsible position of Superintendent of Indian Agencies. He has to look after the wards of this country and protect them from certain vices, of which they easily, as we all know, become a prey. The man spoken of in this letter of the justice of the peace, and whose affidavit is attached, is, as I say, a half-breed, whose position is practically the same as that of an Indian. Yet we find that this official in the constituency of North Qu'Appelle, when a by-election was pending, spent his time—and we will get the expense account in due course—in the service of his country by buying intoxicating liquors for this poor, benighted half-breed who had not sufficient will-power to resist his solicitations, with the result that a family has been practically rendered destitute. We all know very well the high and exalted ideals of the leader of the Government on the question of the public service; at least we all know the high and exalted ideas he entertained before he became Prime Minister of this country. I bring these two instances to the attention of the Government, the latter one especially, and to the attention of the Prime Minister, as evidence of what I believe to be the general practice, so far as partisanship is concerned, of many of the outside officials of this Government, particularly in the Department of the Interior, who operate in western Canada. I say that if the public service is to be degraded and disgraced by such conduct on the part of its high-salaried officials, the sooner this country knows the facts the better. Let us have a statement from the Prime Minister, or from the responsible Minister in this case, the Minister of the Interior, as to whether or not he thinks it is in the public interest and for the well-being of this nation that such conduct should be continued, to the degradation of one of the units of our great body of citizens.

These are only a couple of instances I am bringing to the attention of the Government. I could cite not one but many more instances where officials in the Government outside service, men appointed by this Administration, are carrying on this kind of business. But what is the need of my doing so? We have the evidence of the public

press as to the conduct of this particular gentleman—the fact that he takes the platform and makes political speeches on behalf of political candidates in the West. Not only have we the evidence of the public press, but we have what I would consider to be the irrefutable evidence of this affidavit as to his conduct on the occasion referred to. This seems to be an example of the kind of work this gentleman is doing to earn his $3,000 salary and his $1,400 or $1,500 travelling expenses. The Dominion of Canada is paying for the services of this official, and I say that the Government must be held responsible for the conduct of their officials in expending these moneys not in the public interest, but for the advancement of political parties, whether in provincial or federal politics.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of Interior): Yesterday when the hon. member for Humboldt, on the Orders of the Day being called, arose and gave notice that he intended to bring a matter of great urgency before the House, we expected, of course, to hear something most important, possibly affecting the national welfare. When you ruled, Mr. Speaker, that the matter should not come up except on going into Supply, I sent a note over to the hon. member for Humboldt asking him if he would have the courtesy to tell me what he was going to bring before the House upon its going into Supply. The hon. gentleman, however, has not seen fit to extend this courtesy, and I get up here to-day without having previously had the slightest inkling of what the hon. gentleman has now brought to the attention of the House.

Mr. NEELY: I gave the name of the official agent against whom I proposed to lay the charge.

Mr. ROCHE: That was very definite, I am sure. The hon. gentleman did not give the name of Mr. Smythe, and he said nothing at all about the other charges which he has made in his speech to-day, some papers in regard to which would have thrown light on the subject if I had had an opportunity of bringing them here. The hon. gentleman has said that we have increased the staff of homestead inspectors, and that we are making of them political campaigners. So far as I am concerned, I am glad to say we have increased some of the officials, especially the homestead inspectors, in western Canada. I desire to say also that those officials are not nearly numerous enough to meet the urgent requests made by the farmers, who are asking that inspections be put through more rapidly in order that they may get their patents more rapidly than in years gone by. It is true that there has been some decline in the homestead entries during this last year, but the hon. gentleman did not say that there has also been a very large increase, to the extent of several thousands, in the patents issued during that period. Whilst it has been the practice in the past to take applications at the various agencies and sub-agencies, during the past year we have instructed the homestead inspectors to visit the farmers of those districts wherein there are no agencies and take the applications at their own farms, thus saving them a great deal of time and expense. In this respect the homestead inspectors have been a very great convenience to the people of western Canada. The hon. gentleman says that we have increased our staff. This is true, because we have increased our agencies and sub-agencies. The hon. gentleman knows quite well that the Peace River district and the country north of Edmonton is rapidly filling in; that a great deal of immigration into that portion of western Canada has taken place, and of necessity, in order to keep pace with the requirements of the incoming population, we must have more offices and a larger staff to cater to their wants. If the hon. gentleman could only see a small portion of the correspondence I am in receipt of day after day asking for more land offices and more sub-agencies, he would not blame us, as he has done to-day, for increasing our staff in order to afford greater convenience to the public. The hon. member has said that a certain homestead inspector named Arthur Smythe in Humboldt has been convicted of political partisanship. By whom has he been convicted? It may be—I was not aware of the fact until the hon. gentleman brought the matter to the attention of the House—that this gentleman was hauled before some court in Saskatchewan during the last provincial campaign, but in that respect, Mr. Speaker, he is not alone. Every person who was not well known—especially if he came from Manitoba—and who could possibly be connected with the matter, was taken before the courts before he knew what he was doing. They had blank warrants issued by the wholesale all through the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. NEELY: Can the hon. gentleman prove that?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes, in Saskatchewan—I Can prove it. Mr. Smythe was arrested because it was supposed that he had intimidated some of those people who were residents or who had taken up land in that country. As I say, this is the first time I have heard of this charge against Mr. Smythe; so far as I know, Mr. Smythe was occupying his position before I came into the department. I do not know the gentleman personally, but I have had no complaint against him in connection with the matter which the hon. member for Humboldt has brought to the attention of the House. The hon. gentleman has mentioned the name of Mr. Glen Campbell. I am quite aware that Mr. Campbell was a member of this House during the last Parliament, and I am also aware of the fact that he and the hon. member for Humboldt exchanged what I would call many petrified bouquets at that time. It may be that some of those are still rankling in the breast of the hon. member, and so Mr. Campbell, who is generally quite able to take care of himself, is made the subject of a series of accusations, which I have heard to-day for the first time. Mr. Campbell, a high priced official, the hon. gentleman states, has drawn a great deal of money from this Government, and he says vouchers for a certain amount of this have not been forthcoming. I am not aware of this. I thought possibly the hon. gentleman was mixing up his men, that he was referring to a celebrated character named R. E. A. Leech. That was the gentleman who put in a padded expense account and the Auditor General refused to pay him. That is the gentleman who was rewarded by one of my predecessors in the late Government for his thin red line outrage by being appointed to the high position of inspector of land agencies in western Canada. I am not aware that Mr. Campbell has not sent in his vouchers. If he has not, I presume the Auditor General has not paid his accounts. At all events, the responsibility rests on the watch dog of the treasury, the Auditor General, to look after those details. He states that Mr. Glen Campbell appeared on a public platform in one of the constituencies of northern Manitoba and made a political speech, the proof of which he had in the newspaper which he read. He may have done so, I am not aware of the fact; but certainly the hon. gentleman did not produce the proof that he did. All he produced was a notice of a meeting at which Glen Campbell was advertised to speak. That is about the proof he furnishes in regard to all these other accusations. I do not believe that Mr. Campbell appeared at that meeting.

Mr. NEELY: I did not say that he took the public platform; I said he was advertised to take the public platform.

Mr. ROCHE: Mr. Campbell is not responsible for being advertised at any meeting and I personally know that he is not so fond of appearing and speaking at public meetings that now, since he has become an official of the Government, he would take part in such a meeting. I do not believe he appeared on that platform and delivered a speech.

Again, the hon. member takes exception to his visiting Qu'Appelle, because, in the not distant future, there is to be a provincial by-election in that constituency, at which his brother-in-law, Mr. McDonald, is to be the candidate. I do not know whether Mr. McDonald has been selected as candidate or not.

Mr. NEELY: I said he was not to be the candidate.

Mr. ROCHE: Then the grievance is that he appeared with his brother-in-law and was travelling through that constituency and the hon. gentleman, being suspicious as he is, immediately jumped to the conclusion that because, at some time in the future, there is to be a by-election in that constituency, therefore Mr. Campbell and his brother-in-law, whom he
5 p.m. was probably visiting, must be on mischief bent. Therefore he holds Mr. Campbell up to the odium of the country through this Parliament on a charge of canvassing on behalf of a candidate who has not yet been selected, to my knowledge, on behalf of the Conservative party.

His other accusation is a very serious one touching the character of Mr. Campbell. While half-breeds are not, as he says, the wards of the Government, and Mr. Campbell's particular jurisdiction is to look after the Indians, still it is reprehensible for anybody—I am sure the hon. member for Humboldt deplores the idea of his taking a half-breed into a hotel and buying him even one drink. But if the accusation is true as made by the hon. member for Humboldt that Mr. Campbell did that, it is a very serious accusation, and I certainly will submit those charges to Mr. Campbell and allow him to make his defence. The hon. gentleman and his friends opposite have frequently taken us to task on this side for daring to dispense

with the services of any man of the Liberal persuasion without giving that official an opportunity to defend himself; and I am sure he will not take exception if I take the same course in the case of Mr. Campbell. The opportunity of hearing those charges was afforded me for the first time this afternoon, I did not know their nature and therefore I have no papers from the department which might gainsay the accusation against Mr. Smythe on other charges. But I think such complaints ill become hon. gentlemen opposite, with the record they had when they were on this side in connection with their officers. I need not go beyond the confines of my own constituency. There has not been an election since 1896, when I first contested Marquette, that it has not been overrun by hordes of Liberal officials using their utmost services in favour of the Liberals. I entered no strong protest against it, it was part of the game; I did not put up a squeal in Parliament about it; but now as there is some suspicion, yes, it is all based on suspicion, of Mr. Campbell taking part in a by-election about to take place in Saskatchewan, immediately the hon. member for Humboldt, in that virtuous or simulated indignation of his, rises to take the Government to task for something of which Mr. Campbell may have been entirely guiltless. I think these accusations, in the main, are rather puerile. The one the hon. member made against Mr. Campbell personally is a serious accusation against his personal character which I shall bring to Mr. Campbell's notice immediately, and I shall also give the hon. gentleman the opportunity of receiving Mr. Campbell's reply.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): I do not think there is any question that the House is very much disappointed at hearing so bold an announcement from the present Minister of the Interior—I speak of it as it comes to me—of an intention to administer his department as a political machine.

Mr. ROCHE: Suspicion again.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend suggests that the administration of departments under the previous government was of that nature. I had the honour of administering that department for a term of years. My hon. friend, I think, is aware that definite instructions were issued by myself, pending either a Dominion or a provincial election, forbidding officers of the department to take part in those elections. My hon. friend may say that that order was disregarded, but it will surely be understood that if he, as a member of Parliament, had brought to my attention such an incident as has been brought to his attention to-day, I would have been compelled either to dismiss the official or to admit that I was in a position that no minister or no member of Parliament ever could maintain.

Mr. ROCHE: Is that what you did with Phillip Wagner?

Mr. OLIVER: There was no accusation brought against Phillip Wagner for his actions while I was minister; and he was appointed by me.

Mr. ROCHE: He was in jail before you became minister.

Mr. OLIVER: He was in jail before I was appointed. I appointed Phillip Wagner because he was competent for the position. He filled the position acceptably. There was no protest against his appointment and no objection to any action of Phillip Wagner's after he had been appointed by me.

Mr. EDWARDS: Did you give public notice that you were going to appoint him?

Mr. OLIVER: I appointed Phillip Wagner for good and sufficient reasons, and I stood by the appointment for good and sufficient reasons There was no political reason against Mr. Wagner. Never during my administration of that department was an allegation received in the manner this has been received by the present administrator of that department. My hon. friend, it seems to me, scarcely appreciates the importance of the department of which he is the head, and how far the administration of that department affects the well-being and the progress of Canada. This House will surely realize that the welfare and the progress of Canada depends very largely upon the settlement of the prairies, and that the settlement of those prairies depends very largely upon the fairness with which this Government deals with the settlers. When my hon. friend stands before this House, and gives the House and country to understand that the officials of the Department of the Interior have free rein to use the authority vested in them for the advantage of the party in power, I say he throws discredit on the Government of Canada; he terrorizes the settler on the prairie and restricts settlement to that extent. I ask my hon. friends who are not acquainted with the conditions of settlement on the

prairie, to give a moment's attention while I place those conditions before them. A man takes up a homestead far from a railroad and has his wife and family with him. He lives under difficult circumstances, and in a large number of cases without means, excepting such as he can earn at intervals. He depends on getting the patent for his land. To him that patent means his living; it means in many cases his life; and his getting of that patent is to depend upon the dictation of the homestead inspector that my hon. friend appoints, and who is authorized to give, or withhold, his recommendation according to the political views of the man applying for the patent! A more outrageous proposition has never been been placed before the Parliament of Canada. There has never before been a minister in the Parliament of Canada who dared to take such a position before Parliament. Has this action had any effect? Homestead entries have decreased in two years by nearly 10,000—nearly 10,000 less in 1913 than in 1911—and I ask you to believe me when I tell you that this policy of political administration of the Lands Department of this Government has had much to do with that deplorable decrease in settlement.

Mr. BRADBURY: How ?

Mr. OLIVER: Because the settlers are terrorized by the officers of my hon. friend, and no man will take the chances that he has to take with himself and his family if the reward for his risk depends upon the political administration of a Government such as this. Does my hon. friend think that the settler who depends on the recommendation of an officer who takes the public platform and announces his support of a certain political candidate, does he think that that settler will risk giving his political views ? Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that when my hon. friend's homestead inspectors become candidates themselves, that terrorism is exercised over the homesteader, and that such conduct instead of promoting settlement promotes discontent, and prevents settlement. Does my hon. friend want to know the facts ? In the recent provincial election at Peace River, the homestead inspector, Mr. Joshua Fletcher, took the platform and spoke on behalf of the Conservative candidate. He is reported by the newspapers of that district, as declaring that this Government at Ottawa had to be supported by votes for the local candidate in the Peace River constituency. It must be said that this man was appointed by the late Government. I know the man personally. I appointed him myself. My information is that the man took the platform and spoke as he did, because he had to do it in order to hold his position. Did my hon. friend know that his homestead inspector, Mr. Ambroise Grey, was a candidate in the Beaver River constituency in the recent Alberta elections ? He was a defeated candidate, it is true.

Mr. CARVELL: Did he lose his job ?

Mr. OLIVER: No, he resigned from his position, we were informed, when he became a candidate, but he has been holding his position ever since, and when I happened to visit that country shortly before the opening of this session, I found my friend, Mr. Ambroise Grey, and another official, Mr. F. Fane, also a lawyer named Mackie and a gentleman called Hoyle, travelling around the country in an automobile—I do not know who is paying for it, but I fancy the country is—to collect evidence to be used in protesting the election of the successful candidate. Consider the position, Mr. Speaker, of the homesteaders in that constituency who may have voted against Mr. Ambroise Grey. He is now a homestead inspector and knows that they voted against him. Are they likely to get fair treatment at the hands of Mr. Grey when they apply for their patents ? I do not think that they will even expect to get it, and I say that the settlement of that section of the country is discouraged to that extent.

My hon. friend was good enough to recall occurrences in the Saskatchewan election. I happened to be in the province of Saskatchewan at that time, taking some part in that election. At the town of Outlook I was credibly informed that a gentleman named Walker had been appointed homestead inspector there in place of another man who had been dismissed, and that Mr. Walker took the position on the understanding that he was to draw the salary and act as organizer for the Conservative candidate in the constituency during the progress of the election. He did, as a matter of fact, act as organizer, and I was credibly informed that he had addressed a meeting in the same hall that I addressed a meeting in a few nights afterwards. He had loaned his team and rig, or buggy, that the Government supply to homestead inspectors, to the Conservative candidate for the Conservative candidate's use, and

I was told that the Conservative candidate allowed the horses to run away and break the rig.

An hon. MEMBER: Who paid for it?

Mr. OLIVER: I suppose the Government paid for it. My hon. friend said that during the election in Saskatchewan there were men arrested for their work in that election. I ask him: Was it right or wrong that this man Smythe should be indicted on a charge of intimidation?

Mr. ROCHE: I have had no proof yet that he was.

Mr. OLIVER: The case was tried before the court, the magistrate found Smythe guilty and Smythe did not appeal the case. My hon. friend has seen fit to say that some of these men who were arrested in Saskatchewan came from Manitoba.

Mr. CARVELL: Is Smythe still homestead inspector?

Mr. OLIVER: Smythe is still homestead inspector. Any men who were arrested in Saskatchewan, so far as I am aware, were tried on the charge on which they were arrested, and were either punished or released according to the findings of the Court. I will also draw attention to the fact that things are not thus in the province of Manitoba, where they arrest men without warrant, hold them without trial, and discharge them when the election is over. There is not only that difference, but the premier of that province stands on the public platform and announces to all and sundry that they are going to do it.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the Minister of Public Works?

Mr. OLIVER: Well, the Minister of Public Works has no jurisdiction over that particular matter. The premier of the province of Manitoba stood on the public platform and declared that men taking part in the election would be arrested; they were arrested without warrant, they were held without trial, and they were discharged without offences being alleged against them.

I hope that my hon. friend the minister will realize that the administration of his department is something more than he has seen fit to phrase it here in the House, as a matter of 'playing the game.' I think he will realize that on its righteous, and, therefore, successful, administration depends in large measure the welfare and progress of this country, and if the hon. gentleman sees fit to administer that department, as he has lightly suggested—I think rather in humorous terms than with wrong intent—if that is his intention, then I say he has made a more violent accusation against the good faith and sound patriotism of the Government of which he is a member than any member of this House ever made before.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow some of the statements which have been made by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) to go unchallenged. My hon. friend has undertaken to refer, in answer to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche), to certain arrests that were made in the province of Saskatchewan in the by-election two years ago. I want to tell the hon. member for Edmonton that while a very large number of arrests were made, no charge was preferred against any man who was arrested according to the law in this or any British country in the known world. Take the case of this man Smythe who was arrested; he was not faced by a magistrate upon the charge with which he was arrested at all. Numbers of other homestead inspectors were arrested, and when they were arrested, without the issue of a warrant, they were arrested largely on the strength of a telegram from a whisky detective in the city of Regina.

Mr. OLIVER: Will the hon. gentleman give the names of those other men who were arrested?

Mr. ROGERS: I will be glad to supply my hon. friend with them. I do not have them here. I will name one who was arrested—Mr. Shields.

Mr. OLIVER: Was he a homestead inspector?

Mr. ROGERS: He was a homestead inspector. He was arrested at some distance up the line from Regina, handcuffed, paraded in the train from there to Regina, and cast into jail at that place. Bail was asked and urged, but it was denied. The matter was taken before one of the justices of the High Court, who commented upon the conduct of those in charge of the case and expressed the hope that the people of Saskatchewan were not prepared to conform to Russian methods. Therefore, he would undertake to liberate Mr. Shields, and he said that if the men in charge of the jail did not obey his orders

he and Mr. Johnston would go down to the jail themselves and see that Mr. Shields was liberated from the cell in which he had been placed by the officers of the Liberal Government of the province. Mr. Shields was allowed to go, but a moment afterwards he was re-arrested and put in jail again. The same justice ordered his release at once and Mr. Shields went home. He came back for trial at the time appointed and no charge was preferred against him; he was told to go, as they had nothing to offer against him and no charge to prefer. This condition of affairs obtained in other cases in connection with arrests that were made in that election. There were very many—

Mr. OLIVER: How many?

Mr. ROGERS: The only case in which a fine was imposed by a justice of the peace was that against a homestead inspector by the name of Smythe, and that conviction was obtained on an entirely different charge from the one on which he had been arrested.

Mr. NEELY: What was he fined for?

Mr. ROGERS: He was fined on some trivial charge; I do not recall it. I have not read the case for over a year and I do not recall to memory what the charge was, but I will promise my hon. friends on the other side of this House that before the vote upon this debate is taken I will submit a history of the arrests in that particular province and I am sure it will startle the good sense not only of hon. gentlemen opposite, but the people of this Dominion. My hon. friend the member for Edmonton rose with righteous indignation in respect to the administration of the Department of the Interior and the action of officers of that department in taking part in elections in the western provinces of Canada. I am free to confess that there is and always has been a condition of affairs that apparently has admitted of officials taking a certain part in elections in those provinces. There is probably no man in this Dominion of Canada more responsible for that condition of affairs than is my hon. friend the member for Edmonton himself.

It will be, I am sure, in the recollection of certain hon. members of this House, especially of my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), that in the year 1896 a resolution was introduced and an understanding arrived at between both sides of this House, which carried with it a perfect understanding that officials of the Government were not to take part in elections. I think this is what was laid down by my right hon. friend—I take it from 'Hansard' of 1896, Volume 1:

> That, whilst it is desirable that every official in the employ of the Government of Canada should enjoy perfect freedom of political opinions and the untrammelled exercise of his franchise in accord therewith, no official should be engaged or be permitted to engage in partisan work of any description in the election of a representative to a provinical or Dominion legislature.

This, I understand, was approved and accepted by both sides of the House. I have not in mind whether it was carefully observed and carried out, but I know that, when an election was called for provincial purposes in the province of Saskatchewan at the time of the foundation of that province in 1905, my hon. friend the member for Edmonton, who stands up to-day in righteous indignation condemns the taking part in the political warfare of any province of the officers of any particular department, if the press quotes him correctly, is reported, not only as being in the province of Saskatchewan assisting in that contest, but as undertaking to give out a published interview as appearing in the press of that province of that day. What did he say then? I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to compare his words at that time in the province of Saskatchewan, when he was engaged in the first election of 1905, with the speech with which he has just favoured the House this afternoon. As I understand it, he is speaking of the officers of the Department of the Interior and dealing with this same resolution that was approved by both sides of the House. His interview in part is as follows; he is referring to homestead inspectors and others:

> They have the power of speech and therefore they are entitled to express their political opinions. They are entitled to express them to homesteaders; they are entitled to express them to men under their control; they are entitled to go on the public platform and express them as presidents and officers of Liberal organizations.

Mr. OLIVER: Might I ask my hon. friend the authority for that interview?

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend will find it in the public press of Saskatchewan of that day.

Mr. OLIVER: What paper was it published in??

Mr. ROGERS: I will try to get my hon. friend a copy. I simply copied this out of the paper some time ago.

Mr. OLIVER: Before my hon. friend goes any further, I wish to say that such a statement as being made by me is absolutely false.

Mr. ROGERS: I shall be glad to provide my hon. friend with a press report of it, and he will satisfy himself in the matter. My hon. friend talks about the responsibility resting upon an officer of the department and especially upon a minister who is responsible for the administration of a department. If my hon. friend is not satisfied with the statement in respect to the interview which I have quoted, probably he will be satisfied with an official record of the department, by which record he, as Minister of the Interior, divested himself of all rights and of all powers in respect to the form of appointments made for the filling of positions in the western provinces of Canada. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has mentioned here to-day the name of one R. E. A. Leech, a gentleman whose name is fast becoming a household word in various parts of this Dominion, largely by reason of the services which he has been able to render the hon. gentlemen opposite, and by reason of the generous compensation which he has received in various forms from the public treasury for services so rendered. That gentleman was the Liberal organizer of the province of Manitoba when that famous scheme of the thin red line was practised by which thousands of the best citizens of that province were deprived of their right and of their liberty to exercise the franchise. How was that effort of Mr. Leech appreciated by the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite in those days? I am quoting from a public record how he was appreciated by no less a person than my hon. friend the member for Edmonton who issued this instruction, dated Ottawa, March 23, 1906:

Memorandum.

Mr. R. E. A. Leech,—With a view to securing more efficient service in office and field work in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, you are hereby given authority to suspend, for cause and for such time as deemed advisable, any Dominion Lands agent, clerk, homestead inspector, sub-agent, or other employee in the service of the Lands Branch of the Department of the Interior. You will promptly report to head office each case of such suspension, giving full particulars as to the reasons for the action taken, when the matter will be dealt with by the department.

(Sgd.) Frank Oliver.

In view of these conditions, in view of the appointment of men under such a head and under such an officer of the department as Mr. R. E. A. Leech, is it any wonder that a practice should have been established in those western provinces whereby the officials of the Department of the Interior in particular have from time to time taken part in political contests? I am frank in admitting that it is becoming a very common practice. As my friend the Minister of the Interior said, before the present Government took office, you could not go into any constituency without being met by a horde of Liberal employees taking part in, taking charge of and managing the political campaign of the Liberal party.

In so far as the accusation of my hon. friend from Humbolt (Mr. Neely) is concerned, I was not in the House when he was speaking and I did not hear of it. All that I have to say in respect to Mr. Campbell is that he was for some time a member of this House. I understand that he is an efficient official. If he is guilty of this particular charge, which my hon. friend has made against him, it is a matter of great surprise and of great regret to me. I can only hope and only promise hon. gentlemen opposite that in elections in western Canada, as far as officers of any department of the Government are concerned, they will receive a great deal better treatment, and I hope perfect treatment, as compared with the treatment which we received when we had to go into these contests.

THE DUTY ON BASIC SLAG.

On the motion of Mr. Foster for Committee of Supply:

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmorland): I wish, Mr. Speaker, to invite the attention of the House to a matter of very great importance, especially to the people of eastern Canada; and I propose, before resuming my seat to conclude with the motion of which I have given my hon. friend the Minister of Customs notice. A year ago or so I took occasion, availing myself of the privilege accorded to me as a member of this House, to call the attention of hon. members and of the country to the trend of events with respect to legislation in Canada. On that occasion, I illustrated my viewpoint by calling to the attention of the House several Bills which were simply Bills of an enabling character, Bills giving power to the Governor in Council to legislate in respect to the matter they referred to. I think I pointed out that the Naval Bill was an enabling statute, that the Highways Bill, the Bill relating to Branch Lines, the Agricultural Bill, were all

enabling statutes, that all gave power to the Governor in Council to legislate with regard to matters that should be under the direct control of the people of the country through their representatives. I called attention to the fact that in one particular Bill, namely, that relating to railway construction and railway acquisition, it was an enabling statute giving the Minister of Railways—not merely the Governor in Council, but the Minister of Railways power and authority to do in this respect that which should be performed and controlled by the Parliament of Canada. I think that in some measure I illustrated the dangers incident to legislation by Order in Council. I pointed out that it meant that we were going back in history and doing over again under this Administration what had been done when we were mere colonies under the Crown and under the direction of a Governor in Council who legislated in a large measure for the people. I thought at that time, and I still think, that that class of legislation is against the best interests of Canada. But we have developed very recently a method of legislation in Canada that is much more dangerous and much more inimical to the public interest than that of the Order in Council. I refer to orders made by the Board of Customs of Canada. That is a much more dangerous form of legislation, because of the secrecy of its character, and the subtlety of its nature, and because it is surreptitious in the method pursued. It legislates in respect to matters which should be under the control of Parliament and should be subject to public discussion and within the knowledge of the whole people. An illustration of this is to be found in a case which has developed within the last few days. To an inquiry I made I received an answer from the Minister of Customs to the effect that no Order in Council had been passed whereby the importation of slag into Canada was affected, but that there had been an order of the Customs Board, passed in September last which imposed, or had the effect of imposing, a duty on what is known as basic slag. I need not recite the question and answer. The minister made a statement with respect to the order of the Customs Board, and he placed in my hands for the information of hon. members the following:

Meeting of the Board of Customs held, Ottawa, 9th September, 1913.

Question of duty on basic furnace slag, ground.

Declared to be dutiable under tariff item 663 and in effect from 9th November, 1913.

John McDougald,
Chairman.

Mr. CARROLL: Is basic slag the raw material, that is, the product of the steel mill?

Mr. EMMERSON: It is a raw material, ground material, but that will develop as I proceed. Accompanying this order of the Customs Board was the following memorandum—or at least that was furnished me after I had first received a copy of the order. The order on its face seems to have dropped into the groove in which the Customs Board would meet: there is nothing preliminary to show any initiative with respect to this order. There was no application; apparently it dropped from the heavens, without being put in motion by anybody.

Mr. BRODER: Is the hon. gentleman finding fault with anything that dropped from the heavens?

Mr. EMMERSON: I should be very happy to congratulate the hon. gentleman if I thought he came from that direction.

Mr. FOSTER: That is where he is going.

Mr. CARVELL: To the Senate.

Mr. EMMERSON: I am sure we hope he will get there; I am afraid that if he keeps the company he is now keeping, there may some doubt with regard to his ultimate destination. This memorandum, which is dated February 6, 1914, reads as follows:

The question of the duty on basic slag, ground, was referred to the Board of Customs, 9th September, 1913, under section 58 of the Customs Act, on the verbal representations of the manager of the Cross Fertilizers Company, who claims that the company has a capital of $140,000 invested in the manufacture of ground basic slag at Sydney, N.S., and that in 1912 they manufactured 16,000 tons of this article.

Respectfully submitted,
John McDougald,
Commissioner of Customs.

I do not propose to analyse that memorandum, or to comment upon it. It says that the Board of Customs took action under the 58th section of the Customs Act of Canada with respect to a commodity referred to in the order as basic furnace slag, ground. For many years, down to November 9 last, under the provisions of the customs tariff of 1907, blast furnace slag came into Canada free of all customs impost.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What is the number of the tariff item?

Mr. EMMERSON: 372. Under the order passed on September 9 this was made dutiable under item 663 of the tariff, which reads as follows:

Fertilizers, compounded or manufactured, n.o.p., 5 per cent British preferential tariff, 7½ per cent intermediate tariff, 10 per cent general tariff.

I wish to read, and to ask hon. members of this House to note the reading of it, the 58th section of the Customs Tariff Act, under which this order was passed:

Whenever any difference arises or when even any doubt exists as to any or what rate of duty is payable on any class of goods, and there is no previous decision upon the question by any competent tribunal, binding throughout Canada, the Board of Customs may declare the rate of duty payable on the class of goods in question, or that such goods are exempt from duty, subject in each case to an appeal, by any person interested, to the Governor in Council, and any such declaration of the Board of Customs when approved by the minister, or any such declaration when made by any Order in Council upon appeal, shall have force and effect as if the same had been sanctioned by statute.

This is a provision of the statute which enables the Customs Board, under certain conditions, to vary and control certain items of the tariff. I hold that the order passed in September last is not in accord with the statute. Under the provisions of the statute, any declaration so made by the Board of Customs shall have force and effect only when approved by the Minister, and it must therefore appear on the face of the order that there were doubts or differences in respect of the subject matter of the order, which, when passed, requires the approval of the minister and can only be made effective by that approval being made part of the order. Therefore in my judgment the order itself is illegal and improper. I want to say that this is a dangerous method of making conditions with respect to the importation of anything into this country. I admit that the order refers to basic furnace slag, ground, whilst item 372 of the tariff mentions blast furnace slag.

Mr. MURPHY: Does the order refer to the number of this item?

Mr. EMMERSON: No, it makes no reference to item 372; it simply says: 'duty on basic furnace slag, ground.' Under the provisions of item 372, blast furnace slag has been imported into Canada for many years free of duty. It will be observed that item 372 does not say that blast furnace slag is free only when unground; it does not refer to it in anyway as being ground or unground. I can only infer that a distinction is made between blast furnace slag and basic furnace slag, ground. I hold, in the first place, that the Board of Customs had no jurisdiction to deal with the matter, that they have not followed the statute, that the provisions and conditions of that statute have not been observed by them or recognized by them. We all know and it is well understood that wherever a tribunal is created by statute the terms of the statute must be strictly followed in order to give jurisdiction to that tribunal. A statutory court has jurisdiction and authority only when the provisions of the statute are rigidly followed and strictly adhered to. It must be shown on the face of the proceedings that that has been done. In this instance there is no such showing, it does not appear that they had jurisdiction, and my contention is that under that order any duty that has been collected by the Customs of Canada to-day on blast furnace slag imported into Canada is collected unjustifiably and without authority of law, and not in any way ratified by the action of the board itself.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 51, respecting the Bronson Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 52, respecting the Central Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. W. H. Bennett.

Bill No. 53, respecting the Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 54, respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—Mr. Blain.

Bill No. 55, respecting the Quinze and Blanche Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

THE DUTY ON BASIC SLAG.

Mr. EMMERSON (resuming): Before recess, I was referring to the object of this order of the Customs Board, and in doing so I had remarked on the very great injustice and the secrecy of it. For many years slag has been used by the farmers in conjunction with other commoditios as a fertilizer. The slag is brought in, in a ground form and is then combined with nitrates and potash. I presume the phosphorous in the slag has certain fertilizing qualities. The farmer mixes these commodities together on his barn floor and utilizes the compound as

a fertilizer. The effect of the order of the board has been very material, and has caused very serious surprise. It was not made the subject matter of a tariff discussion in this House, nor was it even subject matter of an application made on behalf of some association. Nothing was heard of it, until, suddenly, out of a clear sky came the intelligence that there had been imposed upon this article a customs tariff of 10 per cent in the case of general importation, and in the case of preferential, a duty of 5 per cent. Slag is a by-product of steel manufacture. It is a sort of cinder and can be used in the form in which it comes from the factory, as a fertilizer for grass lands, but not so effectively as if it were crushed by the farmer. When ground, it is more effective as it reaches more roots of the grass or grain, as the case may be.

Mr. J. A. SEXSMITH (East Peterborough): Does this basic slag add any fertility to the soil?

Mr. EMMERSON: It is used for root crops in a mixture that the chemical fertilizing companies make of slag, nitrates and potash. In its crude form, that is, just as it is taken from the refuse of the mill, it has a fertilizing effect on grass lands, at least, it is so claimed, and it has been used by the farmers, particularly in Eastern Canada, for that purpose. I may say it is also used by the orchardists of Nova Scotia in the Annapolis Valley. I will have occasion a little later on to refer to the transactions of that body with respect to this matter. I believe that a fruit grower from Nova Scotia appeared before the Agricultural Committee of this House last session and gave evidence before the Committee with respect to the importation of slag to the Nova Scotia orchardists.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I do not think the hon. gentleman understands my question. Does slag add to the fertility of the soil, or is it its chemical action on the soil that gives slag its value?

Mr. EMMERSON: I am not expert enough to explain that to my hon. friend. I know it is used as a plant food.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I hardly think it is a plant food. It is used for its chemical effect.

Mr. EMMERSON: At any rate, I can tell my hon. friend that the farmers spread it on their grass lands and I presume they do so because it helps in the growing of their crops. Slag is also used for making blocks and in connection with road making, and it used to be brought into Canada, under clause 372 of the tariff, free of duty. The order of the Customs Board transferred it from clause 372 to item 663, 'fertilizers compounded or manufactured,' and imposed a duty on it. The question might arise, and I presume it was in the minds of the Customs Board, as to whether this was a manufactured fertilizer.

Mr. SEXSMITH: It is not a fertilizer.

Mr. EMMERSON: The Customs Board have treated it as a fertilizer.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I understand it only helps the farmer to mine the soil; it is not a fertilizer at all.

Mr. EMMERSON: Then on the statement of the hon. gentleman, the action of the Board of Customs in making it subject to duty under item 663, which covers fertilizers compounded or manufactured, was without any excuse whatever. I was going on to discuss the question as to whether the mere grinding or crushing of the slag made it a manufactured article. It is a question about which there may be a difference of opinion. My own judgment would be that it is not a manufactured article when so treated any more than ashes brought in and put upon the land would be if the ashes were sifted. The mere sifting of the ashes or the grinding of the material in no way changes their component parts. The grinding of the slag is for the greater convenience of the farmer in spreading it over his land with the greatest possible effect. My contention in respect to this matter is, first, that whatever was attempted to be done was illegally attempted to be done, and, in the second place, that there is no justification for placing this article under item 663.

But the farmers of eastern Canada, the fruit growers of the Annapolis valley, the farmers of Westmorland county, who have been using this article for years not paying any duty upon it, were astounded on learning that it was subject to duty. They only learned it in November, and I have some evidence to offer with respect to the method by which this was carried out. Here is a duty of 10 per cent placed upon this article. They usually brought it in delivered at Halifax or St. John at $11.50 a ton. Slag brought from Sydney could only be purchased at $11.50 a ton; that is at a price equal to the foreign article delivered at an ocean port. If you would ask quotations for slag from the Sydney people you would be quoted a price of $11.50 at Hali-

fax or at St. John, plus the freight to the point where the article was required. If an Antigonish farmer sought to buy slag at Sydney he would be quoted $11.50 at Halifax, because that is the cost of the foreign article, plus the freight from Halifax to Antigonish. The article was quoted at $11.50 at Halifax in order to meet the foreign competition and in addition to that there would be the freight from Halifax to St. John to the point where the article was required to be used.

That situation confronted the farmer. At the very same moment, and it is strange that they should synchronize, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) imposed an additional freight tariff over the Intercolonial railway of, first, about 40 cents a ton from St. John to Sackville in Westmorland county. The farmer had imposed upon him the burden of this tariff, and in addition to that, by another department of the Government he had exacted from him 40 cents a ton as freight on this very same article. The method pursued is a simple one, whereby with simply turning a screw, an additional amount is extorted from the farming interests of Canada. I am amazed at the ease with which it is accomplished. An effort was made by the farmers of western Canada to get free wheat. They sent large delegations, they sent men who were representative of large agricultural associations, men who came here representing thousands and thousands of farmers asking the Government to give them free wheat. The Government would not listen, but here, according to this, one lone man from Sydney, Cape Breton, accidentally meets the Commissioner of Customs. I am only assuming this. The manager of a fertilizer company down in Sydney makes a quiet request, stealthily, without any public notice being given, that this article which had been brought into Canada free of customs, should be made subject to a duty of 10 per cent, and lo, it is accomplished. This is quietly and secretly turning the screw whereby the Customs revenue of Canada is increased and the burdens of the farmers of Canada are added to. The extent to which this method is adopted, I am informed, is something startling. I have been told on very good authority that the increases by this method during the last two or three years would amount to an addition of one per cent to the average Customs tariff of Canada. Yet the people do not realize it until they are called upon to pay the duty, because, after all, it is the consumer who has to pay the duty.

This article of which I am speaking is the raw material of the farmer in eastern Canada. He cannot get manure in abundance. The long cold winters make it almost impossible for the farmers to keep very large stocks of cattle. There is a scarcity of fertilizer, and they are compelled to pay to commercial fertilizer companies prices ranging from $25 to $42 per ton. The $42 article is recognized by the intelligent farmer as being more economical than the $25 article because of its richness in fertilizing qualities. They pay in most instances from $40 to $42 a ton for commercial fertilizers. The product of that fertilizing material is not worth, and I am told by intelligent farmers will not realize to them, $42 a ton on wheat or whatever may be the product grown. That is to say, the farmers cannot realize in the first year $42 a ton for the crop which is planted on the area covered by this material. Therefore it is a matter that is of some moment and that is attracting attention.

There is one subject that is being discussed very generally throughout Canada to-day. It is discussed in this House, in the press, on the public platform, by the fireside in the homes of our country, everywhere it is discussed,—I refer to the increased cost of living. Many contributing causes are alleged. I am not going to speak of the causes or to discuss them. Many people in our towns and cities state that one of the causes for the increased cost of living is the lessened production on the farm. The cry goes out from the artisan and the labourer and the mechanic that the farmer is reaping everything; that he is charging too much for the products of his farm and that he is being enriched at the expense of the consumer. They say: Why do you not produce more? They say that the prices of agricultural products such as vegetables, butter and other products that are in general use as necessities of life, are all higher by reason of the fact of under production. The claim is, and I think it is fairly and rightly made, that the farmers, in eastern Canada at least, are not producing to the extent that they should do. That very fact increases the cost of production because the supply is not equal to the demand. The farmers answer that they are doing their utmost, and many of them say that they have not the plant food required to enable them to till their land so that their production can be greater. Another answer has been very fairly made by the

farmers that because of the restricted markets they are not encouraged and stimulated to further production; that there is a fluctuation and even an uncertainty with respect to a market. That is one of the reasons why I, as an individual, supported reciprocity, because I believe that it would afford an additional market and a choice of markets, thus assuring stability of production, giving assurance to the farmer that if he could not succeed in one market he would succeed in another, and that it would be to his advantage, as it would be to the advantage of a consumer, that the production should be greater and steadier, and therefore the prices would be steadier and more to the satisfaction of the consumer as well as of the producer. It is not to the advantage of the farmer to have a very high price during one year and a very low price during the next year for the same commodity, and it is certainly not of advantage to the consumer. The latter would rather have an assured supply at a steady price than have the supply and the price fluctuate up and down.

That is a mere discussion of the economics involved in this question. The action of the Customs Board, which I hold was not regular because it nowhere appears that the Minister of Customs gave his approval as required under the Act, has indeed resulted to the injury of the farming community in eastern Canada, as I am well informed, and I believe to the farmers generally throughout Canada wherever commercial fertilizers are made and sold.

This slag is used by the commercial fertilizing companies in the manufacture of fertilizing materials in conjunction with other component parts, as I have said, nitrates and potash. These materials are imported from abroad, largely from Chili, Belgium, Germany, the Southern States, etc. The slag and the potash and the nitrates are brought in free under the tariff of Canada. The slag, however, under this order is made subject to a duty. The additional freight rate and the additional duty bear heavily upon the farmers in eastern Canada. To that extent it has an effect upon the production of the farms in eastern Canada, upon the supply of the necessities of life required by the consumers. In that way, it has a natural bearing upon the high cost of living.

I have had the advantage of having this matter placed before me by a very intelligent farmer who comes from my own constituency and whose name, wherever known, is respected. I can best quote from his letter to me. He says:

> One of the several serious handicaps to profitable farming in these two provinces is the low grade quality and excessive prices of most of the fertilizers offered to our farmers. Those well-meaning wise people who do all their farming on paper are continually telling us how easy it would be to double the yield per acre by better methods. But every practical farmer knows—

and my informant is a practical farmer; he is not a gentleman farmer in the usual meaning of that term.

> —that on our average upland farms, with its more or less exhausted soil, bigger crops cannot be raised, unless more plant-food is supplied to that soil in the shape of fertilizers. The immense cost of feeding cattle through our long winters and occasional short crops of fodder make it impossible for any man to keep sufficient live stock to produce more than a trifling supply of barn manure, totally inadequate for any enlargement of his fields, or increased yields per acre.
>
> How, then, I ask, shall the farmer make good in the face of these facts, and double the fruits of his field? 'Nothing is easier,' answer the manufacturers. 'See our factories,' they exclaim, 'all over these provinces, turning out unlimited quantities and endless variety of fertilizers already mixed, to supply your every want.' 'Buy our mixed fertilizers, Mr. Farmer, double your crops per acre, and get rich quick,' is the slogan of their many agents sent out to push the sale of these goods. Unfortunately for the farmers, however, our tariff maintains a heavy duty on all mixed fertilizers. With this advantage, our Canadian fertilizer companies apparently fix their prices to the farmer on the basis of charging him 'all that the traffic will bear,'—$25, $30 and even up to $42 per ton is demanded for these mixed goods. At the same time, our farmers know $1 per ton is the outside market value of barn manure for common crops. Is it any wonder, then, that the farmers are suspicious of such costly goods and buy so little of them? Is it any wonder farm crops are decreasing in these two provinces when the men who try to grow them are charged $40 to $42 per ton for mixed fertilizer of the standard analysis of 4-8-10, which is the lowest grade any man should use? Forty dollars per ton! Just think of it! Not one of our principal crops, not even wheat, is worth $40 per ton. At such unreasonable prices, it requires the whole gross proceeds of three to five acres of hay, or of wheat, or of oats, or of barley, to pay the first cost of a single ton of these factory mixed fertilizers, to say nothing of the large cost of raising and harvesting the crop besides. I freely admit there are plenty of mixed fertilizers on market for $30 per ton, or for less. Much of the factory mixed product, however, is of such low grade analysis, and so completely stuffed with 'fillers' as to make it even more expensive to those who use them, than the better quality at the bigger price.

I relate now the experience of this gentleman with respect to the treatment of this material:

Having become impressed years ago with our great need of better and cheaper fertilizers, I set out to inform myself if such were not obtainable; and, if so, why these provinces should be deprived of their benefits. Travelling in the Southern States, I found their immense production of cotton, corn, tobacco, sugar cane and garden truck, practically all depended on the lavish use of high-grade fertilizers obtained at a reasonable cost. English farmers have steadily increased their yields per acre by importing guano for the last fifty years from another hemisphere; and now with that supply becoming scarce, they have an abundance of high-grade slag at home at prices nominal, compared with the cost of the same grades here. Being fully convinced that I could double the proceeds from my farm operations if permitted to buy reliable fertilizers at their value in the open market, I determined to make the effort.

One year ago, in conjunction with my brother, A. Chase Fawcett, and C. Fred. Fawcett, we set out to buy a few carloads of fertilizers for ourselves and a few neighbours, at what we had learned was something near their real value in the open markets of the world. After weeks of correspondence and many interviews with agents of our Canadian mixed fertilizer companies, we found it impossible to buy their mixed goods at anything near our estimate of their real values. Rather than pay their prices, we decided to buy the several imported ingredients and do our own mixing by hand on our own barn floors. To make a long story short, we soon had six carloads at our station; three of slag direct from England, for our grass and grain, and three of phosphate rock, potash and nitrate, to blend in a 4-8-10 mixture for potatoes and turnips. The best evidence I can give of the complete success of our experiment and the satisfaction we all got by mixing our own fertilizers and knowing just what they contained, is to mention the fact that we are now placing our next spring order for five times as much as last year (or some eight thousand dollars' worth) for our own and nearby neighbours' use.

There is the result of the experiment of this farmer in eastern Canada. He is voicing the judgment, experience and opinion of all farmers there who have had occasion to purchase commercial fertilizers. With respect to his experiment, he goes on to say:

Much as we saved in purchase money and gained in better crops, however, was only in small comparison with valuable knowledge we acquired in the venture. By carrying on a wide correspondence and by further persistently delving into the mysteries of the fertilizer business, we now find that for next year, we can buy most of these unmixed products for even less money than last year, and possibly save something besides on freight rates and larger orders.

But the increase of duty discounts this very much, as also does the recent increase in Intercolonial freight rates. For he and his associates live along the line of the Intercolonial railway, and the recent increase on this material largely discounts the advantage they were to secure by reason of the experiment which they made last year, and the greater knowledge gained by them in study, correspondence and travel. Evidence of that character must of necessity have a very great weight with hon. members of this House, and it must make them realize that the Government of the day, in imposing these additional burdens on the farmers of eastern Canada, have done something which is unjustifiable and against the best interests of the country. If they want to help production, then let the farmer have this material free. This is the farmer's raw material. The protectionist clings to the idea always that, while he should have protection for his manufactured products, the raw material must come in free. That he demands, that he insists upon, and that he secures from any government that is carried on on protectionist lines. The farmer asks that his raw material, this slag, be made free. He goes further—although this may not be pertinent to the discussion of the particular motion I am bringing before the House—he asks that all fertilizers should be made free, because all fertilizers are his raw material out of which he brings forth the manufactured product, the crop. If you want to lessen even in a slight degree the cost of farm products to the labourer, the artisan and the consumer everywhere, make it possible for the farmers to produce their crops at a lower percentage of cost. This can be done always by increased production, and it certainly can be accomplished if you give the farmer his raw material free, and refrain from burdening him with customs duties.

I want to relate some further facts in regard to the manner in which this order was passed by the Board of Customs. (Reading):

We first learned of this proposal to impose such a duty—

That is, the duty that was imposed on the 9th of November.

—by accident. We heard it as a rumour first, but now realize that it is all too true. In October we were on the point of closing a contract for 1,000 tons of British or Belgian slag with the Nitrate Agencies Company, New York city. Said slag was to be of extra quality and some dollars per ton cheaper than any ever on our market before. It contained 17 per cent to 19 per cent phosphorus, with 14 per cent guaranteed soluble and available.

Perhaps the hon. member who questioned me a few moments ago will take that to heart.

Hon. J. D. REID: Is the hon. gentleman now reading from the same letter as that which he quoted from a few moments ago?

Mr. EMMERSON: No, from another letter.

Mr. REID: That is not from a farmer?

Mr. EMMERSON: It is.

Mr. REID: And he was buying a thousand tons for his own use?

Mr. EMMERSON: For his own use and the use of his neighbours; they were co-operating. This man is a practical farmer, a man of some means, and because of his being a practical farmer, working his farm as it should be worked, he is in a position to give an order for a thousand tons for himself and his associates. I think my hon. friend should not look down upon him or regard him with scorn because he is a practical farmer.

Mr. REID: I was not looking down upon him; I simply asked the hon. gentleman a question.

Mr. EMMERSON: The hon. minister spoke contemptuously, and in a way in which I would not expect him to speak.

Mr. CARVELL: Give him the name.

Mr. EMMERSON: The name of the gentleman in question is W. B. Fawcett, of Sackville, county of Westmorland. He was born and brought up in a Conservative family. The Fawcett family has been Conservative from time immemorial—until they had their eyes opened by the iniquities of the tariff. The letter goes on:

> It contains 17 per cent to 19 per cent phosphorus and with 14 per cent guaranteed soluable and available, and was to be delivered to us f.o.b. cars St. John, N.B., at $10 per ton. The Sydney slag advertised and sold throughout these two provinces only carries an analysis of 14 per cent to 16 per cent phosphorus with 12.05 per cent, guaranteed soluble and available to the farmer, or his crops. Just at this point this Nitrate Company informed of the impending duty, with the result that we deemed it prudent to reduce our order to 500 tons under such new conditions as we will have to pay the $5 extra in duty, in case they bring us Belgian slag, or a trifle less if British slag. Another addition to the hold-up in our efforts to increase the farm crops in this vicinity: Mr. Gutelius lately saw fit to give the Maritime farmers a further kick to the tune of 40 cents per ton additional cost in freight from either St. John or Halifax to Sackville. Some say this has again been slightly altered leaving the increase in freight over the Intercolonial at about thirty cents per ton.

Whilst Mr. Fawcett, a very intelligent man and an educated farmer, has his own views with respect to tariffs, and whilst he has been a Conservative, he is not in any sense a political partisan. He was in favour of reciprocity, believing in the interchange of natural products between this country and the people of the United States. To the fact that the Conservatives in his community so believed, I owe my election in 1911 as a member of this House, because in that vicinity and in other sections of the country there were in 1911 at least fifty Conservative reciprocity men who voted not for me personally, but for the principle which I espoused, reciprocity. Mr. Fawcett took that view.

Mr. EDWARDS: How did your majority compare with 1908? The hon. gentleman is making an assertion which the figures do not back up.

Mr. EMMERSON: I have said that I owe my election to fifty reciprocity votes. Although I had a majority of 1,400 in 1908, I am free to say that had it not been for these votes I would not have been elected in 1911. I asked Mr. Fawcett if he had ever imported any of this slag in former years. He says:

> Yes, in a small way we did last year, three carloads. It came about as follows: The United Fruit Company of Annapolis valley quoted us Sydney slag at Halifax at $11.50 per ton, and added that they thought they could deliver it at Sackville at same figure, because freight rate, Sydney to Sackville, was the same as Sydney to Halifax. Later on they advised us they were unable to do so. Then we wrote directly to the Cross Fertilizer Company at Sydney asking them if they would deliver us three cars at Sackville at the $11.50. Mr. Walker, their manager, answered they could not deliver at less than the $11.50 Halifax price plus freight Halifax to Sackville, $1.20 per ton. Failing to see any justice or equity in thus being held up for two rates of freight Sydney to Sackville just because Sackville was unfortunate enough to be placed alongside of a railway instead of alongside St. John or Halifax or any other ocean port, we wired—

Hon. gentlemen can see the force of this statement. He has charged $11.50 a ton, the Halifax price, plus freight Halifax to Sackville but the Sydney concern made their price at Halifax to equal the price of the imported article, plus the duty at Halifax, plus the freight to Sackville.

> —we wired Mr. Walker again that we would take three cars of his slag delivered at Sackville at $11.50 per ton the same as he offered it to us at Halifax, same also as he offered it to us delivered at St. John even after he paid Intercolonial railway freight all the way from Sydney to St. John, otherwise if he refused us the slag at the competitive ocean port price

$11.50 we would give our little trade to the foreign slag which evidently was the only influence at keeping prices within the farmers reach.

Outside of this venture in slag we also imported about three other carloads of potash as it comes from Germany, nitrate as it comes from Chili and phosphate brought as it comes from the Southern States in proper proportions to mix in a complete fertilizer for potatoes and other crops of any analysis of 4 per cent nitrogen 2 per cent phosphorus and 10 per cent potash, After we got mixing these ingredients on our own barn floors we were visited by our New Brunswick Secretary of Agriculture (Mr. Daggett) with his expert chemist (Mr. Durst) who testified that our materials were so true to analysis that each ton was worth from $1 to $2 per ton more than any four by eight by ten mixture put up by any fertilizer manufacturer in the two provinces and sold to farmers at $40 to $42 per ton. We distributed our three cars among our neighbour farmers at $29 per ton which just paid labour and expenses of handling but no profit.

Now, there is the experiment of a practical farmer acting in co-operation with his neighbours, anxious to increase the production of their farm land, feeling the necessity of enriching those lands with plant food, but not having available the natural manure on their farms for fertilizing purposes. They seek to get it at the cheapest possible price, at a price more in keeping with the value of the material, and co-operating, buy the ingredients which go to make up a commercial fertilizer, mix them on their barn floors and have a material that does not cost more than $29 a ton, a material that is, according to the testimony of the agricultural experts of the province of New Brunswick, better in fertilizing qualities than is the ordinary fertilizer purchased from the commercial fertilizer companies. It seems to me, without dwelling further upon the subject, that the action of the Government in attempting to extort secretly from the farmers this additional toll on their raw materials should be condemned. I have further said that the Customs Board were not justified in passing that order, that it is illegal and improper and that it works very serious injustice to the farming community of the Maritime provinces particularly. I presume that wherever in Canada commercial fertilizers are in use there is a proportionate injustice and loss to the farming communities in those sections. I would therefore move, seconded by Mr. Hughes, of Kings, P.E.I.:

9 p.m.

That under article 372 of the Customs tariff of Canada, 1907, blast furnace slag is on the free list, but that the Board of Customs, at a meeting held on the 9th day of September, A.D. 1913, improperly and illegally declared the same to be dutiable under tariff item 663 and in effect from the 9th of November, 1913, without such declaration being, as appears, approved by the Minister of Customs as required by statute and that the Department of Customs in now subjecting the same to duty is violating the statute to the great injustice and loss of the farming community.

[Mr. Emmerson.]

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, the situation appears to me to be something like this, that this Government, desiring to give the manufacturers of the country all the advantages that it is possible to give them, desiring to help them in every way even to the disadvantage of others, and not finding it expedient to raise the customs duties in the ordinary way, by increasing the tariff, have taken advantage of every possible excuse to do the same thing in another way, that is by rulings of the Customs Board. This slag, as has been pointed out by the mover, is an ingredient in the compound of fertilizers and under the late Government it was admitted free of duty. By the tariff law of the country it was admitted free of duty. Some manufacturer in some part of Canada who treated this article in some way or other conceived the idea that it would be greatly to his advantage to have a duty put on it and apparently all he had to do was to see the Minister of Customs, to see a member of this Government, and straightway a ruling of the Customs Board was obtained by which this article, which had hitherto been free, was subjected to a duty of 7 to 10 per cent.

That appears to be a peculiar way of helping the farmers, and this Government has often told us that its great desire is to help the farmers. It is something like the ruling of the Customs Board—putting a duty of $2 a thousand on lumber that had hitherto entered this country free. Rough lumber was admitted free, and under a ruling of the Customs Department of the late Government lumber planed on one side only was considered as rough lumber; but when this Government came into power, and when the present minister took charge of the Customs Department, he made a ruling subjecting that kind of lumber to a duty.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs). That is not right. I may say that rough lumber, or lumber planed on one side, comes in free, and has always been free.

Mr. HUGHES: It is free now, but it was not free a year or two ago.

Mr. REID: Yes, it was. It was only dutiable when planed on both sides.

Mr. HUGHES: At all events, it is true that lumber that was admitted free by the late Government was, by a ruling of the Customs Board, made dutiable by this Government. Lumber is a necessity, almost a prime necessity, to the people living on the plains where lumber is very scarce. It is certainly raw material to the farmers, who have to build houses and barns for the protection of themselves and their stock, and the people who suffered loss by reason of that ruling brought their case to the Supreme Court of Canada, and as I understand it, the Supreme Court found that the ruling of the Customs Board was illegal, and ordered the removal of the duty which had been imposed by the present Minister of Customs. That is one of the things which show the insincerity of this Government when they state that they have the interests of the farmers at heart. They are willing to educate the farmer and do a great many things for him, providing he allows them to tax him all he can bear for the advantage of the manufacturers and the big interests. They are willing to pay professors, and the Lord knows how many men, to educate the farmer, and it is a peculiar education he gets, in some cases at all events. Some years ago a professor came down to my own province and told us that the very best thing the farmers could do was to establish cheese factories and manufacture cheese. He was a learned man and spoke well. The farmers thought he understood the business and took his advice. They established a great many cheece factories. But a few years after that another professor came along and said they had made a great mistake, that cheese farming was not the thing for them, and told them they should have gone in for making butter. He advised them to discard the machinery they already had in the cheese factories, and to install the very expensive machinery necessary for the making of butter. It has been well said that if you would get off the farmer's back, and allow him the freedom of working for himself, in nine cases out of ten he would be able to educate himself, and perhaps be able to give himself a better education than these high-salaried professors give him. If this Government were really sincere in its effort to help the farmer, it would at least give him his raw material free of duty, and lumber and fertilizer are raw material to the farmer, as has been pointed out. Why in the name of common sense, is an effort being made by the back door to tax this material that is so essential to a farmer's existence? It seems to me to be a very peculiar thing, but perhaps the minister may be able to explain it. It is just another indication that this Government wishes to put all the burdens it can upon the farming community for the benefit of the privileged classes, and for the benefit of the men whose orders they have to obey. It is well for the farmers to know the actual situation, and it is well that these things are occasionally exposed. This is an education that the farmers ought to get, and, so far as I am concerned, I will try to give it to them. If the minister has any explanation to make, I trust it will be a reasonable explanation; but there is one thing he cannot explain away, and it is this: that this article, which is of very great importance to the farmers of this country, came in free under the late Government, and under this Government it is taxed to the disadvantage of the farmer and at the behest, I suppose, of somebody who thinks he can make a profit out of it.

Mr. REID: I am very much surprised to see the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) pose as the farmer's champion. Last year when we had the Highways Bill before the House the hon. member did not pose as a champion of the farmer. This Government last year and the year before, put a large amount in the Estimates for the building of good roads for the farmers, and the hon. member for Westmorland was one of those who did what he could to prevent that money being expended.

Mr. EMMERSON: Oh, no, you are wrong on that, as you are wrong on this.

Mr. REID: The hon. member's whole argument was to show that fertilizers should be on the free list. In 1906, when the present tariff was being drawn up, the Hon. Mr. Fielding went into council, as every minister must do, and submitted that tariff for the approval of the Cabinet, and the hon. member for Westmorland sat at that council and approved of fertilizers being put on the dutiable list.

Mr. EMMERSON: That was the tariff of 1907; I was not a member of the Government then.

Mr. REID: November, 1906, was the time at which this tariff was passed, and the hon. member was a member of the Government and approved of a duty being placed on fertilizers, and placed, as he argues, to the disadvantage of the farmers of the country.

Mr. EMMERSON: Now you have a chance to remedy it.

Mr. REID: That may be, but the hon. member did not remedy it, and from 1906 until the present time he has never stood up in the House and advocated that fertilizers be put on the free list.

Mr. EMMERSON: The farmers are asking for it, and you have the opportunity now; why do you not do it?

Mr. REID: Now, this resolution states:

That under Article 372, of the Custom Tariff of Canada 1907, blast furnace slag is on the free list but that the Board of Customs, at a meeting held on the 9th day of September, A.D. 1913, improperly and illegally declared the same to be dutiable under Tariff Item 663.

That resolution does not state, what is the fact so far as blast furnace slag is concerned, that it is still on the free list. But if you bring in another article and call it basic or ground slag, it is a different article altogether; it is a manufactured article and is not the article specified in the tariff item.

Mr. CARROLL: Is not the by-product that falls from the manufacture of steel called basic slag?

Mr. REID: No, I have not heard of it. There is no such interpretation by the Customs Board. They do not know it in any other way except as blast furnace slag.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the difference between blast furnace and basic slag?

Mr. REID: They call it basic slag because blast furnace slag is the base of the article which has been manufactured or ground.

Mr. CARROLL: Blast furnace slag, that is in the rough, is still allowed to come in free?

Mr. REID: Certainly. The hon. member has admitted that this blast furnace slag in the rough, as mentioned by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) is manufactured into other articles, such as paving blocks. There is one article of manufacture called scoria blocks—blocks that are put under the ties in a street railway. The scoria blocks are manufactured in this way: the slag runs in hot state into forms which are so made that when the material cools it is in the shape of a square block. Would the hon. member for Westmorland state that these blocks should be brought into this country and called blast furnace slag?

Mr. CARVELL: Why not?

Mr. REID: It is changed into a manufactured article altogether.

Mr. CARVELL: No, it is only a new form in which it is brought in.

Mr. REID: It becomes another article altogether. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that corn is on the free list; if you simply ground the corn and brought the product in, would you still be allowed to bring it in as corn?

Mr. CARVELL: That is not a parallel case; you say that the slag is run into a mould.

Mr. REID: It is a parallel case. The article is brought into this country not as blast furnace slag but it is brought in and sold as fertilizer the same as any other manufactured fertilizer. When the importer brings this fertilizer, manufactured from blast furnace slag, through the customs house he enters it for the article for which he purchased it—that is fertilizer—and pays the duty imposed by the tariff of 1907. But this article had been imported and it was not brought to the notice of the customs. The importers have been bringing it in—not the farmers directly—but the jobbers in the lower provinces and when they made out their entries it was entered as blast furnace slag. They made their entries read the same as the item under the tariff.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is it compounded with anything else when imported?

Mr. REID: I do not know.

Mr. MACLEAN: It is just plain, ground slag?

Mr. REID: As far as I know. For that reason they did not notice it, and it passed the customs in that way. The way it was brought to the attention of the Commissioner of Customs, as I understand it, was this: There is a concern down in Sydney which has erected a manufacturing plant for the purpose of taking this slag, grinding it and making it into fertilizer.

Mr. EMMERSON: And mixing other ingredients with it.

Mr. REID: They made a different article altogether. This manufacturer imported some $7,000 worth of machinery, but when he went to sell his goods he found that parties were importing this ground slag.

Mr. EMMERSON: My hon. friend may not know it, but this fertilizing company

has been in existence for a number of years, and this material has been imported free during that period.

Mr. REID: They may have been doing that, and yet this concern would probably not find it out for some time.

Mr. EMMERSON: They fix their price to suit the imported article.

Mr. REID: As soon as they found that this was being imported, they notified the Commissioner of Customs. The matter was brought up before the Board of Customs, and they ruled that this was not blast furnace slag as intended by the item in the tariff, that it was being brought into this country as fertilizer, and that it should come under the item covering the article for which it was sold.

Mr. EMMERSON: If those reasons made the Customs Board act, why does that not appear as a part of the record?

Mr. REID: It is difficult for me to give an answer to that, for the reason that the Customs Board has been in existence for years and years, the same men have composed that board, and they are the men who were there during the whole of the Liberal regime.

Mr. EMMERSON: But they cannot be a law unto themselves.

Mr. REID: It has been in existence all these years. The power given to it by the Act has continued during the last fifteen or sixteen years. The carrying on of that Customs Board has not been changed in any way by this Government.

Mr. EMMERSON: Not for twenty-five years, probably.

Mr. REID: I do not know how long it is, but there have been no instructions given to them either by myself or this Government since we came into power. There has been no secrecy about these board meetings. There is a regular board meeting held once a month; others are called if necessary at any time. The hon. member asks why there were not some letters put in from some person showing that some charge was made that this article was being imported in this way. The answer is because the information was given verbally to the commissioner. Hardly a week passes but some importer, or other person, comes to the customs and makes complaint that articles are either being charged too much duty or that parties are importing goods at an under valuation, and so on. They made their complaint to the Commissioner of Customs, and he notified them on what day the board would meet. They appeared before the Board of Customs and stated their case, and the decision is recorded.

Mr. EMMERSON: Is not a record kept?

Mr. REID: Just as the hon. member has a record of this.

Mr. EMMERSON: There is no record there.

Mr. REID: We do not have a stenographer to take down the evidence of every little case. I believe the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfried Laurier), the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) and the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy), will agree with me that the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) is wrong, because the Board of Customs have a precedent for this case. There was a case in 1909 almost similar to this where an appeal was made to the Board of Customs by a firm in Paris, Ontario. Here is the ruling of the Board of Customs:

> The Board of Customs at its regular meeting on the 12th January, 1909, under the powers conferred by section 58 of the Customs Act, declared that broken gypsum rock not ground, per sample, such as would pass through a half-inch screen, is free of duty under item 292 of the Customs tariff of 1907.

This case was where a sample of crude gypsum had been submitted to the Board of Customs. It had not been ground fine like this slag, but it had been put through some machinery and broken up into smaller lumps so that it might be used, as I understand, in concrete work or work of that description. Here is the ruling of the Board of Customs:

> It is admitted that the samples submitted have passed through a stonebreaker.

In this case, it has passed through a grinding mill and been made very fine.

> Small samples were selected for decision, because if these were declared to be free of duty there would be no question as to duty on larger pieces of gypsum rock.
>
> The Customs tariff, 1907, contains the following provisions as to gypsum rock and products thereof, viz.:
>
> Item 292—Gypsum, crude, sulphate of lime, free in all the tariffs.
>
> Item 294—Plaster of Paris or gypsum, ground not calcined—Preferential tariff, 10 per cent; intermediate tariff, 12½ per cent; general tariff, 15 per cent.
>
> Item 293—Plaster of Paris or gypsum, cal-

cined, and prepared wall plaster, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty, per 100 pounds—Preferential tariff, 8 cents; intermediate tariff, 11 cents; general tariff, 12½ cents.

The board held that the meaning of 'crude' in item 292 was 'raw,' not ground, refined or calcined. If the breaking of gypsum rock into small pieces is held to be a manufacture, the broken gypsum rock would fall under item 208 at 30 per cent general tariff, as manufactures of stone, n.o.p., while the ground gypsum, a more advanced article of commerce, is only 15 per cent under the general tariff.

'Crude' is a term usually applied to articles in a rough state—not finished or refined.

Raw materials in earth, clay, sand, rock, etc., are as a general rule free of duty in the tariff of 1907, vide following items free in all tariffs, viz.:

Item 296—Refuse stone, not sawn, hammered or chiselled, nor fit for flag stone, building stone or paving.

Item 295—Clays, including China clay, fire clay and pipe clay not further manufactured than ground; ganister and sand; gravels; earths, crude only.

Item 296—Flint, ground flint stones; felspar, flourspar, magnesite; soap stone, cliff, chalk, China, or Cornwall stone, ground or unground.

Item 297—Silex or crystallized quartz, ground or unground.

The Alabastine Company, Limited, cite a decision by the United States appraisers rating crushed gypsum as 'An article manufactured in whole or in part, n.o.p.,' under section 6, United States tariff, 1897.

There is no similar provision as to duty in the Canadian Customs tariff of 1907.

Crude gypsum is on the free list in Canada but not on the United States free list.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Was there an appeal?

Mr. REID: Yes, here is the decision of council:

His Excellency the Governor General in Council was pleased to hear an appeal from the Alabastine Company, Limited, of Paris, Ontario, against a decision of the Board of Customs on the 12th of January, 1909, declaring broken gypsum rock not ground, per sample, such as would pass through a half-inch screen, to be free of duty under item 292 of the customs tariff as gypsum 'crude.'

His Excellency in Council, having heard arguments in favour of and against the said appeal, was pleased to over-rule the said decision of the Board of Customs, and to order and declare, under sections 62 and 63 of the Customs Act, that the duty on gypsum, as above set forth, is payable under item 294 of the customs tariff as gypsum, ground, not calcined.

(Sgd.) F. R. Bennetts,
Assistant Clerk of the Privy Council.

That is an appeal from the Board of Customs to the Governor in Council, and there were present at that council meeting Sir Richard Cartwright; Mr. Fielding, the framer of the tariff; Mr. Paterson, the Minister of Customs; Mr. Templeman, Mr. Brodeur, Mr. Oliver, from the West, who is also looking after the interest of the farmers; Mr. Lemieux, Mr. Pugsley, Mr. Graham and Mr. Murphy. If that decision was right, then surely the blast furnace slag that is taken rough from the mills, taken to another concern altogether, then ground and made into an entirely different article of commerce, would come under item 294, that is, would be dutiable. If it was allowed to come in free, it came in without the knowledge of the Customs Department. So far as the Government were concerned, we knew nothing about it. It came up in the usual way before the Board of Customs. After they had given a ruling on it, the matter was submitted to me with all the explanations. I certainly approved of the ruling.

If an article is not specified in the tariff, the Board of Customs has been appointed and has always been in existence to interpret under what item that particular article of which the complaint has been made should be placed. There is no such item in the tariff as basic ground slag. For that reason it should come under the item under which it is sold. So far as I am informed by the Assistant Commissioner of Customs, all this fertilizer is imported from England or Belgium, and the rate of duty is simply five per cent.

Mr. CARROLL: Were any representations made by the Cross Fertilizer Company of Sydney as to the comparative prices of their product and the product that came over from England?

Mr. REID: As I understand it, the Cross Fertilizer Company stated to the commissioner that the price that they were charging before the decision of the board has not since been changed. There has been no advance in price.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: How is it that the man who imported the article has to pay the duty on it now?

Mr. REID: There is a ruling of the Board of Customs. At all events, having the duty added to the price, as stated by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), at 5 per cent would be but 50 cents a ton. This is all that could possibly be added even if the manufacturer at Sydney took advantage of the price. But he has not taken advantage of it; the price has not been raised since the interpretation by the Board of Customs?

Mr. EMMERSON: It is 10 per cent from Belgium, not 5 per cent.

Mr. REID: The preferential rate is 5 per cent. The commissioner told me to-day that the importation has been from England, and 5 per cent is the rate which applies. The hon. member for Westmorland has been making a mountain out of a molehill. He has gone into several other matters—the high cost of living, the freight rates on the Intercolonial railway, and so on. I will not attempt to answer him on these subjects to-night. I think the explanation given should be satisfactory to the hon. member. In future, if he is to bring forward a case for the farmers, I hope he will have a better one than this which he has brought before us this evening.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.): After the very elaborate explanation given by the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid), I suppose he thinks that the last word has been said, and therefore that it is presumptuous on my part to attempt to discuss this matter. Nevertheless, so long as I am here, I shall have to take the opportunity to say a few kind words, especially when a matter affecting the administration of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs comes up. We appreciate the position in which the minister finds himself to-night, and I am not surprised that he speaks of this matter as he does—a mere 50 cents a ton to be paid by the farmer on fertilizer. Of course, the minister thinks that not worth talking about. But I may tell the minister if he were a farmer in New Brunswick and probably handling from twenty-five to forty tons of this material, he would find this duty quite a little item. And the duty does not mean merely an increase of 50 cents a ton, but by the time you add two or three profits it amounts to $1 a ton. Of course, the hon. minister thinks in millions now, and he does not care about what the farmer has to pay for fertilizer. He has talked about pretty nearly everything except the subject under discussion. He started talking about my hon. friend from Westmorland preventing the spending of money on the roads. That is outside the question, of course, but to put the minister right, let me quote from the record of my hon. friend from Westmorland, and also from the record of the Minister of Customs, on this question of the roads. Last session the Government, in the goodness of their hearts, saw fit to make a proposition to give $1,500,000 to the country under certain conditions for the benefit of the highways, and provided that it should be expended under the Canada Highways Act. On the 4th of June, I think it was—possibly on the 3rd of June—the Senate of Canada made an amendment to the Highways Bill which this House would not adopt, as was stated in this House by the Prime Minister or the Minister of Railways. This was on the 4th of June. On the 5th of June—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think this is quite pertinent to the question now before the House. This motion refers particularly to certain items in the tariff, and it would be desirable to confine the discussion to that subject.

Mr. CARVELL: I did not know I was prohibited from answering a point brought forward by the Minister of Customs. It was only for the purpose of putting the minister right that I entered upon the discussion of this question of the highways.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister of Customs incidently mentioned the matter, and if he had continued on that line I intended to remind him of the rule, as I did the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Hughes). It seems to me the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), is entering upon an argument that would take a good deal of time.

Mr. CARVELL: I must bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. But there will be another time. He is the man who voted against the Highways Bill, and I have the record here to prove it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that observation is quite unbecoming. When the Chair has ruled, it is the duty of the member to observe the ruling.

Mr. CARVELL: I observe the ruling, Mr. Speaker. But there will be another time. Now, the minister says, when he is charged with having imposed duties by Orders in Council: Oh, you did it once yourselves six or eight years ago. And because we did it once, this Government claim to have the right to go on sinning without being criticised. I would like to hear one single charge brought against this Government in answer to which we should not hear this reply. I have not heard one attack in the last three years in which that has not been their defence. We had it this afternoon on another motion. Yesterday, we had it also. The Minister of Customs says that six or seven years ago the Customs Board made a ruling by which certain forms of gypsum were made free and the treasury

board overruled that and made them dutiable. I do not care whether they did or did not; it does not matter. We charge the Minister of Customs with deliberately increasing the cost of an article which the farmer of the Maritime provinces must have to carry on his operations. This is the farmer's raw material and he must have it in order to produce his crop. We charge the minister with having increased that duty without justification or reason. It is refreshing to hear the minister say: It is true this was done, but it was by an officer of the department, and we did not know anything about it. Yesterday, we had that argument used to the limit. The Prime Minister, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Postmaster General told us that they did not know anything about a thing that had been done—it was done in the ordinary course of business. And the Minister of Customs did not know anything about what had been done by the Board of Customs in the ordinary course of business. I wonder if the hon. minister is sincere in making a statement like that. I am sincere in asking him the question: Does he believe that he can make the people of this country believe his Board of Customs changes the law so as to impose duties which take tens of thousands of dollars out of the pockets of the farmers, and he know nothing about it? He surely does not think that we are so innocent as that. He surely does not think that the people are so innocent as that. I do not think the minister, if the question were put to him, and he had to answer it squarely, would say he did not know it. I know he will not say so though he tried to leave that impression with the House to-night. I know he knew this was being done, and he will not say he did not. When he knew it, the Government knew it, and the Government is responsible for increasing the price of this commodity, and there is no use in their trying to hide themselves behind the action of the board.

Well, what does it amount to, the minister may ask. It amounts to a good deal. I find, on looking over the Trade and Navigation Returns, that during the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1913, we imported fertilizers to the extent of $539,905. That will be found on page 104 of the Fisheries and Navigation Returns, and on page 471 hon. gentlemen will find it stated that we exported fertilizer to the amount of $1,679,806, and imported only $92,425 of slag. We were able very largely to supply the home demand, which involves a large amount of money, and we were able to export $1,679,000 worth, yet we imported only $92,425 worth, which means that practically nineteen-twentieths of all the slag consumed in the manufacture of fertilizer is the home production. The hon. minister did not put on this duty for the purpose of revenue, because the Government are getting only $9,000 or $10,000 out of it—according to the contention of the minister, only about $5,000 or $6,000. I think he is right in saying that a great majority of the material that is imported comes from England. I have not the data before me, but I know from looking the matter up on a previous occasion that at least two-thirds of this slag comes from England. But does my hon. friend expect the country to believe that the manufacturers of this slag have not increased the price to the farmers? What on earth did the manufacturer of this slag want the duty put on for, if he did not intend to increase the price to the farmer? He does not suffer from any outside competition, because there is very little of the material coming into Canada. Just enough outside slag comes in to keep the price down to that of the European markets plus the freight. When the manufacturer of this slag came to my hon. friend the minister and asked him to put the duty on, he did so for the purpose of being enabled to charge the farmers more for the article, and it is a fact that he is charging the farmer more for the article to-day, notwithstanding the assertion he makes to the Minister of Customs. The hon. member for Westmorland has proved it, the letter of that intelligent farmer, Mr. Fawcett, proves it, and our common sense teaches us that it must be so. The manufacturers in Canada do not come to the Government and ask that duty be put on a certain article simply for the fun of it. Every time duty goes on they get the benefit of it, and when a duty of five or ten per cent is put upon this slag, depend upon it the producer in Canada gets five or ten per cent extra, and the farmer pays for it out of his own pocket. That is why I am finding fault with the Minister of Customs to-night. I know there is not a member in this House to-night whose constituents are as vitally interested in this matter as mine are. I am satisfied that out of $539,000 worth of fertilizer imported into Canada last year, more than half of that came into my own constituency, and that two-thirds of it came into my constituency and that of the member for Victoria (Mr. Michaud). I am satisfied that last year my constitu-

ents paid more than half a million dollars for fertilizers alone, and that the people of the constituencies of York, Carleton, Victoria and Madawaska probably paid $750,000 for fertilizers; therefore it is a matter of no little importance to our people. The hon. minister says it is a mere bagatelle—that the imposition of the duty does not necessarily increase the price. I tell him that it means from $50,000 to $60,000 to my constituents alone, and when you add to that ten per cent duty on the manufactured product you are adding fifteen or twenty per cent to the cost of an article which is an absolute necessity to the farmers of the eastern provinces. This matter requires more than the passsing notice which the Minister of Customs has given it here to-night; we should have some better evidence that it was in the interests of the country and of his department that this duty should be imposed. What evidence have we that it is necessary? I am not an authority on what basic slag is; neither is my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, because the question was put to him fairly, and he could not answer it. I have seen the slag as it runs out from the blast furnaces—I presume nearly every member in this House has seen it. The metal comes out in two streams; one the molten metal and the other the slag. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs understands that this slag is collected in some kind of a mould, that it hardens, and is subsequently shipped. In Sydney, I have seen them throw it out, mountains of it, alongside the steel works. Whether it is turned out in a great mass and carted away, as I have seen it done in Sydney, or whether it is poured into a mould and made into better shape for transportation purposes, it is the same slag; I care not whether you call it slag or basic slag, it is slag just the same. According to all we have heard to-night, this slag has very few fertilizer properties; it is only the basic material around which the real fertilizer centres. It makes the substance which contains the real fertilizer, because they add to that phosphorus, potash and ammonia. The hon. member for Westmorland says that these are, introduced in the proportion of four, eight and ten respectively; I understand that the ordinary commercial fertilizer contains these elements in the proportion of four, six and ten. Of course the proportion of four, eight and ten would result in a better article. But the slag is simply used as the substance to absorb the real fertilizing elements, ammonia, potash and phosphorus. If that be true, and I am satisfied that it is, what justification has my hon. friend for classifying slag as fertilizer? Although he did not say it, I should imagine that in imposing this duty he is contending that the slag becomes a fertilizer; therefore he imposes the same duty as he would upon fertilizers. Getting back to the real crux of this matter, at the behest of the manufacturer the hon. minister has deliberately, without any justifiable reason, added from fifty to seventy-five cents a ton to the cost of the basic article in the manufacture of fertilizer, and when two or three profits are added to that it is evident that the farmers of this country are being charged more than they should be charged for this article. This is done not for revenue purposes, because no revenue is obtained out of it. In the first six months of the present fiscal year we imported only $42,792 worth of slag, and at five per cent only about $2,000 or $3,000 would be collected on this amount. Therefore, as I say, the duty is not imposed for the purposes of revenue; it is done simply at the request and behest of a manufacturing industry in this country, and the net result is that the Government get in revenue a mere bagatelle, and the farming community of my county alone pay probably $50,000 more for their fertilizer. The hon. minister laughs at it; says it is a matter of no consequence. I want to tell him that it is a matter of some consequence, and I think my hon. friends opposite will find that it is a matter of a great deal of consequence before this session is over.

Mr. CARROLL: Do I understand that the farmers of the county have to put this material through some process of manufacture before they use it?

Mr. CARVELL: No, practically all the fertilizer consumed in the St. John river district is the manufactured article. There are a great many people who, like Mr. Fawcett, say that the farmers are being—well, I will not say robbed, but compelled to pay much higher prices than they should pay for this article. I have before me a very interesting letter—I wish I had time to read it to the House—written by Mr. H. B. Durost, of my own town. This letter, published in the Hartland Observer, would point out to my hon. friend what this matter really means to the farmers of my county.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER: I understood the question asked by my hon. friend (Mr. Carroll) to be this: Is the article which the farmers in Carleton county, for instance, use under this denomination simply a slag ground up, or is it a fertilizer made out of the slag and other ingredients?

Mr. CARVELL: It is the latter, certainly; I was going to explain that. It is the commercial fertilizer, which sells from $40 to $42 a ton, according to the quality. The commercial fertilizer is composed of slag as a base, and around that or through it and with it are the real fertilizing elements, four parts ammonia, six parts phosphorus and ten parts potash. That is the general formula.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER: I would ask the hon. member for Cape Breton whether the product turned out by the Sydney company is simply the slag ground, or is it the slag ground and mixed with the other materials, thus constituting a compound fertilizer?

Mr. CARROLL: Perhaps the great majority of the product of the Cross company is the latter.

Mr. CARVELL: It is merely the slag and the other ingredients are added by other people.

Mr. CARROLL: The manufacturers of fertilizers who approached the Government for this duty are manufacturing the slag and add the other ingredients themselves and sell it as a fertilizer.

Mr. CARVELL: That may be, but there are thousands of tons of fertilizers manufactured in the eastern provinces and the state of Maine and all through the western states made from the slag with the addition of the other fertilizing properties, so that while the Cross Fertilizer Company may manufacture a certain amount of this product into commercial fertilizer, they must sell a much greater proportion of it simply as the ordinary basic slag, they sell it to other fertilizing companies who mix it, and one branch of the argument of the hon. member for Westmorland was whether it was not better for the farmer to mix this himself, to buy his slag, import the nitrate, potash and phosphate, mix it himself and save $15 a ton. But it does not matter who mixes it, the slag itself is the basis and upon this base the Government have placed the duty. By doing so they have made the base cost, we will say 50 or 75 cents a ton more than it ought to and I do not care whether it is mixed by the Cross Company, or the Windsor Company, or the St. John Company, or by the farmer on his barn floor, it means that it costs the farmer a dollar a ton more than it ought. That is the real question and the one we ought to decide in this resolution to-night. I think the Minister of Customs ought to go further than this, he ought not only to rescind this regulation but, when the tariff is brought down, he should make fertilizers entirely free. Do not come back and say: You did not admit fertilizers free. I was in the House in 1907 when the Tariff Bill was enacted and privately I tried to make fertilizers free.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friends laugh. Every time anything is said they make that reply, they say: You did not do it. It is always the tu quoque argument.

Mr. FOSTER: I think I have heard that in other years.

Mr. CARVELL: The fertilizer business in the Maritime provinces was a mere bagatelle in 1907. Statistics will show that not one-quarter, not one-fifth, not one-tenth, of the fertilizers were consumed in the Maritime provinces in 1907 that are consumed to-day. The imports in the year ending March 31, 1906, of dutiable fertilizers into Canada amounted to only $157,519; whereas during the first six months of the present year we have imported $300,000 worth. This is only a very, very small proportion of the actual amount consumed, as you can see that we are manufacturing at home; it has become a big industry, we are manufacturing from the slag produced at the Sydney Steel Works, and it is being manufactured, as I said, by a number of different companies, by the Cross Company and by the farmers. So in 1907 it was a comparatively unimportant item. There was no discussion in the newspapers about it, it was not considered a matter of any great importance. To-day it is a matter of the first magnitude, it is that without which the farmer in the Maritime provinces cannot produce his potatoes, and I am told in the province of Nova Scotia they can hardly produce their fruit without it. It is a prime necessity and it is just as important that it should be made free of duty as it is that wheat should be admitted free for the benefit of the farmer of the West. It is just as important to the farmer of Carleton county to have free fertilizers as anything I can imagine to-day in the world, and I hope that this discussion will result

10 p.m.

in the Minister of Customs not only removing this obnoxious ruling of his Customs Board, but that when the tariff is brought down he will see that fertilizer is put on the free list absolutely. Then the farmers who are compelled to buy this very expensive fertilizer, without which they can hardly farm, will be able to save at least $6 to $7 a ton, which means, in some cases, almost the difference between success and failure in the farming industry of New Brunswick.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes I shall occupy upon the motion of the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), I shall not attempt to discuss the effect of the interpretation of the particular item of the customs tariff which is under discussion upon the price of the article and its general effect upon the consumers of fertilizers. That has been very fully and lucidly discussed by the hon. members for Westmorland and Carleton, and I could hardly amplify what they have said if I desired. The issue involved in the motion is the interpretation of an item in the customs tariff and whether the decision of the Board of Customs in interpreting the tariff item is correct or not. In my judgment there is no authority in the statute for the ruling made by the minister and by the Board of Customs.

There are two items in the tariff involved in this discussion, namely, item 372, blast furnace slag, which is free, and item 663, which is the item invoked by the Department of Customs to sustain the ruling they have made. Tariff item 663 is as follows:

Fertilizers compounded or manufactured, 10 per cent (under the general tariff).

The question is whether basic or blast furnace slag, which is I think one and the same thing, when imported into Canada in a ground state, enters free of duty or whether it is subject to a duty of 10 per cent under item 663, respecting fertilizers. I would think if we had no other evidence or authority before us than the customs tariff itself, it is quite clear that the position taken by the hon. member for Westmorland is absolutely correct and well founded under a construction of the tariff. Blast furnace slag, as I have already stated, is imported free of duty. This item does not differentiate between slag in the rough state, as it comes from the furnace, and slag ground or reduced to any mesh, and I think it is a fair and logical inference that furnace slag may be imported free of duty whether in a natural or ground state. Looking again at item 663, we find that 'fertilizers compounded or manufactured' are subject to a duty of 10 per cent. I cannot understand how the Department of Customs can argue that furnace slag, ground, is a fertilizer. It is admitted by the minister that it is merely an element and not a constituent in a compound, and that it is not a manufactured article; and therefore I say, by reference to these two items, that blast furnace slag, ground, is clearly importable free of duty. This is an important matter for many reasons. The functions of the Customs Department are purely administrative, and ministerial and to some extent judicial. They are certainly not legislative, and it would be an unfortunate thing for this country if, in the establishment of tariffs, the Customs Department were permitted to arrogate to itself legislative powers, and particularly to increase the tariff rate or rates. That is the objection which I think hon. gentlemen on this side make against the ruling of the department. I think it was clearly the intention of Parliament—and Parliament alone makes the tariff of this country and not the Customs Department—that all the constituents which enter into the manufacture of fertilizers should come into Canada free of duty. If hon. gentlemen would look at item 662, the one just preceding the chief item under consideration they will see that fertilizers—

—unmanufactured, including phosphate rock, kainite or German potash salts and German mineral potash; bone dust, charred bone and bone ash; fish offal or refuse and animal or vegetable manures,

are admitted free, and these articles were deliberately made free of duty by Parliament in order, I assume, to furnish to the manufacturers of fertilizers their raw material at the lowest possible price. The following item 663 provides the tariff rate for the manufactured article. Now if it was the policy of Parliament—and it evidently was—to permit of such articles as phosphate rock, German potash salts, bonedust and fish offal to come in free of duty, is it not logical and obvious that it was also the intention of Parliament that furnace slag, ground, should enter free of duty, because it is one of the constituents in a fertilizing compound. For that reason I say it is obvious—at least it is perfectly clear to me and I think it should be to hon. gentlemen generally—that the ruling of the Department of Customs is in error, and that the objection made by the hon. member for Westmorland is well founded. Further, take the item

of felspar, which is a very important element in the manufacture of fertilizers. It is also upon the free list. Combined with fish offal, it produces one of the richest fertilizer known to the world, and yet our tariff has provided that felspar shall enter free of duty, and there is no distinction whatever in the tariff as to whether felspar be imported in the crude or ground state. I say again, it was clearly the policy of the Government responsible for the preparation of this tariff, and Parliament which enacted it, that the raw elements entering into the manufacture of fertilizing compounds should enter this country free of duty. The Minister of Customs has invoked in defence of the ruling of his department, a ruling made by the Board of Customs some four years ago in connection with gypsum. I submit that the case is hardly applicable to the one before us for consideration. Under item 292 of the tariff, gypsum in the crude is free, and I would like hon. gentlemen particularly to observe that gypsum in its crude state is designated as being free, and gypsum if not crude is subject to duty. Naturally, the question would arise, when there was an importation of gypsum, whether it was crude or otherwise. In this case the gypsum apparently entered Canada, ground, or manufactured. The gypsum was reduced to a comparatively small size and the question for the Department of Customs to determine was, whether it was gypsum crude, or gypsum manufactured, and I think it is quite clear that the ruling made by the Department of Customs was in error and that the appeal was very properly sustained by the Treasury Board. I submit that there was no warrant or authority under the tariff for the ruling made by the Department of Customs in connection with the matter now before us. I say it is quite clear—and it has been the policy of Parliament—that the constituents entering into the manufacture of fertilizers should be free of duty in order to give to the manufacturers the raw materials entering into the manufacture of fertilizers at lowest possible price. I think it is also quite clear that the motion made by the hon. member for Westmorland is well founded both in fact and law. I think the ruling made by the Department of Customs is absolutely in error, and I hardly think the case is arguable. I think the Minister of Customs should at least concede that the ruling is subject at least to doubt, if not clearly in error.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Emmerson:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Boivin,
Cardin,
Clarke (Essex),
Cruise,
Delisle,
Demers,
Ethier,
Fortier,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Gauvreau,
German,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lafortune,
Lanctot,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Law,
Maclean (Halifax),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCraney,
McMillan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Michaud,
Molloy,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Oliver,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Proulx,
Reid (Restigouche),
Robb,
Seguin,
Sinclair,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Truax,
Verville,
Warnock,
White (Victoria, Alta.),—44.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Alguire,
Ames,
Armstrong (York, O.),
Arthurs,
Ball,
Barker,
Barnard,
Barrette,
Beattie,
Bennett (Simcoe),
Best,
Blain,
Blondin,
Boulay,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Boys,
Brabazon,
Bradbury,
Broder,
Burnham,
Carrick,
Clark (Bruce),
Clarke (Wellington),
Coderre,
Cromwell,
Crothers,
Edwards,
Elliot,
Foster (North Toronto),
Fripp,
Garland,
Gauthier (Gaspé),
Girard,
Glass,
Hanna,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hepburn,
Hughes (Victoria, O.),
Kemp,
Lavallée,
Lesperance,
Lewis,
McKay,
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Marshall,
Meighen,
Merner,
Mondou,
Morphy,
Morrison,
Munson,
Nantel,
Nicholson,
Paul,
Perley,
Rainville,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche,
Rogers,
Schaffner,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Shepherd,
Smith,
Smyth,
Stanfield,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thompson (Yukon),
Thornton,
Wallace,
Webster,
Weichel,
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox,
Wilson (Wentworth),
Wright,—83.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Borden,	Clark, M.,
Macdonell,	Tobin,
Middlebro,	Ross,
Morris,	Turgeon,
Walker,	Loggie,
Nickle,	Lapointe, E.,
Foster, A. de W.,	Carroll,
Cockshutt,	Charlton,
Bellemare,	Brouillard,
White Hon. W. T.,	Emmerson,
Davidson,	Chisholm, Wm.,
Currie,	Wilson, C. A.,
Stewart, D.,	McKenzie,
Porter,	Champagne,
Northrup,	Devlin,
McCurdy,	Pugsley,
Fisher,	Boyer,
Doherty,	Marcil,
Green,	Buchanan,
Achim,	Bourassa,
Clements,	Knowles,
Armstrong, J. E.,	Gordon,
Chabot,	Béland,
Jameson,	Martin, W. M.,
Lalor,	Richards,
Thoburn,	McCrea,
Lancaster,	Guthrie,
Hartt,	Lovell,
Aikins,	Turriff,
McLeod,	Carvell,
Burrell,	Douglas,
Sevigny,	Power,
Pelletier,	Lemieux,
Monk,	Bureau,
Fowler,	McLean, H. H.,
Tremain,	Chisholm, A. W.,
Rhodes,	Macdonald,
Baker,	Kay,
Cochrane,	Graham,
Bristol,	Bickerdike,
Clare,	Cash,
Forget,	Lapointe, L. A.,

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I was paired with the right hon. the Prime Minister. Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM: I was paired with the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. EMMERSON: I was paired with the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. CARVELL: I was paired with the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. McLeod). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. PELLETIER: I was paired with the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. DOHERTY: I was paired with the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I was paired with the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. NORTHRUP: I was paired with the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The 'Hansard' reporters have been complaining to me that the pairs are not properly taken down on account of the low and indistinct way in which members make the announcement that they are paired.

Amendment negatived, and main motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply.

Department of Labour—Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, $25,000.

Mr. VERVILLE: I was not in the House on Friday last when the Estimates of the Department of Labour were under consideration, but I have read in 'Hansard' the speeches made by members on this side of the House on that occasion, and I do not wish to go over the same ground that has been covered by them. In the few remarks that I intend to make, I wish to tell the hon. Minister of Labour very frankly exactly what the labour men think of him as a Minister of Labour.

I have read very carefully the report made by Commissioner Price. I am surprised that in that report letters of the miners from the West have been published, but very few, if any, of the letters that have been sent to the Department of Labour have been published. It would seem fair that both sides of the case should be stated in a report made by a Royal Commissioner.

It is true that I have asked for the papers to be brought down, but the returns are very slow in coming. This may be one of the reasons why this year the Estimates of the Department of Labour have been brought down almost before those of any other department. Generally, the Estimates of the Department of Labour are brought up very late in the session. I am aware that I shall not get the return for which I have asked for, for a long time to come. Last year on the 5th of April, I asked for a return, and it was just for

a lock and key. I got the return only last week, and no lock and key.

I claim that this report of Commissioner Price is not absolutely correct, and I really believe that it has been copied from a report made in 1903. It seems to me that this report was written with the intention of making the country believe that the whole fault lies with the men. I am not here to say that the men are perfect, far from it. If you want to get perfect men, whether employees or employers, you will have to go higher than the members of this House, or the public in general.

It would only be fair if both sides of the question were put before the public. I know that letters have been sent to the minister, and he will probably read some of them to the House. A letter, which I intend to read to the House, was sent to the Minister of Labour and the answer was simply: 'I will take the matter into consideration.' The Minister of Labour is still considering the matter, although it is a long time since the letter was sent. This letter, which appears in the report of the commissioner, has been sent by the miners themselves and is dated September 30, 1913:

Hon. T. W. Crothers,
Minister of Labour.

Dear Sir,—A short time ago, if you remember, in the Wilson hotel, you made the remark that if you could do anything in your power for the benefit of the workers that you would be only to pleased to do so. Now, I will endeavour to give you a full explanation of the trouble which we are engaged in at the present time. Our men have been openly discriminated against, and the companies refuse to give any reasons whatever. They refuse to meet our commitees, and we claim the right to question at any time why our men are discharged.

The companies refuse to concede that right to us, and what do we find? They put us up against a lockout; our men are compelled to act on these gas committees and we can find no other reasons why they are discriminated against. Of course the companies are able to prove that they are not discriminating against our men on account of their actions on gas committees, but they do not submit any reasons why they have discharged them, and that is what we want to know—if there is any way to compel them to let us know why they are allowed to discharge our men unquestioned. That is the only question at issue. And if there is any remedy we would like to know.

Trusting you will give this question your immediate attention and that we will receive an early reply.

This letter has been replied to, but only with the statement that the letter will be taken into consideration. The ministers are still considering the question. And I am not prepared to say that the men did all that was right, but I am prepared to admit that both were right and both were wrong. But first of all I believed that when the minister took that trip to the West we expected that through his power as minister he would bring the two elements together, and, for the benefit of British Columbia as well as the country at large, would secure a settlement. It seems to me the mission of the minister was not to settle who was wrong and who was right, but to try to bring about a settlement. I have read the report. I do not pretend to know anything about mining further than to have been in a mine to see the conditions under which men have to work underground. At the same time, I think the commissioner was not justified in making this report. I do not know any better way by which I can show that than by reading to the House a letter that the minister himself received. That letter was written by Mr. Farrington. Of course, it may displease the minister, because this man happens to be an American, and I know the minister does not like to have any truck with the Americans. But he certainly is in a position to criticise the report better than I am. I hope the House will bear with me while I read this letter, for I am particularly anxious to get it on 'Hansard' so that the people in this House and outside of it may know how the criticism often levelled against the men in this case appears to one who knows exactly the mining situation in the West:

Hon. Thomas W. Crothers, K.C.,
Minister of Labour for Canada,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—I have just been favoured with a copy of the official report filed with your department by Royal Commissioner Samuel Price, who, I understand, was appointed in accordance with an Act of the Dominion Parliament to investigate the coal miners' strike now existent on Vancouver Island. Because of my having charge of this strike from its inception, I think I can discuss the report with a reasonable degree of assurance that I know my subject; and as the representative of the men involved in the strike I feel that I have a license to defend them against the injustice done their cause by reason of the commissioner's manifest failure to reveal the truth. Therefore, in the absence of a personal meeting, I take this means of communicating to you the statement that the Royal Commissioner's report is neither an impartial nor a complete exposition of the situation on the Island. Much of it is composed of a quotation on an opinion written by a former commissioner in connection with the Island strike of 1903, and which opinion was virulent in tone, unwarranted by the facts and injurious to the miners of that time, but entirely foreign to the present controversy; yet it is now reproduced in Commissioner Price's report, evidently to deceive the public and

injure the men engaged in the existent strike. Moreover, as a Congressional guide the report is misleading, and worthless as an historical document, for the reason that the commissioner has given but scant consideration to the miners' side of the dispute, while he has overstepped propriety to find justification for the iniquitous attitude of the mine owners. He has given credence to rumour where rumour was damaging to the miners' union, and excused the evil practices of the mine owners in the face of tangible proof of their guilt.

To those who are familiar with conditions on the Island it is clear that the Royal Commissioner has predicated his report upon the unsupported statements of the mine owners and their satellites; and, on the other hand, denied the union men the opportunity of appearing before him in defence of their position or to refute the untrue statements of these hostile agents. In view of my prominent connection with this trouble I should be expected to have much valuable matter to contribute to the investigation, and I have, yet I was given no opportunity to present it to the commissioner. In fact, I never met him but once, and then only informally, during my brief conference with you in Vancouver city the first week in July. I do not mention this because I feel slighted, but because it shows the commissioner was not anxious to have facts. Furthermore, I have made careful inquiry of the district and local officers connected with the strike, and many individuals of influence and activity among the strikers, all of whom unite in declaring they did not have the privilege of appearing before the commissioner, and none of whom were even aware of his visit to the Island; which further indicates his desire to escape rather than to find the truth.

Couple his transgression in this respect with his transparent disposition to favour the mine owners and his apparent willingness to accept and include in his report everything, no matter how flimsy, that reflects discredit upon the United Mine Workers of America, and you must agree the Royal Commissioner's report is destitute of justice to the striking miners.

The miners have been insistent in their claims that the Canadian Collieries Company are employing Orientals, in violation of the Provincial Mining Laws to break the strike. The commissioner has concealed the true conditions in this respect by making irrelevant comparisons and by failing to give an account of the number of Orientals employed during the two and one-half months intervening between the last day of May and the date of his report. However, accepting his figures as a basis for computation, we find that of all the men employed in all the coast mines during 1912 less than 20 per cent were Orientals, and that of the men employed under ground by the Canadian Collieries Company eight and one-half months after our men were locked out, or in May, 1913, the ratio of Orientals was more than 62 per cent. And had the commissioner considered the additional number employed during June and July, and up to August 14, the date of his report, the ratio would be greater than that. Yet the commissioner says:

'Statements made as to the wholesale granting of miners' certificates to Orientals, who are said not to be properly qualified, are also, I find upon careful inquiry, not correct. According to figures obtained from the Department of Mines, only thirty-six new miners' certificates were granted to Orientals from the commencement of the trouble down to the time of the inquiry, and the examination for these was conducted in the usual way according to the requirements of the law, and the certificates were only granted after the examiners, including the Chief Inspector of Mines, were satisfied that the Orientals were qualified and entitled to receive them.'

It is a matter of common knowledge among the strikers that the men employed as strike-breakers in the Cumberland mines of the Canadian Collieries Company are being wantonly maimed and killed because of their inexperience and a lack of knowledge as to how to protect themselves against the dangers of mining. In this connection the commissioner says:

'The allegations made as to unsafety of some of the mines are at least grossly exaggerated. The statement that the percentage of fatal accidents at the mines of the Canadian Collieries Company has increased over two hundred per cent cent from 1911 to 1912, while correct, arises from the fact that in 1911 these mines had an abnormally low percentage of fatal accidents, only .94 per 1,000, while that of the province was 2.32 per 1,000. In 1912 this company though showing as alleged, a great increase over 1911, was still very low, and little over half that for the province the exact figures being 2.12 per 1,000, while that for the province as a whole was 3.92. The official returns show that at the Extension collieries there had been no fatal accidents either in 1911 or 1912?

While admitting an increase of 200 per cent in fatalities during 1912, in the mines mentioned, he attempts to justify this sacrifice of human life by saying other companies have killed more, and points out that no fatalities occurred in the Extension mines of the same company either in 1911 or 1912; but he neglects to explain why none occured in these mines. The explanation is a simple one. During 1911 and up to the middle of September, 1912, the Extension mines were operated by experienced men, and from the middle of September to the end of 1912 they were idle because the company could not recruit enough Chinamen and other inexperienced vagabonds to operate the mines of both Cumberland and Extension, so they herded them all into the Cumberland mines and slaughtered them there; which fact also accounts for the 200 per cent increase in the fatalities occurring in the Cumberland mines during 1912. But what of the fatalities occurring in the same mines of this company during 1913? Almost eight months of this year had passed when the commissioner's report was rendered, yet, though dealing with fatalities, he ignored completely those occurring in that period. Why? At the end of 1912, the Cumberland mines had been closed to their former skilled employees only three and one half months, and the list of fatalities augmented 200 per cent. When the commissioner's report was rendered the former employees had been excluded for eleven months. The number of inexperienced men employed had been increased, discipline demoralized by the constant coming and going of strange men, and the safety of the mines impaired because of a lack of experienced attention. Now, do not forget that for the first eight and one half months of 1912 these mines had the advantage of being worked with prac-

tical men; every man employed was an experienced man, and when they ceased work the mines were as safe as human hands could make them. So when the inexperienced men were first employed they had the benefit of the safety provided by the experienced men to begin with. Still, within a lapse of three and one half months the fatalities among them had increased 200 per cent.

With this as a basis to work from, you may be able to judge the magnitude of the fatalities occurring under the less favourable conditions of the succeeding months not mentioned in the report. Certainly they must have been appalling, yet the commissioner leaves us to speculate as to their number and goes around the corner to applaud the company. You will notice the commissioner declares: 'The allegations made as to the unsafety of some of the mines are at least grossly exaggerated.' The above declaration is an evasion of the truth; the strikers have made no such allegations. On the contrary, we acknowledge that when experienced men are employed the mines are as safe as ever. What we do allege is that the mines are veritable death traps for the type of men now employed; and that these unfortunate wretches are being mercilessly murdered in order to defeat the ends of justice and to satisfy the inhuman greed of the mine owners.

In dealing with the wage question the commissioner says:

'The miners who perform what may be described as the more skilled part of the work ordinarily earn good wages, getting from $3.30 up to $5 and $6 and even as high as $7 and $7.50 per day, according to the amount of coal they produce. No exact figures as to the average are available for all the mines, but the managers of the Canadian Collieries Company give the average for all men working at the face, during the five months preceding the trouble, as $3.99½. The Western Fuel Company give the average they were paying miners as $4.86, and the company miners get $3.30. The manager of the Jinglepot gives the average pay for his miners, during the month preceding the strike, as $5.05½ per man. The helpers, drivers, and pushers and other labourers get much less, running from $2.86 or less up to $3 or $3.50.

The above, along with the other features of the report, force one to believe that when handled by the mine owners the Royal Commissioner was as docile and confiding as a well-behaved family cow. He states: 'No exact figures as to the average are available for all the mines, but the managers told him so and so.' Would he have us believe these companies keep no books? If they do not would the managers be in a position to furnish the averages quoted? And if they do, why did he not go to the books instead of to the managers to learn the facts before assuming to speak intelligently and authoritatively on the question?

This phase of the report is given added absurdity by the fact that instead of going to the miners for their views as to the wages they earn he quotes the Mayor of Nanaimo to strengthen the claims of the mine managers. A quotation follows:

'Outside opinions generally seem to regard the actions of the union, especially at Nanaimo, as being unwarranted. The mayor of the city, in giving evidence before the Labour Commission before any trouble had taken place in Nanaimo, described the condition there in respect to the earnings of the miners as being exceedingly good, and said he thought the relationship between the employers and the men was very satisfactory.'

A number of Nanaimo miners, as well as the mayor, testified before the Labour Commission referred to in the quotation. They told of low wages, blacklists, discriminations, disobedience of laws, robbery and other injustices suffered by the men, but their testimony failed to supply the commissioner's wants. What was needed was something to indicate the men were earning substantial wages, so the testimony of the men was ignored and that of the mayor was incorporated in the commissioner's report. The fact that the mayor had never worked in the mines a single day in all his life and was not in a position to furnish first-hand, reliable information as to the conditions under which the men worked or the wages they earned does not seem to have made any difference. The mayor had will not give up their right to affiliate with the managers' assertions that the men were receiving good wages, and that was sufficient to make his testimony worthy of mention in the report.

And, as if to overwhelm the skeptical with the abundance of his proof, the commissioner again quotes the managers, as follows:

'The managers also say that the wages they are paying are high and, with one or two small exceptions, as good as those in other camps, and that the conditions in Vancouver Island in other respects better than in other places, and especially that as compared with the United States, the hours of labour are very considerably shorter.'

Thus is this important question disposed of to the satisfaction of the commissioner, with the introduction only of the biased oral declarations of the lieutenants of the mine owners and the incompetent testimony of the Mayor of Nanaimo. The injustice to the men could be excused by attributing it to the commissioner's gullibility and incapability, were it not that his lack of big calibre, dignity and decency, his animosity for the strikers and his obvious desire to create public antagonism against their union are displayed by his having given space in his report to the following:

'Some persons express the opinion that the officials of the United Mine Workers' organization are in the pay of the mine owners of Washington state, or are, at all events, acting in the interest of the people and men there who are profiting by the tie-up in Vancouver Island.'

The above canard was manufactured and circulated by the mine owners at the beginning of the strike for the purpose of stampeding the men; but it was so convincingly exposed at the outset that no one of intelligence gave it credence. Even the mine owners found it to be a useless expedient and abandoned its use long ago. And had the commissioner been actuated by honest motives 'some person's opinion' would not have sufficed; he would have demanded sufficient proof before giving space to such malicious twaddle.

Although abounding with untruths, prejudice and deception, and devoid of virility and virtue, the most contemptible feature of it all is that the commissioner allowed his report to be used by the mine owners as a medium to malign the miners and their union, and without en-

deavouring to learn the truth gave circulation to the following:

'Coming to what I am satisfied has always, from the commencement of the trouble, been the crucial point at issue, the managers say their companies are determined not to recognize or deal with the United Mines Workers' Union or its officials. Various reasons are given for this determination, among them, that it is controlled by foreign socialists and agitators who care nothing for the interests of the people of this country. They claim that the United Mine Workers have been trouble-makers in other places, and some go so far as to assert that the leaders are merely in it for the money they make and that they have to be bribed in order to get along with the union at all.'

As for our being trouble-makers, if to slacken the fetters of oppression, raise wages, improve working conditions, shorten the hours of toil, elevate the standard of living, protect the weak against the injustice of the strong, defend right against wrong, educate the young and relieve the distress of the old, teach sobriety and clean living and to bring a greater measure of hope, happiness and comfort to the homes of our people, means we are trouble-makers, then we plead guilty to that; the person who is not, is a dead weight on the rest of humanity.

As for the organization being controlled by socialists, we deny the allegation. Though we have some enthusiasts—and they are not all foreign to Vancouver Island—who force the trade union movement to suffer because of their political zeal, a sifting of our official personnel will demonstrate that we are not controlled by socialists; and an examination of our laws, policies and practices would have revealed to the commissioner that the United Mines Workers of America is non-political in every respect. But in this, like everything else, he chose to quote biased opinions rather than search for the truth. So far as the leaders are concerned, their integrity and sincerity will compare favourably with that of the commissioner or his informants, and he or they are challenged to prove the contrary. As to the general statements, it has no value because it has no proof. Yes, it has a value, too. It proves the commissioner's disposition to discredit our action, and that he has stultified his dignity and degraded himself to the level of a vicious traducer, by giving circulation to a lot of rant which he cannot show has any foundation in fact.

By the way, I observe the commissioner omitted mentioning the fact that the Western Fuel Company are now defendants in court down San Francisco way, charged with swindling the United States Government out of a half million dollars. However, that is a matter of fact, and facts are not important to the commissioner. This does not reflect any discredit on the United Mine Workers of America, so I suppose the commissioner did not think it worth while.

Now I am going to conclude by saying that the Vancouver Island miners have been the victims of many indignities and much abuse. The conditions there have been grossly misrepresented, and to their detriment. They have suffered from governmental tyranny to an extent that would not be tolerated in the United States, Great Britain or any of the European countries; and there is a steadily growing suspicion among the workers that the provincial government has determined to defend the employers of the province, no matter what their international alignments are, and regardless of what their treatment of their workmen may be, and at the same time use all the power of government to prevent the growth of international unionism.

My observations have convinced me that there are strong reasons for this suspicion, and there is a likelihood that the Royal Commissioner's report will bring your department within the pale of that suspicion. Now, let me add that the miners of Vancouver Island are of a high standard of intelligence. They appreciate the value of international unionism and are not deceived by all this bigoted twaddle about 'outside interference by foreign agitators,' and will not give un their right to affiliate with the United Mine Workers of America, and the sooner the employers and the Government understand this and honestly meet the inevitable the sooner the strike will be settled.

Yours very truly,

Frank Farrington.

11 p.m.

I know this letter is a very long one, but it is very important to have it on 'Hansard.' I am not going to discuss the report because the writer of this letter has dealt with it far better than I can. As I stated a moment ago, the minister himself went there, and I know that some of the men were very anxious to tell of their grievances, but it happened that he was called away to England just then, probably to find out how strikes are settled in that part of the world. We do not have to go to England to find out that. Strikes are settled by mutual consent if possible, otherwise by compulsory consent. There is always a way to get men together. I know that at a certain stage of the game, and some hon. gentlemen will bear me out in this, it is difficult to determine whether it is really a strike or a lockout. The miners, I understand, took a couple of days' holiday, or more, and when they returned to work they were ordered to take out their tools. The question then arose, was it a lockout or a strike. The mine owners declared it was a strike. The country is face to face with both elements. Admitting that they were both partly right and both partly wrong, it is surely the duty of the Minister of Labour or some of his officers to do all in their power to bring about a settlement. Probably, as the minister stated the other night, it was impossible to get these men together. Still while you cannot get two mountains to meet, you can generally get two men to meet. I do not blame the Minister of Labour for taking a trip to the other side, he was anxious to attend the Trades and Labour Congress in England. It is a very important matter and probably he thought he would get some information of value there. I do not want

to say anything about the manner in which he was received in Great Britain. I happened to meet Will Thorne, a member of the Congress and a member of the Imperial House of Commons, who was a fraternal delegate at the last Congress in Montreal. Mr. Thorne told me that the reputation of the Minister of Labour had preceded him to England and that his reception at the Trades and Labour Congress was a very cool one.

There is one thing upon which I insist, that is that the minister should give us not only the correspondence which has taken place between the Department of Labour and the miners but also the correspondence between the department and the mine operators. It must be remembered that there is still a strike there, which is a detriment to the mass of the people of this country and we are here to try and bring about conciliation as far as possible. I really believe that the minister cannot settle that strike. I believe that his lack of experience in labour matters will prevent that. There are some in this House who understand the position as clearly as I do, that it is necessary for a man to have experience in that walk of life. The mentality of men generally must develop according to their circumstances and surroundings. We cannot expect my hon. friend to be able to settle these things because he does not understand the situation. If my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Shepherd) had been a Minister of Labour, I am almost sure that he would have been able to settle that strike because he would have known how to go about it. We cannot expect that with all the intelligence of the Minister of Labour he can do that, it is impossible for him to do it. So I would say to the Prime Minister, if he were in his seat, that I am sorry to tell him he has made a great mistake in appointing the present Minister of Labour.

Mr. CROTHERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. VERVILLE: Of course he may not believe that but we can all express our own opinions. Let us talk openly here, we are in committee and we may as well be frank. What I am going to say to the minister, may not be Parliamentary language, but the labour men of the country call the Minister of Labour as a Minister of Labour, not as a member of this House, a regular frost. Of course I do not know what that means, English is not my mother tongue, but that is what they say. At the same time I know the Minister of Labour has been East. He is quoted in the newspapers as stating that conditions were all right in the East. I take issue absolutely with him. I know my men whenever I go anywhere, I go with the crowd, with the men who are suffering. I do not go with the crowd who do not want anything, who are well supported in every way, whether by the tariff or otherwise, men who are not in want, at least not in want of three meals a day. Whenever you are with this crowd you will find that conditions are not so nice as we may suppose. I do not know if my hon. friend has found that out but I happened to make inquiries about the Dominion Coal and Steel Works and I found out exactly how the poor miners are treated in that part of the country. Not one but a dozen or more of them came to me and showed me how they are treated. First of all some are obliged to buy at the company's store. It is true that at the store they do not sell dearer than at other places but in many cases the men have to get a certificate from the office that they have earned a certain amount of money. That means if a man has been sick or has sickness in his family and has not worked, he cannot get anything to eat because he has not earned anything. It is true that they do not have to pay too high a rent but just imagine a man earning $1.40 or $1.50 a day who, not being able to work on account of illness or illness in his family, cannot get anything to eat because the company's store will not sell to him. The miners are charged a certain amount for medical assistance and a certain amount for the relief fund, &c., and it will be found that in many cases the labourers working in those mines receive $331 per year to live on provided they work every day, and I am informed that some of them are obliged to handle 115,000 lbs. of coal a day to earn $1.95. Let one of us do that and see what he would be like at the end of a day or a week or a month. That is the condition under which many of them are working. I am not speaking now of the regular miners but of other classes of men. I never bother myself about men who are getting from $4 to $6 a day, provided they can earn it in a day of reasonable length. It is those who earn the small wages who are treated worst. Whether at Glace Bay or Sydney Mines or Sydney, at the steel works, the conditions of the poorer class of labourers are deplorable. It is inhuman to have men working eleven, twelve or thirteen hours a day. If these people were business men they would give three shifts in the twenty-four hours.

I think the Department of Labour should immediately set to work and try if possible to have three shifts a day in those institutions. I have been in the homes of these men, I have seen them. I know exactly how they live. They are mere mortals, they simply know the route to go from the works to the house and back again; they have no time to think because they are so tired they have not time to rest. I was told by one authority when I spoke of the heat: This is very hot but you get accustomed to that. I told him that if this principle were followed out logically then those men, if they worked there long enough, could shovel in much hotter stuff in another place and never burn themselves.

If you call a meeting of workingmen in any of the cities, there is a staff of men employed by the companies that will be found at every door and I have seen fifty men come to a meeting and look in at the door and I have heard them say: We would like to go in but these officers are there and we will get fired to-morrow if we go in. The minister says everything is all right; probably he has been told that everything is all right by the mine owners and other interested persons. I would advise the Minister of Labour, whenever he goes anywhere, to find things out for himself and not to take the company's word—not even to take the men's word. Let him go as a common citizen and inquire for himself. When the minister travels he might ride in an ordinary, common car like any one else. We do not need to ride in a special car when we go anywhere. Let him ride in a common car and with the common people. The Department of Labour should consider the situation at these steel works immediately.

I wanted to explain the conditions of which I have spoken to the committee, and I have read this letter because it is a thorough exposition of the case from the miners' standpoint. It is written by one of the organizers. My hon. friend will say that he is an American, that he is paid to do this and that if he did not do it he would get fired. I might answer my hon. friend by saying that he is getting paid for the work that he does now and that if he did not do it the Manufacturers' Association would say: We will get this man fired out of that job.

I hope that, when my hon. friend the Minister of Labour is placed upon the bench as a judge, the present Government will take a practical man and put him at the head of the Department of Labour. whichever Government is in power, whether it is this Government, or the one which succeeds it, I hold that it will never have any success until a practical man is made Minister of Labour. I fail to see that when John Burns was made a minister the prestige of the British Government was in any way diminished in the eyes of the world. I fail to see that when Mr. Wilson was taken from the ranks of the miners of the United States and made a member of the United States Government the Government was diminished in the opinion of the world. Far from it; these governments have increased in the estimation of the world generally. Unless this Government, or the Government which comes after it, can find a man in this country to be Minister of Labour who is a practical man and who will understand exactly the grievances, whether of the employers or the employees, no success can be hoped for in the administration of the Labour Department. The Minister of Labour ought to be a man who is practical enough to understand the conditions and one who will not resort to a lot of technicalities in order to attempt by all possible means to fool the men. I am not applying these remarks only to the present Government, but I claim that this Government, or any Government which comes after them, will never make a success of the department until such time as they have a man of practical knowledge, a man who has made a thorough study of economic conditions, not in a superficial fashion, but from a practical point of view, at the head of the Labour Department. I do not believe that my recommendation will be followed by this Government and probably not by another Government that may come in, but nevertheless that is my impression and time will show whether I am right or wrong.

Mr. SHEPHERD: The hon. gentleman made the statement that a man had to mine 115,000 pounds for the sum of $1.95.

Mr. VERVILLE: To handle.

Mr. SHEPHERD: What do I understand the hon. gentleman to mean by handling—not mining?

Mr. VERVILLE: No.

Mr. SHEPHERD: That is a matter of 51 tons and it would be impossible for any miner to mine that quantity.

Mr. VERVILLE: Some of these men are getting as little as 13 cents a gross ton to load the coal.

Mr. CROTHERS: Mr. Chairman, before attempting to reply to the observations made by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville), while the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), is in the chamber, I would like to call his attention to some grossly inaccurate statements made by him in this House last Friday evening when we were in committee. He stated on that occasion, as will be found on page 592 of 'Hansard' that:

,I happened to be looking over the Civil Service list the other day—

Just happened to be.

—and I found that for the year ended March 31, 1911, the list of employees of the Labour Department consisted of twenty-one names. In the list for last year there are thirty-nine names. In a little over two years in this department, which is what might be called a non-productive department from a material standpoint, there has been almost a doubling of the staff, and yet what is the net result?

I have here the Sessional Papers for the year 1911 and if my hon. friend will look at them, on page 276, he will find that instead of there being only 21 members of the staff that year there were 24. If he will also be good enough to look at the report for last year, he will find, on pages 369 and 370, that instead of the number having grown from 21 to 39 it had grown from 24 to 30.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Estimates state that there were 35 last year and not 30.

Mr. CROTHERS: There were 9 out of these 35 that were vacancies, which vacancies were not filled at all.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are you going to fill them now? You are taking votes for 36 this year.

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, there are nine vacancies and 36 have been placed in the Estimates this year.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are you going to fill these positions up?

Mr. CROTHERS: They were there last year and I did not fill them up.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why are you taking a vote for them if you are not going to fill them?

Mr. CROTHERS: Perhaps my hon. friend does not know the practice in the different departments. If a man is promoted from one position to another the salary is voted for the position that he has left although there is a vacancy, and the position may be left vacant year after year, or until another man is appointed in his place. It is a very peculiar practice, but it obtained when we came in, and it obtains yet. I am calling the attention of the committee to the grossly inaccurate statements made by the hon. me ıber for Humboldt when he said that in 1911 there were 21, when, if he had looked at the record he would have seen that there were 24. He says that last year the number was 39, when, as a matter of fact, it was 30.

Mr. NEELY: Will the non. gentleman be good enough to send over the Sessional Papers for 1911?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, I will be glad to. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) has read a long letter said to have been written by Mr. Frank Farrington. This is the same gentleman who supplied us with some evidence which throws a flood of light upon the origin and purpose of the labour troubles on Vancouver Island for the last year and a half.

Mr. NEELY: These Sessional Papers are marked 1912.

Mr. CROTHERS: No, the hon. gentleman will find that, although the report is marked 1912, it is for the year 1911.

Mr. NEELY: It is the report of 1912.

Mr. CROTHERS: No, but it gives the servants of 1911, and if the hon. member will look at the beginning of the names, he will find that that is so.

This same gentleman, Mr. Frank Farrington, has given us some evidence which casts a flood of light upon the origin and purposes of the labour troubles that have existed on Vancouver Island for the last year and a half. For the benefit of the members of this House, I propose to read some of that evidence which he has provided for us. Hon. members will know that the headquarters of the United Mine Workers are at Indianapolis; that Mr. John P. White, of the same city, is president of that association, and that Mr. Frank Farrington, who wrote the letter read by my hon. friend, is vice-president of the association, with headquarters at Seattle.

This is an address which was delivered by Mr. Frank Farrington to the United Mine Workers of the United States. It refers back to the beginning of this trouble in Vancouver. It was published in the United Mine Workers' Journal on the 27th of March, 1913; and at the risk of wearying my hon. friends, I propose reading it, although it is somewhat lengthy. Mr. Farrington says:

Six months have passed since the Canadian Collieries Company, operating on Vancouver Island, B.C., locked out 1,500 of our members who were employed in their mines in Cumberland and Ladysmith. While the labour press of British Columbia has carried explanatory articles concerning this trouble, little has been written relating thereto for the United Mine Workers' Journal and other labour papers throughout the United States, and, as a consequence, a great majority of the rank and file of the Miners' Union know little or nothing of the importance of this contest, the causes leading up to it, the difficulties encountered since its inception, or the influences that have been used to defeat the miners in this section of the Pacific Northwest who are struggling for a greater measure of the things to which they are entitled.

Vancouver Island is rich with almost inexhaustible deposits of the finest quality of bituminous coal yet discovered on the American continent, and said to be equal to the famous Welsh coal which is reputed to be the best in the world. These vast and rich deposits of coal have been monopolized by a few combinations of capital, the greater of which is our present foe, the Canadian Collieries Company, which is a ramification of the Canadian Northern Railway and Steamship Company, a corporation composed principally of British capitalists and incorporated for $100,000,000.

Much of the coal is mined by Chinese and Japanese workmen, and all of it is mined under non-union conditions, and is used for coaling vessels plying between the trans-Pacific trade, but the bulk of it is shipped through the Straits of Georgia and Juan de Fuca into the markets of British Columbia, Alaska, Mexico, San Francisco, Portland and Seattle, in competition with the union-mined coal of Washington and eastern British Columbia. An idea of the advantage this coal has in the markets of the Pacific coast will be gained from the knowledge that union-mined coal produced in the Roslyn-Cle Elum field of Washington, has been entirely excluded from the local Seattle market because it cannot be transported over the Cascades mountains and meet the competition of Vancouver Island coal. Again, Oregon with Portland as its chief base of distribution received almost all of its coal supply from the same source. Coming, as it does, down the coast, and entering the Columbia river at Fort Stevens, whence it reaches Portland and is sold at a price that prohibits competition from the adjoining state of Washington, and this notwithstanding there is an import duty of 45 cents per ton on all coal coming from the island into the United States.

However, this is not the worst feature of a bad condition. There is another angle to it that must have the consideration of the United Mine Workers of America. Extending along the Pacific coast of British Columbia six hundred miles, from Vancouver Island to Prince Rupert near the Arctic circle, is one immense bed of high grade coal which has been monopolized by practically the same interests that operate on Vancouver Island. Already this rich source of supply is tapped by many mines in process of development, so as to be ready for the opening of the Panama canal, which will undoubtedly in the near future make this territory one of the greatest coal producing centres on the American continent. It is anticipated that with the opening of the canal myriads of alien workers from European countries will be induced to enter British Columbia via Vancouver city and Victoria, the natural ports of entry into this new field of labour. Even now the large steamship companies have agents scouring Europe, who are painting seductive pictures of the possibilities of this new El Dorado and offering inviting transportation rates to all those who wish to enter after the opening of the canal. That their efforts will result in multitudes of workers migrating into British Columbia is not doubted. Much of this foreign labour will be used to develop these rich mining properties and will create a tremendous tonnage that must find a market. These mines are located so that the output can be dumped from the tipple into ocean-going vessels, and with the long haul around the Horn eliminated, can be freighted without transfer from the mines to the Atlantic seaboard at a transportation cost that will allow it to become a strong competing factor in the markets now supplied by the union-mined coal of the eastern States. As a matter of fact, the Canadian Northern railway and other steamship companies have already contracted for the construction of an additional number of modern ocean freighters to be used in this trade.

Now, what follows?

So that it is not beyond reasonable conjecture to expect that within a comparatively short time we will find this coal bidding for markets on the Atlantic seaboard as well as on the Pacific coast. This feature in itself would not be so bad if there could be an interchange of competition, but that cannot be, for the reason that the much superior quality of this coal will always bar outside competition from its own zone.

The duty devolving upon the United Mine Workers of America, because of this condition—

Not because the miners on Vancouver Island are suffering.

—is to organize Vancouver Island and adjacent territory, raise the standard of employment and act as a balancing medium in the establishment of equitable competitive mining rates. This will be a herculean task but it must be done—

In the interest of the mine workers of Vancouver Island? No, in the interest of the mine owners and the mine workers of the United States.

—or we must suffer inequitable competition.

That is the trouble—the mine owners and mine workers of the United States will suffer from 'inequitable competition' unless he becomes boss of the situation.

—and the job—

J-o-b, job.

—can be easier done now than after the task gets bigger.

Recognizing the seriousness of the condition and being desirous of protecting the interests of our membership.

Then he brings in the miners in Vancouver Island.

—as well as being anxious to extend assistance to the men employed on Vancouver Island who, because of the absence of an organization were being infamously treated and subjected to impositions that reached the last degree of toleration, the International Executive Board decided to extend the power and protection of the organization to the Island. In keeping with this decision a district convention was held in Nanaimo during the month of November 1911, and a district organization was formed.

It was because of 'this condition'—keep that in your mind all the time. The rest of it is not important, but perhaps I had better read it:

From the beginning the men took kindly to the organization, which grew rapidly in numerical strength, and there was every prospect of a substantial organization being established, when, during September, 1912, the Canadian Collieries Company, evidently fearing their power was passing, began singling out and discriminating against the more active of the men.

It is said over and over again that these men were dismissed because they had reported gas in one of the mines. That is not what Mr. Farrington says. He says it was because they were active in carrying out the schemes I have already read to you.

Peaceful overtures from the men for an explanation of the management's action met only with arrogant rebuff. This sort of treatment was tolerated until it could no longer be endured without resentment, and after every peaceful means of redress had been exhausted the men decided to show their opposition to such injustice by taking a holiday, which they did, and after which the company refused to allow them to return to work unless they would sign individual contracts (old iron-clads so familiar to the men of the United States), the terms of which would make the signers little more than bondmen, and which would result in the voluntary dissolution of their union. This the men refused to agree to, and the fight has been on ever since.

During the progress of this struggle all modern instruments used to defeat men engaged in industrial struggles elsewhere have been used to defeat the men engaged in this contest. Hardships, hunger, evictions, brutality, arrests, strike-breakers, false reports, illegal representation of vested rights, intimidation, political prostitution and armed guards are elements common to this battle for human rights.

However, notwithstanding that the company have mustered every influence at their command, they have not been able to produce any considerable part of their original tonnage, or to discourage the men involved, and if solidarity, fidelity and courage are a harbinger of success the end will see the United Mine Workers of America established on Vancouver Island.

Now, the mine owners of Vancouver Island believe, rightly or wrongly—a belief based somewhat on this article and other evidence which they have—that the mine owners of the United States are colluding with the mine workers in the United States for the purpose of getting control of the mines of Vancouver Island so that they will not be in a position to compete with those in the United States 'inequitably.' Now, this article is dated 27th March, but you will remember it goes back as far as November, 1911. That was followed, on the 30th of April—and my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), the other night was kind enough to say that I knew in April about this strike. Yes, I knew in April, but what day in April? The 30th. How much time was there between the 30th of April and the 1st of May.

Mr. CARVELL: May I ask did the department have any information prior to the actual calling of the strike?

Mr. CROTHERS: None prior to the 30th of April. (Reading):

Seattle, Wash., April 30, 1913.

Mr. Robert Foster,
President District 28, United Mine Workers of America, Nanaimo, B.C.

Dear Sir and Brother,—A number of months ago Mr. John P. White, president of the United Mine Workers of America, invited the owners of the mines operating on Vancouver Island to attend a conference to formulate a joint agreement covering working conditions in the mines on Vancouver Island.

Mr. John P. White, a foreigner, living in Indianapolis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, invites the mine owners, the operators, to meet him and enter into an agreement with him to regulate how they shall produce coal in Vancouver Island, whether their men shall work one day in the week or five or six days, whether they shall open one mine or two or a dozen. That is the effect of this invitation, and I know that my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) does not sympathize with that.

This invitation received no response from the mine owners.

Of course not. My hon. friend from Edmonton would not respond to an invitation of that kind sent him from Chicago, to meet the writer to determine how the hon. member should carry on his own business.

Instead, the Canadian Collieries Company forced the men of Cumberland and Ladysmith into a strike which has now lasted more than seven months.

Not a lockout. Mr. Farrington, himself, says here that it is a strike. But the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) called it a 'holiday.'

Mr. VERVILLE: I did not deal with that part of the report. But I shall have a chance to answer.

Mr. CROTHERS (reading):

During this strike the men of Nanaimo and South Wellington had not been called upon to suffer any personal inconvenience or financial loss.

They were not on strike. The men at Nanaimo, South Wellington and Jinglepot were working under agreements, one of which would not expire for five months, one for seven months, and one for two years and four months, and since the agreements had been signed up there had never been a complaint. The agreement provided proceedings for settling disputes. He says these people 'are not suffering any personal inconvenience or financial loss,' and then he calls them out on strike.

However, the other companies operating on the island are co-operating with the Canadian Collieries Company in a hopeless effort to defeat the men of Cumberland and Ladysmith. Therefore, using the authority given me by President White, and in order that we may combat solidarity with solidarity, I hereby instruct you to call a strike of all the men employed in and around the mines at Nanaimo, South Wellington and Jinglepot.

These men had no complaints against their employers, and were working under three separate agreements, yet Mr. Foster was instructed to call out all these men.

The strike to begin May 1 and to continue until working agreement between the United Mine Workers of District 28, and the mine owners on Vancouver Island has been secured; said agreement to carry increased prices for labour and improved conditions of employment. You will please see that a force of men sufficient to protect mining property is permitted to work so long as the companies do not attempt to ship coal.

You will always find a clause of that kind in a strike call.

All other men should be urged to join the strike. You should also exert every effort to prevent unlawful or abusive tactics by the men during this conflict.

Listen to this:

And you will also make an earnest effort to secure the names of all men who refuse to respond to the call to strike so that they may be published throughout Canada, Great Britain and the United States. The men involved, union and non-union, will receive the financial support of the International Union as long as the strike lasts.

This decision has been reached only after months of mature consideration. The time is now here for the men of Nanaimo and South Wellington to prove their worth. If they show the same fighting spirit as their brothers of Cumberland and Ladysmith, May 1 will see the dawning of brighter days for the mine workers of Vancouver Island.

Yours fraternally,
Frank Farrington.

That was followed next day by a call issued by the local man, Foster, to whom Farrington had written, the important part of which is in these words:

I therefore avail myself of the privilege granted by the International representatives, brother Farrington, and the recommendation of the convention hereinbefore mentioned, and declare a strike at all of the coal mines on the island, and ask all miners to cease work until the companies concede them an advance in wages proportionate to the advanced cost of living, fair working conditions and an agreement specifying those wages and conditions of employment, said agreement to be entered into by and between the United Mine Workers of America and the coal companies of this district.

So that everything that occurred since November, 1911, should be read and interpreted in the light of this article that Frank Farrington published on March 27. On April 30, what followed? The very next day the following was issued in the form of a long, blood-red dodger, which was scattered in thousands throughout the city of Nanaimo:

General Strike. After having consulted the managers of the different collieries around Nanaimo, the parties signing themselves as a joint committee have decided to call a meeting at the Princess Theatre at 7 p.m.

These were men who did not want to strike. As a matter of fact one company, the Western Fuel Company, had 1,500 men employed, and only 240 of the 1,500 belonged to the United Mine Workers Association—the other 1,260 did not want to strike; they were satisfied with conditions.

While not opposed to meetings of the miners, we beg to inform all employees in or around the mines that a strike has been declared by the United Mine Workers of District No. 28, and endorsed by the National.

It would be truer if it had been said that the strike had been declared by the National and endorsed by the local association.

And will continue until such time as the operators of this district enter into an agreement with the United Mine Workers of America. Ballot or no ballot—

The men were not permitted to say whether or not they wanted to strike; 1,260 men who did not want to strike were not permitted to say anything about it.

—any one going to work in these mines will be branded a scab.

240 men brand 1,260 as scabs; the result is they all quit work. This is the same organization and these are the same officials who fought the mine owners of Nova Scotia for 22 months in the years 1909 and 1910, and there has been peace in Nova Scotia ever since.

I am told by the chief whip that as some hon. gentlemen who are not here to-night desire to speak on the subject of industrial training and technical education, it has been arranged that item 286 shall be allowed to stand, and that this one be allowed to pass.

Mr. NEELY: The minister said on Friday last that my statement in the House contained some grave inaccuracies. It does contain an inaccuracy of three names, due to the fact that I looked at the sessional papers published in 1911 for the list of that year, and in looking at the sessional papers published in 1912 I see that it contains the civil list of 1911, which has 24 names. But when it comes to my mentioning the 39 names, I have no correction to make in my figures at all. Whilst in the civil list of last year there were actually 30 names, the minister is asking us to vote money to pay 39.

Mr. CROTHERS: Thirty-nine—I do not think so.

Mr. NEELY: I think if the minister looks up the list he will find that I am not mistaken. Thirty-six men are provided for in this year's vote, and there are three men in the outside service, making a total of thirty-nine.

Mr. CROTHERS: The hon. gentleman cannot get out of it that way. He did not say anything about the outside service; he said he had been looking over the civil list the other day, and that he found thirty-nine names. He can find only thirty on the civil list, and the explanation as to the thirty-six I gave to my hon. friend the member for Pictou a few moments ago. Nine out of the thirty-six are vacancies.

Mr. CARVELL: At this late hour I do not want to review at any great length the very impressive and somewhat dramatic presentation of this case which has been made by the hon. minister. But I would like to get his understanding of this matter in order that there may be no misunderstanding. In the first place, I want to tell my hon. friend that I do not know anything about coal mines. I never was in a coal mine in my life, therefore I am asking for information. I understand the minister in this particular instance objects to this man Farrington and to White having anything to do with labour conditions in Canada, because they are residents of a foreign country.

Mr. CROTHERS: I did not say that.

Mr. CARVELL: Did you not? It is pretty hard to pin the minister down to anything at all, because he always get out of it by saying: 'I did not say that.' I did not say the minister used exactly those words, but I leave it to any hon. gentleman in this House, if that is not the substance and meaning of what he said. I would have to get the 'Hansard' for his exact words. The minister alleges that there was a deep laid plot some years ago, by which the United Mine Workers of America, a labour organization of the United States, wished to interfere with labour conditions in the province of British Columbia, for, I might say, national reasons, not purely reasons connected with the mining industry of British Columbia. The minister has gone to a great deal of trouble and read a lengthy article published by Farrington, who occupied some position with the United Mine Workers' organization. I understand that practically all the labour unions in Canada to-day, excepting one labour union in Nova Scotia, are international in character.

Mr. STANFIELD: Not quite.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not an authority, but I believe that practically all of them are international in character. The organization formed two or three years ago, of railway clerks and freight handlers, is local, I know. This seems to be a condition, and no matter whether we like it or not, it is a condition of things which we have to face. No doubt it is doing a good work, and I hope the minister will not say that trade unionism is not a good thing, so far as labour conditions are concerned. I do not think we are drawing an unfair inference from the statements made by the minister to-night when we say that he is opposed to the United Mine Workers of America in our coal industry because they are foreigners. I think I am equally safe in saying that the substance of the minister's explanation to-night is, that he is opposed to any attempt to settle this strike because he does not want this American organization to interfere in labour affairs in Canada. If I am right in my deductions, then I think the minister should answer this question: Is he, or is he not, opposed to international labour unions in the Dominion of Canada? I

think I am entitled to an answer to that question.

Mr. CROTHERS: Do you? I do not say anything against the United Mine Workers; I do not say anything to the effect that I was opposed to international unionism. I know that a great many unions in Canada are connected with this association. Some are not, a great many are, I am not discussing that question at all. It is legal for them to have unions here. I have not said anything as to whether I was in favour or opposed to that.

Mr. CARVELL: I wish you would.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have done nothing in opposition to such unions, and I do not propose to do anything in opposition to them. I was simply trying to give the members of this House the origin, as it struck me from that article, of the difficulties in Vancouver Island.

Mr. CARVELL: Then the minister does not dissent from my conclusion from his remarks, that he has not done anything to settle this trouble between the United Mine Workers and the men of British Columbia?

Mr. CROTHERS: I said nothing to warrant any such conclusion. We have been working at it since the 16th of September.

Mr. CARVELL: Would the minister go this far: would the minister say that he will not attempt to settle the strike at the present time because the trouble happens to be caused by the United Mine Workers of America?

Mr. CROTHERS: No, I will not say anything of the sort. The Deputy Minister spent nearly the whole of November in Vancouver Island trying to get the people together. We have an officer stationed at the city of Vancouver, a man whom I sent there when I was placed in charge of the Labour Department in order that we could have some one on the ground. There was a great deal of work to be done there. Before that, his headquarters had been at Ottawa. I sent a man of experience, Mr. J. D. McNiven, and he is in communication with us all the time, I get a report from him every week. I might say before I sit down, that the Canadian Collieries are employing about 400 more men than they employed at the time the strike began, and are putting out a great deal more coal than they were at that time. I had a report a few days ago from Mr. McNiven, stating that the output of the Western Fuel Company during the first week of February averaged 700 tons daily. Similar quantities are being turned out at Jinglepot and South Wellington. Large quantities of coal are being mined on Vancouver Island to-day, and there are large numbers of men employed. The men are going back almost daily, and most of them are put on. The owners could not find work for them all, because they are not working as many mines as before the strike. We are just having a repetition of what occurred in Nova Scotia, two or three years ago. The mine owners are operating their mines, but not to so large an extent as before the strike, but nobody is suffering through lack of coal.

12 p.m.

Mr. CARROLL: By union labour in Nova Scotia, not by United Mine Workers.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does the minister not think that the Minister of Mines is largely to blame for this trouble, instead of the Minister of Labour? Under the late Government, warm friends of my hon. friend blamed the Minister of Railways when there was a railway strike, and using the same argument as was used against me by gentlemen from the town where the hon. Minister of Labour resides, the Minister of Mines is certainly responsible for this trouble, and ought to be here answering questions instead of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. CROTHERS: Since my hon. friend has referred to the practice of the Government of which he was a distinguished member, I might read a letter to show what the practice of that Government was in such matters. My hon. friend from South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) referred the other night to the Conciliation Act, and pointed out what might be done by the minister under that Act, without any application on the part of any one. Something could be done, I quite agree with him. That same Act was in existence in 1906, when we had a very serious strike within a stone's throw of this city—about 20 miles down at a place called Buckingham. The men at Buckingham, more than a month before there was any serious trouble, requested the Labour Department to go down and intervene with a view to bringing about peace. My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) was at that time managing the Labour Department. It was not a separate department at that time. But let me read a sentence or two from a letter written on the 2nd of November by the then Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux). About the 8th of October there was a riot at Buckingham. Mr.

Lemieux had been requested in September to go down and see if he could not make peace between the men and employers, but he failed to do anything. A riot occurred three men were killed and others very seriously wounded, but this was the position taken by the then Minister of Labour.

Mr. MACDONALD: There was no legislation on the statute-book to enable him to act, there was no Industrial Disputes Investigation Act.

Mr. CROTHERS: He could not do anything under that Act but he could under the Conciliation Act.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why not?

Mr. CROTHERS: Because the employers would not have anything to do with the settlement. The men might have applied for it.

Mr. MACDONALD: Of course they could.

Mr. CROTHERS: I am now attempting to answer the position taken by the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) that under the Conciliation Act the minister could have intervened of his own will or motion. That Act was in existence then, nothing was done under it. Men were killed, blood was shed, then militia were sent down from Ottawa; and this is what Mr. Lemieux said in a letter to Hon. W. E. Weir.

Re Buckingham Strike.

I have to thank you for your letter of the 31st ult. and for your kind promise to send copies of the several reports made. With regard to what you say as to the report of our inspector, I would say that this matter was not investigated by any officer of the Department of Labour.

The procedure of the department in most of the cases which the department has had to deal with has been to intervene only where all sides have been willing to accept the department's friendly offices.

And he refused to have anything to do with it unless both parties asked the department to intervene. The men in this case asked them to do it but the employers did not want them to do it. The result was that the minister did not do it and he says that was the practice of the department, not to do anything unless both parties to the dispute were in favour of intervention.

Mr. CARVELL: That was seven or eight years ago. Does my hon. friend think the Department of Labour should stand still for seven or eight years? Is there to be no advance in the method of handling these troubles in seven or eight years? It just comes back to the old argument, if we are guilty you are guilty, too. That is the answer you get every time any question comes up in this House. The Minister of Labour surely must not think that because, before there was a Department of Labour, when it was only a sort of appendage to the Post Office Department, the then Postmaster General took a certain attitude before we even had the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, he can hide himself behind the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act.

Mr. CROTHERS: Nobody is trying to do it. Try to be fair if you can.

Mr. CARVELL: It is very hard to be fair with the present Minister of Labour.

Mr. CROTHERS: I know it is hard for you.

Mr. CARVELL: I fail to find a single soft spot for him to fall on. I do not want to distort the facts, but I say it is pretty hard for the present minister to get any comfort out of the action of the Postmaster General seven or eight years ago when there was not in existence an Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. I had hoped that his department had advanced some in that time, that there was a possibility of a better feeling between capital and labour than there was seven or eight years ago. If that is the conception which the minister has of the duties of the Labour Department, I am afraid he is only bearing out the idea that many of us on this side of the House have been trying to express to him during the course of this debate.

Mr. CROTHERS: The hon. member for Carleton was here last Friday night, he heard the whole statement as to what we have done to try to bring about a peacable settlement on Vancouver Island.

Mr. CARVELL: I heard nothing.

Mr. CROTHERS: But to-night he says there has been no advance made in the department, that we are acting as Mr. Lemieux did seven or eight years ago, when he knows or ought to know that that does not represent the matter.

Mr. CARVELL: Will the minister tell us what he has done to try to settle the Vancouver strike?

Mr. CROTHERS: I did.

Mr. CARVELL: Nothing has been given so far. He sent a telegram.

Mr. CROTHERS: I gave a full statement to the House.

Mr. CARVELL: And you reported that nothing had been done then. Give us the information now.

Mr. CROTHERS: No, I told you the other night that I was in Vancouver Island; I told you my fair-wage officer who went to the Crowsnest Pass in 1910 went to Vancouver Island day after day. I told you I appointed a commissioner; I told you that my deputy spent a month at Vancouver Island and that Mr. McNiven of Vancouver was in constant communication with Vancouver Island. And in the face of this the hon. member gets up and says nothing has been done, nothing more than was done by Mr. Lemieux seven or eight years ago.

Mr. FOSTER: Preposterous.

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes.

Mr. FOSTER: I think the arrangement was that items 287 and 288 were to pass and the other items were to stand.

Mr. VERVILLE: Just one word.

Mr. FOSTER: Oh, let us go home.

Mr. VERVILLE: There is no letter whatever from the department to the mine owners in the report of the commissioner. Before we proceed with the other items another day, it seems to me that all the correspondence should be laid on the Table so that we may have a chance to see the position that has been taken. I am asking what will be no more than fair because the present report is only half complete, and my hon. friend knows it very well.

Mr. CROTHERS: On Friday evening Sir Wilfrid Laurier asked me to bring the papers here. They are here to-day. You could have seen anything you wanted to see.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are they on the Table?

Mr. CROTHERS: No, they are here. We do not put originals on the Table as a rule, unless it be for a few moments.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why not send them to my hon. friend?

Mr. CROTHERS: No, I will not, but I will put them on the Table.

Mr. CARVELL: That is all we want.

Mr. FOSTER: Is it understood that they should be put on the Table to-night and that the hon. member for Maisonneuve should peg away at them all night?

Mr. CARVELL: There ought to be some understanding so that the hon. member for Maisonneuve can see them. The minister ought to be fair.

Mr. CROTHERS: I shall be very glad, if he will come to my office, to let him see the whole thing.

Mr. CARVELL: There are other members beside the hon. member for Maisonneuve. Why not make copies?

Mr. CROTHERS: We are making copies as rapidly as we can, but in the meantime I brought the originals here at Sir Wilfrid Laurier's request.

Mr. CARVELL: Surely they are not so voluminous that you cannot have them the next day.

Mr. CROTHERS: We could not get them out in several days.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Foster, the House adjourned at 12.23 a.m. Wednesday.

Wednesday, February 11, 1914.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of Inland Revenue on Adulteration of Food for the year ended March 31, 1913.—Hon. W. B. Nantel.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

DR. D. H. McFADDEN, M.P.P.

Mr. MOLLOY:

1. Is Dr. D. H. McFadden, M.P.P., of Emerson, Manitoba, in the employ of the Government?
2. If so, when was he employed?
3. What are his duties?
4. What is his salary?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Yes.
2. April 1, 1913.
3. Inspector of quarantine stations for western Canada.
4. $1,800 per annum.

CHESLEY POST OFFICE.

Mr. TRUAX:

1. Was Samuel Wright or any other person appointed as collector of letters from the mail boxes in Chesley, Ontario? If so, at what date was he appointed, on what date did he begin to attend to his duties, at what wages, salary or compensation, and what amount has been paid to him for services and expenses, if any, to date?

2. Was William Haliday, or any other person, appointed as janitor or caretaker of the post office building in Chesley? If so, at what salary or wage per day, per month or per year; what was the date of his appointment, when did he commence to attend to his duties, what amount has been paid him for his services to date, and has any allowance been made him as extras or otherwise for making and attending to fires in the building?

3. When does the department expect the building to be open and used for the purposes for which it was constructed?

4. Where and in what building is the post office now situated and in operation, and how long has it been there?

5. (a) When was the construction of the new building contracted for, and (b) with whom, and (c) when did the work thereon first begin?

6. How long has it been in course of construction, and is it yet completed?

Mr. CODERRE: In so far as the Department of Public Works is concerned:

1. Post Office Department to answer.

2. No caretaker has yet been appointed. Mr. Haliday was clerk of works, at $80 per month, from 8th May, 1912. Amount paid to 8th January, 1913, is $1,600.

3. The main contract is completed, but the fittings are not yet installed, but are expected to be very shortly.

4. Post Office Department to answer.

5. (a) Date of contract, April 3, 1912. (b) Gilpen Bros., of Wiarton. (c) Commenced work early in May.

6. Main contract comenced early in May, 1912. Final estimate passed December 16, 1913.

In so far as Post Office Department is concerned:

A street letter box service was established in Chesley, Ontario, on the 17th October, 1913. A temporary arrangement was made with Samuel Wright to collect the mail matter posted in the boxes until tenders could be invited for a permanent contract. For this temporary service Mr. Wright has been paid fifty cents per trip, or one dollar per day. For the quarter ended 31st December, 1913, Mr. Wright was paid $65. The Post Office Department is now considering the tenders for a permanent contract.

[Mr. Coderre.]

PAYMENTS TO MR. E. H. CIMON.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. What sum of money was charged either in fees or travelling expenses by E. H. Cimon, of Fraserville, in connection with the investigations held in the counties of Temiscouata and Kamouraska?

2. Has he been paid?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Fees, $97.50; travelling expenses, $4.85; total, $102.35.

2. Yes.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—SHOPS AT TRANSCONA.

*Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Are the Transcontinental shops at Transcona completed? If so, what is the toal cost, including equipment?

2. If not completed, what is the amount expended up to date, and what is the estimated amount required to complete?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.

2. Paid:

Locomotive shops—	
Buildings	$1,488,983 35
Machine tools, motors and power house equipment	829,726 65
Shafting, hangers, wiring, air and steam piping, yard water system, &c., &c., and miscellaneous equipment	428,795 93
Total	$2,747,505 93
Car shops—	
Buildings	$ 958,982 23
Equipment	174,679 80
Total	$1,133,662 03
To be paid—approximate:	
Car shops—	
Buildings	$ 24,846 39
Equipment	54,897 85
Motors	26,500 00
Exhaust system	15,000 00
Miscellaneous items	13,000 00
Industrial track	3,073 73
Wiring	29,904 97
Total	$ 167,221 97
Total, car shops	$1,300,884 00
Total locomotive and car shops	$4,048,389 93

KITSILANO INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Are the Indians of the Kitsilano reserve now in occupation of that reserve?

2. If not, where are they residing?
3. What rights to land had they acquired where they now reside?
4. Did they remove from the reserve with the knowledge and consent of the department?
5. What is the present social and moral condition of these Indians now as compared with their condition before they removed from the reserve?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. It is reported that the Indians are not now occupying the Kitsilano reserve.
2. It is reported that they are residing on other Indian reserves at Squamish river and other places.
3. The Indian reserves on which they now reside were set apart by the Indian Reserve Commission in 1876-77.
4. No.
5. In so far as any information in the department is concerned, the social and moral condition of these Indians is not materially changed.

IRON AND STEEL PRODUCTS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

What was the total value of the imports of iron and steel and iron and steel products of every kind into Canada during the year ending December 31, 1913?

Mr. J. D. REID:

Iron and steel of all kinds in the rough, including pig iron, kentledge, billets, ingots, blooms, slabs, puddled bars, etc., cast scrap iron and other scrap, and skelp iron, $9,869,263. Iron and steel of all kinds in partially manufactured form, including bar iron, Canada plates and all sheets and plates, rolled angles, tees, beams, channels, girders, hoop, band and strip, Universal mill plate, tool steel, rolled nail rods, and all similar articles of iron or steel adapted to further manufacture, $35,484,530. Iron and steel products of all kinds, other than the above, including machinery, engines, agricultural implements, hardware, tools, etc., $96,581,652. Total, $141,935,445.

YARMOUTH—PURCHASES OF LIVE STOCK.

Mr. LAW:

1. How many and what breed of swine have been purchased by the Department of Agriculture in the county of Yarmouth for farm or breeding purposes during the year 1913?
2. What is the name and address of each seller?
3. What is the name and address of each agent or representative through whom the purchase was made?
4. What was the highest and lowest price paid?
5. Was a commission paid for purchase or examination? If so, to whom and how much?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Two. Breed, Yorkshire.
2. W. A. Churchill, Lakeside; John A. Moir, Yarmouth North.
3. H. W. Corning, Chegoggin, N.S.
4. Highest price paid, $25; lowest price paid, $25.
5. No commission was paid for purchase or examination. The representative of the department by whom the purchase was made was paid at the rate of $6 per day while engaged in the purchase and distribution of pure bred stock in the Maritime provinces.

Mr. LAW:

1. How many and what breed of horses have been purchased by the Department of Agriculture in the county of Yarmouth for farm or breeding purposes during the year 1913?
2. What is the name and address of each seller?
3. What is the name and address of each agent or representative through whom purchase was made?
4. What was the highest and lowest price paid?
5. Was a commission paid for purchase or examination? If so, to whom and how much?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. No horses have been purchased by the Department of Agriculture in the county of Yarmouth for farm or breeding purposes during the year 1913.
2, 3, 4, 5. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. LAW:

1. How many and what breed of cattle have been purchased by the Department of Agriculture in the county of Yarmouth for farm or breeding purposes during the year 1913?
2. What is the name and address of each seller?
3. What is the name and address of each agent or representative through whom purchase was made?
4. What was the highest and lowest price paid?
5. Was a commission paid for purchase or examination? If so, to whom and how much?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. One Guernsey bull was purchased by the Experimental Farms Branch of the Department of Agriculture in the county of Yarmouth during the year 1913.
2. Howard Corning, of Chegoggin, N.S.
3. W. S. Blair, superintendent of the Experimental Farm at Nappan, N.S.
4. The price paid was $150.
5. No.

Mr. LAW:

1. How many and what breed of sheep have been purchased by the Department of Agricul-

ture in the county of Yarmouth for farm or breeding purposes during the year 1913?

2. What is the name and address of each seller?

3. What is the name and address of each agent or representative through whom purchase was made?

4. What was the highest and lowest price paid?

5. Was a commission paid for purchase or examination? If so, to whom and how much?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Five. Breed, Cheviot.

2. R. B. Wyman, Arcadia; J. C. Corning, Chegoggin; B. B. Killain, Yarmouth; Ed. Golden, Chebogue Point.

3. H. W. Corning, Chegoggin, N.S.

4. Highest price paid, $25; lowest price paid, $15.

5. No commission was paid for purchase or examination. The representative of the department by whom the purchase was made was paid at the rate of $6 per day while engaged in the purchase and distribution of pure bred stock in the Maritime provinces.

ANTIGONISH FOOD INSPECTOR.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM:

1. Is Moses Delorey, of Tracadie, Antigonish county, still food inspector?

2. If not, when were his services dispensed with, and was anybody appointed in his place?

3. How many prosecutions under the Act did he initiate?

4. How many convictions did he obtain, and who were the persons convicted, if any?

5. Is it the intention of the Department of Inland Revenue to appoint another food inspector for Antigonish county?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. Yes.

2. ——.

3. The department alone takes the initiative regarding prosecutions.

4. None. He collected samples from various parties, none of which were found to be adulterated.

5. Not now.

ARMOURIES.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many armouries have been built in Canada by the Department of Militia and Defence since the year 1900?

2. How many of said armouries have had sites contributed by the towns or cities where such armouries are situated?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES:

1. 48.

2. 32.

[Mr. Law.]

OTTAWA PROPERTY PURCHASE.

*Mr. MURPHY:

In connection with the scheme for beautifying the city of Ottawa, is it the intention of the Government to purchase the properties on the north side of Wellington street extending from the Perley Home westward to Pooley's bridge?

Mr. ROGERS: The question of the purchase of property on the north side of Wellington street extending from the Perley Home, westward to Pooley's bridge has not yet been considered.

SS. MONTCALM.

*Mr. DELISLE:

When back from her trip to Seven Islands will the Montcalm be employed exclusively in future, to keeping the chanel free from ice between Quebec and Montreal?

Mr. HAZEN: The Montcalm was due to return last night. She will, so far as the conditions of the service permit of it, continue ice-breaking operations between Quebec and Montreal.

SUPERINTENDENT OF PILOTS.

*Mr. DELISLE:

Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a pilot as successor to the late Captain Riley, who was superintendent of pilots of the Quebec and Montreal division?

Mr. HAZEN: The matter is under consideration.

INSIDE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Since October 10, 1911, how many persons have been appointed to positions in the inside civil service who had not passed the public competitive examination held by the Civil Service Commission in May and November of each year?

2. How many of such persons were appointed in each department?

Mr. CODERRE: Number of persons appointed in each department since October 10, 1911, who have not passed the semi-annual competitive examinations for third and second divisions and for the lower grade, held by the Civil Service Commission in May and November of each year:

Department.	Number of appointments.
Auditor General	4
Agriculture	38
Commission of Conservation	5
Customs	3
External Affairs	1
Governor General's Secretary	3
House of Commons	20
Indian Affairs	1

Interior	66
Inland Revenue	8
Justice	6
Labour	1
Mines	35
Marine and Fisheries	10
Militia and Defence	10
Naval Service	5
Post Office	69
Privy Council	1
Public Works	51
Printing and Stationery	1
Railways and Canals	10
R.N.W.M.P.	2
Senate	1
Secretary of State	4
Archives	6
	361

ST. CASIMIR POST OFFICE.

*Mr. DELISLE:

1. Has the Postmaster General received a petition from the residents of the parish of St. Casimir, county of Portneuf, asking for the construction of a post office in their locality?

2. If he has not yet received it, has it been addressed to the Minister of Public Works?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to grant the request of the residents of St. Casimir, to that effect?

4. If so, will an amount of money be put in the next supplementary estimates respecting such construction?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3 and 4. The matter is under consideration.

OTTAWA DRILL HALL.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the Government acquired a site for a new armoury or drill hall in Ottawa?

2. If so, where is the site located, and how much was paid for it?

3. If not, will the Government make provision in the Estimates of the present session for the purchase of such a site?

Mr. HUGHES: It is under consideration.

SEAMAN JOSEPH LE BLANC.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Was Joseph Le Blanc, of Port Felix, N.S., employed as a sailor on D.G.S. Canada during 1913?

2. If so, when did his employment begin and when did it cease?

3. At what date was he placed in a hospital at Montreal, by whom was he so placed, why was he sent there, and what is the name of the hospital?

4. If he departed this life in said hospital, what is the date of his death and the cause of his death?

5. Where was his body buried?

6. Who owns the lot in which his body was buried?

7. How can the place of interment be identified?

8. Did the parties in charge of said hospital, or the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or the captain of the D.G.S. Canada, or any officer on behalf of the said Government, receive a message from Mrs. Margaret Richard, of said Port Felix, requesting that the remains of said Le Blanc be forwarded to Port Felix for interment?

9. Why was the remains of the said Le Blanc not sent to Port Felix for interment?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes, as able seaman.

2. Began 11th of April, 1913; ended 22nd of August, 1913.

3. Entered Montreal general hospital on 9th of August, 1913; sent by the commanding officer Canada, suffering from empyema, complicated by broncho-pneumonia.

4. Died from empyema, complicated by broncho-pneuomnia, on 22nd August, 1913.

5. In the Catholic cemetery of Cote des Neiges, Montreal.

6. The Catholic Sailors' Club.

7. By the officers of the Catholic Sailors' Club, Montreal.

8. On 22nd August the commanding officer Canada telegraphed Mrs. Richard the news of her brother's death and asked her to communicate with the hospital concerning the burial, otherwise the agent of Marine and Fisheries Department would arrange it. Ship proceeded to sea on 23rd August, and on arrival at Shelburne on 27th August a wire was received from Mrs. Richard as follows: 'If Government will forward Joseph Leblanc's body free of charge to Mulgrave, we will meet it there; otherwise please have buried Montreal. Advise answer.' A letter from Mrs. Richard dated 25th August, asking for the body to be forwarded free of charge, was also received by the Prime Minister.

9. In accordance with the telegram from the commanding officer Canada and in the absence of directions from Mrs. Richard, the body was buried in Montreal.

THE SHELLFISH COMMISSION.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has the Government taken any action on the reoprt of the Shellfish Fishery Commission of 1913? If so, what action?

Mr. HAZEN: The report is still under consideration.

METCALFE DRILL HALL.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Since October, 1911, how often has the

drill hall at Metcalfe, Ontario, been used for other than military purposes?

2. From whom was permission obtained to use the said drill hall on each such occasion?

3. Was any rental or other fee exacted for such use?

4. If so, how much was paid, and to whom was payment made in each instance?

5. Have all moneys so paid been remitted to the Militia Department? If not, by whom, and under what authority have they been retained?

Mr. HUGHES:

1. Twice.

2. By the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence.

3. No.

4 and 5. Answered by No. 3.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY GRADE REDUCTION.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Did the Government or any member thereof authorize the publication of the following item in the Ottawa Citizen of July 3, 1913:—

'The new management of the Intercolonial has in view extensive improvements designed to facilitate the operative utility of the road. The principal question to be considered immediately is that of grade reduction. At present the maximum grade is one and one-quarter. It is the belief of General Manager Gutelius that a six-tenths grade is quite feasible and the adoption of this would result in doubling the present haulage capacity of the road. With this improvement in view, surveys and estimates are to be prepared this summer.'

2. What arrangements, if any, have been made to carry into effect the improvements mentioned in the foregoing extract?

3. Will a six-tenths grade be established on the Intercolonial railway? If so, what is the estimated cost of the necessary changes in the line?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No authority was given by the Minister of Railways and Canals.

2 and 3. No decision has been arrived at.

SUBMARINE BELL FLOATS.

Mr. LAW:

1. Were tenders asked for thirteen submarine bell floats by the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

2. If so, what tenders were received and what is the respective amounts of same?

3. To whom was the contract awarded and what was the amount paid?

1. Yes.

2. The John Inglis Co., Ltd., Toronto, tendered for $6,370; the Eastern Steel Company, Ltd., New Glasgow, N.S., tendered for $7,735; the New Burrell Johnson Iron Co., Yarmouth, N.S., tendered for $7,800; the Sydney Foundry and Machine Works, Ltd., Sydney, C.B., tendered for $8,200; International Marine Signal Company, Ottawa, tendered for $11,700, with an alternative offer in accordance with their drawings for $11,375; T. Hogan & Company, Halifax, tendered for $11,635; D. McLachlan & Sons, St. John, N.B., tendered for $28,600.

3. To the John Inglis Company, Ltd., Toronto. Nothing has yet ben paid on this contract.

SS. GULNARE.

Mr. LAW:

1. Were tenders asked by the Department of the Naval Service for a boiler for the SS. Gulnare?

2. If so, how many were received, and what are the names of the tenderers and amounts of same respectively?

3. To whom was the contract awarded, and what was the amount?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. Five tenders were received viz.: the John Inglis Company, Ltd., $4,800; the Canadian Allis-Chalmers Company, $5,025; the Polson Iron Works, Ltd., $5,438; the New Burrell-Johnson Iron Company, Ltd., $5,700; the International Engineering Works, Ltd., $6,366.

3. The John Inglis Company, Ltd., 14 Strachan avenue, Toronto, $4,800.

OTTAWA RIFLE RANGE.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. What is the total expenditure to date on the rifle range in course of construction in the township of March, county of Carleton?

2. When will the work be completed, and the range ready for use?

3. What arrangements have been made for the transportation of riflemen and others going to and returning from the said range?

4. If none, is it the intention of the Government to have a spur line built from one of the present lines of railway to the said range?

5. What is the distance from the city of Ottawa to the said range by public highway?

Mr. HUGHES:

1. Cost of land, $193,379.86; cost of construction, $191,650.42.

2. The range will be completed and ready for use early next autumn.

3. Arrangements under consideration.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. The distance from the city of Ottawa (post office) to the range by public highway is twelve and a half miles.

RICHIBUCTO LIFE-SAVING CREW.

*Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Did the Department of Marine and Fisheries send an official to Richibucto, Kent county, N.B., in September last, to investigate charges of neglect of duty on the part of the life-saving crew at the north beach near Richibucto? If so, what was the name of the official

and what position does he occupy in the service of the department?

2. Who did he interview in that vicinity, and did he take and receive evidence? If so, who were the witnesses examined, was the investigation held in public or was it merely an inquiry of individuals held in private?

3. Did he examine and interview other than friends of the Government? If so, whom, and did he avoid interviewing all those who did not want to shield the members of the life-saving crew?

4. Did the investigating official make a report? If so, what was its nature?

5. What are the respective ages of Captain Long and Henry D. Irving, members connected with the life-saving station at that place?

6. Was Captain George Orr, master of the schooner Champion examined, was a minute taken of his evidence, and was the evidence of Captain Orr's two sons and James Legoff taken?

7. Was the evidence of Captain Weston, of the schooner Maud Weston, or of Clem. Edward, his mate, taken?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes. Moses H. Nickerson, inspector of life-saving stations for Maritime provinces.

2. Collector of Customs, Mr. E. B. Carson, of Rexton, Captain Jas. Legoof, Mr. R. O'Leary and others. It was a private inquiry of individuals.

3. No information in the department.

4. Yes; that the charges were without foundation.

5. Captain Long gives his age as 52. Henry D. Irving as 55.

6. Captain George Orr made a statutory declaration as to the facts of the case. James Legoof was interviewed by Mr. Nickerson. The department has no information to the effect that evidence was given by Captain Orr's two sons.

7. The department has no information to that effect.

CUSTOMS OFFICER ANGUS YOUNG.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What position did Angus Young, of North Sydney, hold in the Government service?

2. When was he appointed, and at what salary?

3. What were his duties?

4. Is he still in the service?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. Acting preventive officer of customs.

2. He has been employed by the Customs Department since April 17, 1913; at salary of $900 per year.

3. He was boarding officer in the harbour at North Sydney, and was also deputized by the chief preventive officer of customs to order the movements of the Alert in the waters surrounding Cape Breton.

4. Suspended February 5, 1914, pending investigation re Str. Alert.

FERRONA-SUNNY BRAE RAILWAY.

Mr. MACDONALD:

Does the Railway Department intend to continue to treat the line of railway from Ferrona to Sunny Brae as a separate railway, apart from the Intercolonial, in the matter of freight rates and other privileges?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. It has not been decided to make any change in the present arrangement.

THE STEAMER ALERT.

*Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who is the owner of the steamer Alert?

2. When was she chartered by the Government?

3. For how long and at what price per month was she chartered?

4. Where has she been since December 1, 1913?

5. On how many occasions has she been outside the harbour of Sydney since December 1, 1913, and for what purpose did she go?

6. Is the contract for her hire still in force?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. W. N. McDonald.

2. October 1, 1912, for service from January 1, 1913.

3. Charter may be terminated at any time upon one year's notice in writing by either of the contracting parties; $1,250 per month owner paying all wages, fuel and maintenance.

4. In Sydney Harbour, Bras d'Or Lakes, Grand Narrows, St. Peters canal, Port Mulgrave, Port Hawkesbury, South Bay, Ingonish, Neil's Harbour, and on the fishing grounds from northern Cape Breton to the southward of Glace Bay.

5. Twenty, on five of which her cruise extended for more than one day; for the protection of the revenue and of the inshore fisheries.

6. Ordered out of commission on February 5, 1914, by instructions from Minister of Customs.

UNOPPOSED AND UNDISCUSSED MOTIONS.

Mr. Neely.—For a return showing the number of binders, reapers, mowers, ploughs, seeders and cultivators exported from and imported to Canada, with their value respectively, in each of the years 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913?

Mr. Sinclair.—For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other papers to be found in the Department of the Naval Service in connection with the death and burial, at Montreal, of Joseph LeBlanc, a sailor on D.G.S. Canada.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all papers, telegrams, correspondence and petitions in any way referring to the dismissal of the postmaster at Ainslie Glen, Inverness county, and the appointment of Neil McKinnon to said office.

Mr. Oliver.—For a return showing reasons for the dismissal of Mr. Larivière, Dominion Lands agent at Grouard; the date of his appointment and of dismissal, and salary at time of dismissal; also the name of agent appointed in his place, with date of appointment and salary?

Mr. Oliver.—For a return showing reasons for the dismissal of Gordon McDonald, homestead inspector in the Grouard Land agency, the date of his appointment and of dismissal, and salary at time of dismissal; also the name of inspector appointed in his place, with date of appointment and salary.

Mr. Oliver.—For a return showing reasons for the dismissal of Mr. P. Tomkins, Dominion Lands agent at Grouard, the date of his appointment and of dismissal, and salary at time of dismissal; also the name of agent appointed in his place, with date of appointment and salary.

Mr. Oliver.—For a return showing reasons for the dismissal of Mr. George McLeod, in charge of telegraph construction on telegraph line to Peace River; the date of his appointment and of dismissal, and salary at time of dismissal; also the name of the official appointed in his place, with date of appointment, salary and qualifications.

Mr. Oliver.—For a return showing reasons for the dismissal of Mr. Webster, immigration agent at Edmonton; the date of his appointment and of dismissal, and salary at time of dismissal; also the name of the agent appointed in his place, with date of appointment, salary and qualifications.

Mr. Oliver.—For a return showing reasons for the dismissal of Jacob Mohr, interpreter for the immigration agency at Edmonton; the date of his appointment and of dismissal, and salary at time of dismissal; also the name of the interpreter appointed in his place, with date of appointment, salary and qualifications.

Mr. Oliver.—For a return showing reasons for the dismissal of Mr. Shinbine, caretaker of the immigration hall at Edmonton, the date of his appointment and of dismissal, and salary at time of dismissal; also the name of caretaker appointed in his place, with date of appointment, salary and qualifications.

Mr. Murphy.—For a return showing how many honorary appointments to military rank have been made by, or with the approval of, the present Minister of Militia and Defence since he assumed office, with the names of the persons so appointed, and the rank of each?

Mr. Boyer.—For a return showing how many seigniories there are in the province of Quebec; their names and the amount paid to each of them as an indemnity by the Government, after the adoption of the law of 1854; the value of each of the seigniories on which the consolidated funds were based.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, petitions and other documents in any way connected with the dismissal of the postmaster at Alexander, Inverness county, and the appointment of a successor.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a copy of all telegrams, correspondence, instructions, recommendations and other documents that passed between the Shellfish Fishery Commission of 1913, and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, from the date of the appointment of said commission to December 31, 1913, excluding such documents as have been printed in the published report of said commission.

[Mr. A. W. Chisholm.]

Mr. Sinclair.—For a return showing the names, tonnage, port of registry and destination of all foreign vessels engaged in fishing, both sail and steam, that entered and cleared from the port of North Sydney during the year ending December 31, 1913.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all papers, letters and documents of every kind relating to the dismissal of A. Michael Russell from the position of caretaker of the drill hall at Windsor, county of Hants.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all papers, letters and documents of every kind relating to the dismissal of Albert McHeffey from the position of postmaster at Shubenacadie, county of Hants.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all papers, letters and documents of every kind relating to the dismissal of Thomas Nelson, from the position of postmaster at Scotch village, county of Hants.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all papers, letters and documents of every kind relating to the dismissal of C. Stewart McPhee from the position of postmaster at Enfield, county of Hants.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all papers, letters and documents of every kind relating to the dismissal of John A. Roy from the position of postmaster at Maitland, county of Hants.

Mr. J. J. Hughes.—For a return showing the amount paid by the Government to complete the Elmira branch of the Prince Edward Island railway, after taking the work off the contractor's hands; also showing the amount paid to each person who performed any work whether paid by the day, month or year, with the time employed, the rate of wages and the nature of the work performed; also showing the quantity of material supplied by each individual or firm, and the amount paid to each individual or firm for such material, with the price of each article whether by the pound, the yard, the gallon or by count, and the quantity left over, if any; also showing the quantity of material supplied by the Government, if any, with full details, and the value of such material.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, reports and other documents relative to the purchasing of land from Joseph Fraser, in connection with the works at Cariboo Island, Pictou county, in the Public Works Department.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all petitions, letters, telegrams, and other papers relative to the establishment of rural mail delivery routes in the county of Pictou since January 1, 1912, together with the number of said routes, the carriers on each route, the tenders received in each case for the service, a copy of the correspondence in relation to said tenders and their acceptance, and the post offices closed or to be closed as the result of the establishment of said routes.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, reports, appraisals, and other documents relative to the expropriation of the lands of John Campbell and Albert E. Milligan, in connection with the improvements on the East river at Pictou.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the purchase for the Intercolonial railway of a quantity of coal in the United States, within the past few months.

Mr. Proulx.—For a return showing the total amount of the travelling expenses of the members of the Government since their advent to power; the number of trips to other countries, Europe included, they have made; the names of the ministers who have travelled at the expense of the public treasury; the total amount so expended by each of the ministers who have so travelled; the objects of these visits, and how long they lasted.

Mr. L. P. Gauthier.—For a return showing the total amount of the travelling expenses of the members of the late Government from the 1st January, 1897, to the 21st of September, 1911; the number of trips to other countries Europe included, they have made; the names of the ministers who have travelled at the expense of the public treasury; the total amount so expended by each of the ministers who have so travelled; the objects of these visits, and how long they lasted.

Mr. Oliver.—For a copy of the Orders in Council directing action in the Manitoba courts regarding the surrender and sale of lands of the St. Peter's Indian reserve, and of all letters and papers of instruction re the conduct of the action to be instituted, and of all papers showing the terms of the surrender, the specific parcels of land sold, the conditions of sale, the purchasers of the same, and the prices paid; also a copy of all papers showing the reasons of the Government for entering the action and the purposes which it proposes to attain by doing so, if successful, and what course it purposes to take if the action fails.

HUDSON BAY TERMINALS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved:

For a copy of all contracts, accounts, bills, memoranda, letters, correspondence, receipts, vouchers, bills of lading, &c., referring to all materials, provisions, supplies and goods of every description purchased and forwarded to Port Nelson during the year 1913 by any department of the Government of Canada and agreements for employment of workmen in connection with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway terminals at Port Nelson.

He said: In making this motion I desire to address the House in regard to the work carried on by the Government during the year 1913 in connection with the establishment of Hudson Bay railway terminals at Port Nelson. From the information which came to the public, directly and indirectly, from those who were at Hudson Bay during the past season and who have since returned, I think it has been abundantly established that the Government is open to censure for its conduct of affairs in connection with the work carried on at Port Nelson during the past season. I think that if Port Nelson is at all practicable and is to be adopted as a shipping terminal for the proposed Hudson Bay railway, the reputation of the port has been very seriously damaged, which is extremely regrettable. A year or more ago the present Minister of Railways paid a visit to Hudson Bay with a view of conducting a personal investigation into the practicability and desirability of selecting either Port Nelson or Fort Churchill as a port for the Hudson Bay railway. This journey on the part of the Minister of Railways, which was an arduous one, was, in my judgment, highly commendable. I have often wondered why we have not had the advantage of a report or statement from him upon the floor of the House explanatory of his visit and observations in this far-off country. It is apparent that the minister recommended the selection of Port Nelson as the Hudson Bay terminal port, but so far he has not seen fit to take Parliament into his confidence or, at least, we have had from him little or no justification or evidence for the selection which he has made.

The comment or criticism which I have to make on the operations conducted by the Department of Railways in connection with the Port Nelson terminal during last season would be about as follows: There was a lack of business method in connection with the whole year's operations or work of the department in connection with the establishment of the proposed terminals at Port Nelson. There was a general unpreparedness for the work they were endeavouring to carry on and complete during the past season, with the result that the whole project has been seriously damaged in the eyes of the public. To be more particular, there was a very obvious lack of aids to navigation in the Hudson bay waters; incorrect charts were furnished to captains of vessels navigating these waters. There was practically an absence of buoys in the portions of Hudson bay traversed by the ships chartered by the Government. There was an utter absence of facilities for the unloading of ships. There was an utter absence of wharves. There was no organization to protect and preserve the supplies and materials which were landed there by the various steamers or vessels which visited that port under charter to the Government. There was, further, extravagance in connection with the amount of material purchased by the Government and despatched to the site of the proposed terminal during the last season. The amount so purchased, I say, was altogether unnecessary and could not possibly have been utilized, or consumed, for a considerable number of years.

I say further that there is evidence that in the selection of the ships chartered wise judgment was not exercised, and it is the judgment of some of the captains of ships

which went there during last summer that a grave error in judgment was made in the selection of the ships so chartered. There has been also grave complaint concerning the treatment extended to the labourers who went to Port Nelson last season under contract with the Department of Railways. That point, however, I do not propose discussing on this occasion. During the season we find that steamers were chartered at very great cost, carrying very extensive and valuable cargoes to Port Nelson. They were kept there for several months without any provision having been made for discharging or lightering their cargoes. One steamer with its total cargo became an absolute loss, and this loss might have been wholly or partially obviated, we are informed on fairly good authority, by a little care and attention on the part of some who were in these regions as employees and servants of the Government. Other chartered ships were kept there for several months and were obliged to throw over portions of their cargoes and then leave without fully discharging the balance of their cargoes for Sydney and other ports in Nova Scotia. Had they not done so, they would have been frozen in there during the present winter season. Other steamers were sent there fully loaded with very valuable cargoes and were obliged to return without discharging any portion of their cargoes. In a general way, this is the story of the administration of affairs in connection with this matter and the results, I say, are not at all beneficial to the project of the Hudson bay railway, or creditable to the department of the Government charged with the responsibility of administering this particular public work. The result is, as I have already stated, that the reputation of the whole project has been very seriously damaged indeed. There has been a great waste of public money and very little if any progress was made in the matter during the year 1913.

Mr. AIKINS: Would the hon. member give the name of the vessel which is said to have returned without its cargo having been discharged?

Mr. MACLEAN: I shall reach that later. There were two, one was the Alcazar. Nothing was discharged except some of the cargo on the fore deck that was thrown overboard. She returned to Sydney with the balance of her cargo. The conditions which I mention raise the very important question, first, as to whether the construction of the Hudson bay terminal at Port Nelson during the last season was proceeded with and carried on in an efficient and businesslike manner. The other question, and it is worth while our discussing it briefly in order to elicit some information at least as to whether Port Nelson is the proper port terminal to select for the Hudson bay railway. I say that the burden is on the Administration to establish a favourable answer to these two points, which, I say, are now open to controversy and question. I think the burden of proof is upon the Government to establish that their conduct of affairs during the past season was of a businesslike character, and that Port Nelson is the proper port terminal for the Hudson bay railway.

The only evidence which we have at our disposal is that given to the public from those who went to Hudson bay last summer in one capacity or another. No official report has been presented to the public, so far, from the Department of Railways, concerning the operations of the past season; consequently the only intelligence we have comes from the source I have indicated. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins) asked me for some specific information concerning the return of cargoes which were despatched to Hudson bay during the past season, and I desire to refer briefly to the result of the trips made to the Hudson bay last season, by two or three steamers chartered by the Government. The first one I wish to refer to is that of the steamer Alcazar, which arrived at Port Nelson on August 14, from Port Arthur, Texas, laden with about 2,000,000 feet of hard pine lumber. The chartering of this steamer cost the Government about $60,000. I think the charter was $35,000 for the trip, subject to a demurrage of $250 per day, after the first day of September. I know it has been stated in the press that the total cost of chartering this steamer approximates the sum of $60,000. This report may not be absolutely correct, but I have no doubt it is substantially correct. This steamer returned to Sydney, Nova Scotia, without discharging cargo, as it found no facilities for lightering its cargo at Port Nelson. A portion of the deck cargo was thrown overboard, and so far as I can learn, was absolutely lost. The failure to provide suitable lightering facilities is difficult to understand. The Alcazar was unable to approach within from eight to ten miles of the mouth of the Nelson river on account of the low depth of water, and there was no other possible

method of discharging its cargo and conveying it to the site of the port terminals except by lightering. It is extremely difficult to understand why the Government despatched ships laden with valuable cargoes to these waters without making ample provision for lightering the ships. The voyage of the steamer resulted in needless waste of public money, and its whole purpose rendered valueless. At the time of the arrival of the Alcazar at the Nelson river, there was but one lighter provided for the unloading of ships, and in addition to the Alcazar there were three other laden ships lying in the same waters. I cannot understand what possible defence the Minister of Railways can urge to justify his failure to provide sufficient lightering facilities. The cargo of the Alcazar was not available last season for the purpose for which it was required in connection with the construction of terminals at Port Nelson, and will necessitate its reshipment to Hudson bay next season. So much for the Alcazar. Another steamer chartered by the Government was the Alette, which was wrecked in Hudson bay and became a lotal loss, and the loss, it is urged by some who were on board the ship, was due to the lack of navigation aids.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE: Has the hon. gentleman any information 3 p.m. that it is a total loss? I have no such information.

Mr. MACLEAN: My information is that the Alette is a total loss.

Mr. COCHRANE: If the hon. gentleman will allow me to correct him, the Cearense may be a total loss, but not the Alette.

Mr. MACLEAN: The Minister of Railways is correct, the Alette, however, met with some mishap. She was laden with 3,000,000 feet of pine, worth $75,000. Some of this pine was loaded at Port Arthur, Texas, and some of it at the port of Halifax. In addition to this cargo of pine, the Alette was conveying to Port Nelson two scows built at Toronto, which were to be used for lightering purposes I assume. The captain of the Alette says—perhaps it may be said that he is hardly an authority on a matter of this kind—that the cargo of pine carried to Port Nelson by the Alette was not actually required for some years.

Mr. COCHRANE: Which captain said that? There were two on the boat.

Mr. MACLEAN: Captain Robertson. This ship found the same conditions prevailing, as did the steamer Alcazar, no lightering facilities and no wharfs for the reception of the cargo. It is also said that the scows which were conveyed by the steamer Alette were improperly constructed, and were not designed by persons having any knowledge of the conditions prevailing at Port Nelson. It would appear that these scows will not prove of much practical value. Actual conditions should have been anticipated before constructing scows of this design. Another steamer despatched with cargo to Hudson bay was the Cearense. This ship, I understand, was wrecked about 20 miles from Port Nelson, and I understand was totally wrecked and the cargo wholly lost. It is charged that the wreck of the Cearense was wholly due to the lack of proper navigation aids, and which was easily avoidable. I wish to refer to statements made respecting conditions there by one or two persons who were on board the Cearense, and I do so for the purpose of giving to the House the opinion of those who had the advantage of personal observation of conditions generally. Captain Howard, of the Cearense, was interviewed at Halifax on his return, and he is reported in the Halifax Chronicle newspaper.

Mr. COCHRANE: That is the man who lost the ship?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, he was the captain of the lost ship, and he says that the loss was due to the neglect of certain employees of the Government. This paper says:

> Captain Howard, the commander in charge of the ill-fated steamer at the time of the disaster, speaks only in enigmas, the following of which, given to The Morning Chronicle and signed by him, is quite characteristic of all his statements regarding the wreck of his steamer.
>
> Captain Howard refuses any statement regarding loss of Cearense but suggests that sleepers remember that parties are awake even though those who are responsible to aids to navigation should remain abed—servants of the people, even though Government employees.

That might sound to hon. gentlemen rather enigmatic, but what Captain Howard doubtless meant was that had proper assistance been rendered by other Government vessels there his ship would not have been lost. The steamer Acadia was provided with wireless apparatus and, Captain Howard alleges, had there been proper attention paid by those on board—

Mr. COCHRANE: Did not he have wireless?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, he had wireless, but he could not get into communication with the Acadia because, as he says, the operators on the Acadia would not respond. While I am referring to the steamer Cearense, I would like to read a written statement furnished to a Halifax newspaper by one of the officers of this ship. His name is Mr. Joseph Anderson. This statement refers to conditions generally, and I would like to give it to the House. It is as follows:

In writing this article the facts and statements are taken while the steamer Beothic is lying at Port Nelson to be unloaded. The conditions as follows, are not the least bit exaggerated: Whilst aboard the steamer Beothic one could cast his eye across the Nelson river and meet with a sight of great distress, as some of the near-lying vessels which had been anchored from two to three months, were compelled to leave with the best part of their cargo on board, knowing that the bay, within another month, would freeze, and thus all chances of leaving would be lost. The cargo of lumber that the steamer Alcazar and the steamer Alette carried upon their forward and after decks, was thrown overboard, as this was their only salvation.

One could see 12 by 12 lumber, and all kinds of spars and logs floating down the bay. The whole cause of this situation is the inadequate system of handling freight.

Further, he says:

If ever conditions were in a state of remorse, things are certainly at their worst in the handling of provisions and the housing of the workmen at Port Nelson. On arriving on shore, the eye meets with such a spectacle that one can hardly believe that such a condition really exists. Food and provisions in every shape and form can be found lying in heaps, at the mercy of all weathers,—like coal, heaped upon an open field,—only the more perishable goods, such as flour, &c., being protected by heavy canvas. This means that there are thousands of dollars worth of provisions that are found utterly useless within the period of a week or two, and condemned to the scrap pile.

He proceeds further, but I shall not give to the House the concluding part of his statement. However, such is the opinion expressed by one who was there and who personally observed the conditions. I wish also at this moment to read a portion of a statement made to the Halifax Chronicle by Mr. Page who, I think, was employed upon another steamer but who, of course, had knowledge of actual conditions. I do not propose reading it all, but a portion only, and which is as follows:—

If they ever make a port of Port Nelson, they want a different class of men up there than they have today. They want a master mind who will be able to direct affairs, who will have the knowledge of what is required, and who has had experience in building decks and marine equipment under the most trying conditions, for those at Port Nelson are sufficient to tax the power of any man. As it is now, the work is handled by men not much more than students. . . . One of the most striking evidences of the incompetency and 'don't care' attitude of the authorities is connected with the wrecked steamer Cearense. She struck in shoal water and almost every bit of her cargo could have been saved had there been any one present with enough interest to make the least effort to recover any portion of the valuable material she had aboard. As it is she lies there, every day meaning further damage, the waves and ice breaking asunder her hull and scattering her cargo. As proof that much of this machinery and provisions stored in her could have been salved, is the fact that sufficient of the wireless equipment was procured to enable the port to have communication with the Pas during the winter if they get it erected.

I believe the wireless equipment was saved by a representative of Lloyds, who went from New York to Hudson bay specially in connection with the wreck of the Cearense.

It was of course necessary to have a towboat to convey laden vessels and materials eight or nine miles up the Nelson river to the location of the proposed terminals. The Department of Railways purchased the tug Kathleen, at Halifax, and for which there was paid the sum of ten thousand dollars. This is the information contained in the answer to a question asked by me.

Mr. COCHRANE: The answer given to the question distinctly says that the Kathleen was bought after public advertisement calling for tenders. We certainly could not be in collusion with any one as to her purchase.

Mr. MACLEAN: I have no recollection of that being a portion of the answer.

Mr. COCHRANE: I have a copy of the answer right here.

Mr. MACLEAN: I have no doubt that the minister is correct. A powerful tugboat was needed, and the businesslike method to pursue in such a case would be to secure a tug sufficiently powerful and efficient for the purpose. I assert that the steamer Kathleen was totally unfit for the service, and nobody in connection with the Department of Railways should have shown such utter lack of judgment as to have purchased her for that work. I trust the minister was not personally responsible for it. A word or two further about the steamer Kathleen. There is a current of

about eight or nine knots an hour in the Nelson river.

Mr. COCHRANE: That is exaggerated.

Mr. MACLEAN: I doubt if it is exaggerated. That statement is made by persons who have personal knowledge of the conditions there. The steamer Kathleen was capable of making about nine knots, and when in use in Nova Scotia carrying lobster boats, it is said she could make about two miles an hour with a very light tow. It is quite obvious, therefore, that the steamer Kathleen in attempting to tow a heavily laden scow up this current to the port terminals could not possibly make any headway whatever. In fact she would make progress backwards. If given sufficient time she might find herself going through Hudson straits and out into the Atlantic, rather than up the Nelson river.

Mr. COCHRANE: That is exaggerated too.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is, perhaps, a little exaggerated, because the captain in charge of the Kathleen would take means to prevent that. It is quite clear, however, that very weak judgment was exercised in purchasing this steamer. It is the opinion of every person capable of expressing an opinion on the matter, that the Kathleen was unsuitable for the purpose for which she was bought.

The information which reached the public concerning the conduct of affairs at Hudson bay during the past season came from those who were there, and who submitted themselves to newspaper interviews. A very full and comprehensive statement was given to a Halifax newspaper by Captain Robertson, of the steamer Alette, with reference to the conditions as he found them, and concerning the project generally. Captain Robertson is a very competent and intelligent man, and was, I think, personally interested in a favourable outcome of the undertaking. I crave the indulgence of hon. gentlemen if I read rather copiously from his statement. I desire to put it on record, and if Captain Robertson is a reputable and trustworthy man, the facts should be before the House and the public. In his statement, which appears in the Halifax Chronicle of Tuesday, November 5, Captain Robertson, in discussing the whole matter, gives his experience in the Hudson bay:

> Our great difficulty was that the aids to navigation did not agree with the charts furnished us at Halifax before proceeding north. The channel is very adequately and accurately charted, but the Marine Department have failed to place buoys where the charts signify. The only buoys placed there are small iron barrels that I believe have been placed there by the Acadia. The channel is marked to be buoyed and certain buoys said to exist that are not there and never were there to my knowledge. This is openly the fault of the Marine Department, showing evident carelessness on their part. The big buoys were suggested and recommended by Captain Anderson and the Government charts show them, but they have never been placed in position, neither are they up there.

I have heard words of commendation expressed by persons who were at Hudson bay last season concerning the hydrographic work performed by the steamer Acadia, and I think it is only fair that I should make this statement. But I have heard very serious criticism of the Marine and Fisheries Department for their failure to carry out the recommendations of the Hydrographic Board. Proceeding, he said:

> These small barrel buoys have a flagstaff with a piece of rag tied to the top of them. With regard to that leading buoy it is marked on the chart, but it is not in the position indicated. In fact was not in existence, which again is the fault of the Marine Department or whoever your Government has to look after such matters, for I understand that the Acadia's duty was not to place these buoys, but only to chart them, and it was up to the Marine Department to see that they were properly placed. As I was trying to find the channel, the steamer Cearense lying to the port of us nearly piled us up on the ledge where she was stranded. Not knowing that she was aground I attempted to come around near her, but hit the bank. We were fortunately not going with much speed, so I forced down the helm and steered off to the starboard. There is no doubt to my mind that the leading buoy not being in position was the cause of the Cearense being wrecked. Had there been a conspicuous buoy marking the outer end of the channel, or what is generally termed the fairway, the accident would very likely not have occurred. Had the buoy been there a valuable ship and a valuable cargo would have been saved.

I suppose it is only fair that I should say that any criticism which is made by Captain Robertson in regard to the placing of the buoys is not properly directed against the Minister of Railways, whose department is blameless, but against the Marine and Fisheries Department, which neglected to place buoys recommended by the officers on the steamer Acadia, and which should have been placed before the Government undertook the responsibility of sending valuable ships and cargoes to traverse the waters of Hudson bay. Captain Robertson proceeds to discuss his own experience in navigating Hudson bay. It

will be remembered that he was the captain of the steamer Alette which went there, timber laden, and was obliged to return to Sydney with its cargo undischarged, except a small portion which he threw overboard.

Mr. COCHRANE: He did not return.

Mr. MACLEAN: The minister is right and I am wrong. There were so many ships in the Hudson bay fleet that it is hard to keep in mind the names. Captain Robertson says:

About a couple of hours after we arrived that beautiful tug Kathleen came down with Mr. McLaughlin, the engineer of the construction work, accompanied by Captain Fleetly, marine superintendent, on board. I served notice on them of being ready to discharge the cargo at 9 a.m. the next day and that I would count lay days from that date. We were then anchored eight miles from the site of the town which was as close as advisable for a steamer of the Alette's draft to get and where vessels of her size could lay. The Alcazar and Beothic were both lying near, one above us and the other below, Mr. McLaughlin looked over the scows and wanted to know how long before I would be ready to discharge them. I informed him as soon as the deck cargo was off the ship. The engineer then left, but came next day, again looking over the ship, went back to the camp, and returned that evening giving instructions to throw the deck load overboard so that he could see the scows. When he saw the scows after the deck load had been thrown overboard and partially lost and destroyed in the currents and tides, he came to the conclusion that the scows would be of no use to him in Port Nelson that year. After that he simply ignored us, never coming to the ship unless we sent for him. I urged him to allow us to discharge the cargo so we could get out before the ice blocked the passage. He was always making promises. He had not the means with which to perform them. He was continually promising to send men and lighters when he had only one lighter, the Neophyte. This lighter is an old motor schooner. She has a capacity of 200 tons.

I pointed out to Mr. McLaughlin as soon as I learned the true state of affairs that it was dangerous for the Alette to remain, that it endangered not only the ship, but the lives of the men as well, and I asked him to let me sail. As far as the cargo was concerned they wanted provisions and stores more than they needed the lumber and piling with which the Alette was filled, for her cargo was not required there for a long time. I urged that, as long as we lay there, but was as persistently refused. Had it not been for Captain Saunders, Lloyds surveyor, who had come up on the Bellaventure, approaching him—

That is, Mr. McLaughlin—

—on the subject, he would have kept us there until I would have been compelled to have taken the matter into my own hands and sailed to save the lives of my men and myself. By this time the ship was not in any too good condition owing to the damage done to the bottom of the ship by striking against the boulders which cover the bed of the Nelson river. These boulders are the greatest danger to anything with a draught of over eighteen feet. On the evening of October 4 I received instructions from Mr. McLaughlin to sail. It took me until the 7th to secure that portion of the deck load which still remained on the ship.

Now, I wish to refer to his criticism of the scow, sent for lightering purposes to Hudson bay:

Here I want to refer to the scows and the absolutely inadequate design of them for the work they were supposed to perform. It was nothing more than the idea of a jackass that would have provided such a thing for service in Port Nelson. They were great, huge, massive affairs, perfectly square, whereas the only thing that could ever navigate that river against those tides and currents should be built pointed with a bow and a helm that would answer readily. These were sent up with us in sections and were to be put together for the Kathleen, that beautiful little tug, that was built for pulling lobster pots around to tow up and down the river. We did get one of the sections overboard, but it sunk soon after we launched it. We then discovered that the scows could never have been properly put together at Port Nelson, for the only facilities for clinching a rivet is one old blacksmith, his son and a portable anvil.

This, if Captain Robertson is correct, is but additional evidence of the general lack of preparation on the part of Department of Railways. He proceeds to discuss conditions as he found them on shore. He says:

Piled high on shore you would find mixed in heaps, ropes, chains, boxes of provisions, Big Ben clocks, boxes of cigarettes and cigarette papers, and tins of milk. I cannot remember the stuff, but there were piles of it of all descriptions, some covered by tarpaulins, some had become uncovered by the wind, and there were piles of provisions over which nothing had been put.

He then refers to the provision made for housing the men and which he criticises rather severely. I wish to read further his remarks as to the provision made for landing facilities:

The facilities at Port Nelson consist of a small wharf like a fisherman's landing, not anything more. On this staging there is erected a small derrick capable of handling not more than five tons. The Neophyte ties up alongside of it with her load and as the tide goes down, sinks with it until left on the bottom. She then has to wait until the tide returns before she can leave the wharf to go back to the ship for another load.

Discussing the propriety of the project in a general way, he says:

The proposal to navigate Hudson bay may be a very good one, but at Port Nelson there is no possibility of ever making a port of shelter for ships, if finding too much ice in the straits, they return to port for the winter. From what I know of Fort Churchill it seems much more likely a place. Then, again, in the construc-

tion of any port at Hudson bay, there is need of engineers who have had practical experience in building ports in the most difficult places. Gold medallists may know how to mix concrete, but there is something more than that needed at Port Nelson to-day if there is ever to be anything done.

I am sorry to have occupied so much of the time of the House in reading the statement made by Captain Robertson, but inasmuch as he appears to discuss the question in a very comprehensive way, and in the light of his personal experience, I thought it desirable to give his views to the House, and have them placed on 'Hansard.' The assertions of Captain Robertson, which agree thoroughly with those made by others who were at Hudson bay during the summer, indicate, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, an utter lack of business methods in connection with the work carried on at Hudson bay last summer by the Department of Railways. Suitable or ample provisions clearly were not made by the Government for receiving the numerous valuable cargoes sent there for the purpose of the construction of the port terminals. It is difficult indeed to understand how any department of the Government, particularly the one presided over by the Minister of Railways, could have overlooked the provision of adequate facilities for lightering the cargoes from ships. I think the fact that the steamer Kathleen was the only steamer purchased and sent to the Hudson bay as a tow-boat is open to very grave censure indeed. On the whole, I submit that I have given the House sufficient evidence to indicate that the operations carried on last season in Hudson bay are scarcely creditable to the country or to the Government. I think the result has been, and will so prove in the future, to be quite damaging to the Hudson Bay railway project in the eyes of Canadians generally. If the establishment of a terminal port in the Hudson bay is possible, and is eventually selected, it will for quite a time be prejudiced by reason of the conditions prevailing at Port Nelson last season.

I do not propose to refer further to these matters at any great length, but, as I said in the beginning of my remarks, the question naturally arises whether a proper selection was made when Port Nelson was designated as the port terminal for the projected Hudson Bay railway. I do not propose discussing the advisability of the construction of the railway itself; that is a matter of public policy to which Parliament has long been committed. It is, however, very important that the best available port be selected as the terminal of the railway. I will not attempt to urge upon the Government that in selecting Port Nelson a mistake was made. I would not present myself as a competent judge of such a matter. I do say, however, that the selection of a terminal port is a matter of extreme importance, and because of the experience of last season the selection of Port Nelson for the railway terminal is at least open to some question. I do trust that we shall have from the minister some statement indicating the reasons which led him to recommend to the Government the selection of Port Nelson. We should, I am sure, be very glad to hear from him particularly by reason of the fact that he has made a personal investigation. There is a great deal of evidence to the effect that Fort Churchill is the more desirable port. I have in my hand a published statement of one William Beech, of Winnipeg, who is reputed to have spent a great part of his life in the Hudson bay country. I have no personal knowledge as to his competency to give an opinion as to the desirability of selecting either port, but—

Mr. COCHRANE: I think he would be more capable of giving an opinion as to the townsite which he owns at Fort Churchill.

Mr. MACLEAN: At any rate, there is a portion of his statement which I desire to read, because it agrees very thoroughly with the assertions made by some of the captains of steamers who were in the Hudson bay during the past season.

Mr. COCHRANE: By that I mean that he is a prejudiced witness.

Mr. MACLEAN: Prejudiced witnesses may sometimes tell the truth. Referring to Port Nelson, he says:

> When the tide is out the greater part of the space between the banks in the estuary of the river is dry, and consists of a dreary stretch of mud floats dotted with boulders constituting a continuation of shoals farther out. There is a channel from the Nelson river into the bay, but it is narrow and tortuous. The most direct line of soundings give the depth from six feet near the shore to thirty-three feet deep at the ship thirteen miles away. The sediment brought down by the rivers, particularly by the Nelson, has silted up the mouths of the rivers and formed a huge bar that extends for many miles out to sea. With these conditions can the Government make an artificial harbour with a sea breaking in for 500 miles without a break of any description?

It is quite clear, from the experience of some of the captains of the steamers which were at Hudson bay during the past season, that the opinion of this writer has some foundation. The printed paper which I have

in my hand contains also some evidence given before a committee of the Senate two or three years ago respecting the relative merits of Port Nelson and Fort Churchill as railway terminal ports. Before that Senate committee Dr. A. P. Low, who was once in the Government service, said:

> Churchill is the only present natural harbour on the south side of the bay. That is the first harbour going north.

I do not know whether or not the minister will report that Dr. Low's testimony is weakened by this or that circumstance, but I wish to say that when in the public service of this country he enjoyed an exceedingly high reputation, and I think that his opinion is worthy of some consideration. Before the same committee, Mr. J. B. Tyrrell gave evidence as follows:

> The mouth of the Churchill river is an exception to the general character of the Hudson bay shore. There is at the mouth of the Churchill river a rocky hill rising, or at least a mass of rock. The remarks about the shore descending to the bay do not apply exactly to the mouth of the Churchill river. That is the reason Churchill is a harbour. Churchill would be a harbour in low water; it is one of the most magnificent harbours in the world, probably the finest harbour. It is a rocky hill rising about 100 feet high and bow-shaped. Projecting out into the bay is a rocky knuckle on one side, so that in entering the harbour ships have to take a slight curve, but they very, very quickly get away from the influence of ocean waves. At the present time the harbour is about 30 to 40 feet deep.

This document also professes to give the opinions of other persons as to the superiority of Churchill over Nelson as a Hudson bay port, but I shall not weary the House by reading it. As I said a moment ago, I am presenting this to the House and the Government largely because the experience of a number of captains who pursued the Hudson bay during the last season is that it would appear that the practicability and availability of Port Nelson as a harbour is extremely doubtful indeed and I think is a subject well worthy of further investigation. If Fort Churchill is a more suitable terminal than Port Nelson, it is perhaps not yet too late to make the change. The experience of the Government last season in connection with their efforts to establish terminal facilities at Port Nelson was extremely unfavourable, besides being very expensive; and should we have a recurrence of this during the coming season and the following season it would be a very regrettable matter indeed. I fear the result would be that in the end, if terminals are constructed at Port Nelson, they will be found unsuitable for the purposes for which they are intended. In respect to the conduct of the work carried on during the last season at Hudson bay there is evidence of incompetence and unbusinesslike methods and I think that the department is open to censure. Some defence should be forthcoming from the Government. I undertake to say, subject to correction of course and to a change of opinion if evidence is forthcoming to justify a change, that further investigation should be made concerning the relative merits of Churchill and Nelson before Port Nelson is definitely selected as the port terminal for the projected Hudson Bay railway.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals): The hon. gentleman led off by saying that the House had never been favoured with an expression of opinion or an explanation why Nelson was selected. If I remember correctly, and I have not looked up 'Hansard,' I gave the reasons last session. The hon. member has truly said that I went up there in 1912. I looked at both harbours, not for one moment thinking that I am a harbour engineer or an expert in navigation. When we arrived at Nelson first we looked over the situation, and I must say, frankly and freely, as I did then, that it is not an ideal harbour. On going up to Churchill and looking at it we found that it was not ideal either, although in regard to expense it could be created a harbour a good deal cheaper than Port Nelson. One strong reason influencing us is that there is 70 miles of barren lands which we would have to cross to go to Churchill. This tract has been frozen since Adam was a kid and I have yet to meet an engineer who will vouch for the building of a road across that 70 miles. As all people know, railroads when built should be ditched in order to carry off the surface water and it can be imagined what the result of building a road through such land would be. Taking that into consideration, no engineer would advise building across that country. There was no other place for us to develop but Nelson. Another great reason for that is that this will be a grain road to a great extent; it is 85 miles shorter to Nelson than to Churchill. It will cost more to develop Nelson.

One objection I have to the criticism of the hon. gentleman is that he has collected the opinions of men who were either interested or who had had mishaps, either through their own neglect or negligence or

accidents that could not be helped. I may say that the steamer Cearense is a total loss owing to its own captain. They arrived there some time in the evening. They anchored out quite a distance and alongside of the Marine and Fisheries boat Acadia. They communicated with the boat that night. The captain started off in the morning without asking the captain of the Acadia to give him any information about going in. I understand further from our own people that the Cearenses' wireless was out of commission and to prove that two of the captains of the ships that were in Nelson harbour have told me that they tried to communicate with him in order to inform him that he was taking the wrong direction. He went on without taking any soundings at all, because had he done so he would have found that he was in very shallow water. He did not go where the buoys were and I am absolutely without fear of contradiction in the statement that this man was altogether at fault for the losing of the ship.

In 1912 we sent an engineer and party up to look over the situation, and bring down plans to show us what was needed. We employed Mr. Hazen for the purpose. He went up by the Beothic, landing there in August and he came down in the winter, I think in February. He brought his plans down. The chief engineer of the department, who has been there a long time and in whom I have absolute confidence, did not agree with the layout proposed by Mr. Hazen and after a long distance discussion Mr. Hazen said that if he could not have his way in reference to the laying out of the scheme he would not go back. But he said he would stay and see to it that the things they needed, both in the way of lighters, supplies and materials would be shipped up. He did stay, he was in charge of the loading of all of these things and of the engaging of the boats, and he went up with them. I may say that the scows, to which reference has been made, were to have been delivered at Halifax by the first of July. The makers, unfortunately, like a lot of other manufacturers, were away behind in filling the order, but we sent them up as soon as possible. We loaded the greater portion of the merchandise on the steamer Beothic which was going up for the Marine Department, and just to show the luck we had, I might say that she struck on a rock off the coast of Newfoundland and had to be put in dry dock at Halifax. We have not been able to communicate with him, as we expected to, by wireless this winter. We hope, however, in a few days to receive the first message. The Cearense took up what apparatus was not carried by the Beothic, and the installation of the wireless was completed about the first of December. In reference to the harbour, we purchased a dredge which we proposed to use in the spring. We employed the best men we could get in order to get the dredge up there safely. The best man recommended was Captain Saunders, who was Lloyd's inspector in New York. He went up there personally, and in a report which he sent me, he says in reference to the Nelson river:

> The condition of Nelson river as compared with other swift rivers, such as the Mississippi, Delaware, Mersey, Thames, Hoogly, Moulmain, etc., from my own personal experience, I am satisfied that the navigation and anchorages in the above-mentioned rivers are far more dangerous and difficult to navigate than the Nelson river.

With regard to the timber, I may say that we never intended to lighter it in. Mr. Hazen recommended that it could be rafted in. He tried that and failed, although he took boom chains up for the purpose of making a boom out of the long pieces of timber by means of which the timber was to be taken in, but he never attempted it. I do not know why, he has never made a report. It was never, however, our intention to lighter in this timber.

In reference to the Alette, I may say that Captain Freakley, who has had
4 p.m. 15 years experience in those waters, tells me that if Captain Robertson's boat was hurt in the Nelson river, it was through his own fault. His explanation is that Robertson gave his boat too much chain—something over 90 fathoms —while swinging to the tide at slack water. The other captains used two chains. He tells me that Robertson was advised to do this, but did not take the advice and met with an accident. Later, when re-entering Nelson river with the Acadia following her into port as a convoy, Captain Robertson, for reasons not yet explained, turned his vessel about and ran her aground. There was about 20 feet depth of water at low tide in the river channel opposite the dock site. I may say the steamer Minto has been up, opposite to where the terminals are being built, without any accident. But these big boats absolutely refused to go up that far and I do not blame them very much. They

could have gone with perfect safety, however, but the captains were afraid. In reference to not having facilities at Port Nelson for handling this freight, my hon. friend should think for a moment. We only had a survey party there. We cannot get timber to build a dock by the river, unless we go about 100 miles, and then it is very scarce. We had no horses to haul timber. We had either to do one thing or the other, and we thought it best to get this timber in so as to have a long season next year. The season this year was very short. The first steamer did not arrive there until August, as it was hindered by ice. We expected it to get there by the middle of July, as the boat got off in good time. All the ships were unloaded with the exception of the Alette and the Alcazar. As my hon. friend has stated, the Alcazar was chartered to go to Hudson bay, and it is a question whether we could not even now insist on their going back with the timber. As to that, I will not express any opinion.

Mr. McLaughlin, who succeeded Mr. Hazen, is a man who has been in the department for a long time. I think he is a live young man. He may have had more than he could possibly handle, but I have not lost any faith in him or in the port. They got off a good deal of the timber, enough to build a dock for the lighters. They also landed their engines and the track and were able to handle the stuff. We hope to send a large number of men overland this winter, in order to get a full summer's work done next season. If we took them up by steamer we could not expect to land there until the end of July at the earliest. I may say that we were very unfortunate in not getting those scows. They would have furnished ample lightering, according to the engineers. We have had considerable difficulty this year, but we must expect that in connection with the ports in that northern country. Everything has to be taken in, before we can construct anything. The big dredge that was sent in was not wrecked. Captain Saunders was good enough to take some photographs, and I have one here showing the dredge high and dry. I am quite sure we have made no mistake in the selection of men, and we feel we will get a good year's work done in the coming summer, and that we shall have sufficient dockage and the dredging well advanced when the road reaches Port Nelson. It will not be finished by any means, because if the strait is a success, we shall have to spend an enormous amount of money in carrying out the scheme. I still have great hopes that the changes which have taken place in the St. Lawrence will also take place in the Hudson strait. I do not feel that we are entitled to any censure. We may have made some mistakes; we only had a short time to get in these things, and we got in as much as ever we could. We have got enough provisions in there to carry on the men till next summer, and I am quite satisfied that the results of another year will be pleasing not only to myself but to the House and the country as well.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): I am sure the statement that has been made by the minister is full justification for the motion and criticism of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). This is a matter of very great importance upon which the public should be informed, and in regard to which there should be no delay in giving the fullest information. I am very pleased with the attitude of the minister towards the question in hand. I accept his position as being entirely friendly to the project and I accept unreservedly the statement of his intentions to push it to completion as rapidly as possible. But, at the same time, where an enterprise is of such far reaching importance as this Hudson Bay railway, where it affects such a large number of the people of Canada and affects so directly what I claim is the most important interest of the people of Canada, anything that does, or seems to, throw discredit upon that project must necessarily be the subject of criticism and possibly of adverse criticism.

I need not say to the House—it has been said before and it will be echoed by all the representatives from the prairie west—that in the opinion of the people of that country, the future progress and welfare of the West is in large measure dependent upon the successful development of a transportation route by way of Hudson's bay and that any delay in the accomplishment of that object is a serious detriment to the welfare of that country, and, therefore, to the whole country. It must, therefore, be accepted that they look with hostility upon any action, or any failure to act, that may delay the completion of the enterprise or may discredit it to any serious extent.

In regard to the choice of the port of Nelson, as against that of Churchill, we have this situation, that there is beyond question a port at Churchill which answers every requirement resulting from the con-

struction of a railway to that port at a minimum cost for port development. The objections stated by the minister, are, first, that the road to Churchill would be increased in length some 85 miles, and would traverse for a considerable distance barren or frozen ground not suitable for railway construction, that there would be the extra cost for that additional 85 miles, and of course, the additional cost of the operation of that 85 miles. These are matters that are fair to be taken into consideration. As far as my hon. friend's objection, or the objection of his engineers, to the possibility of building to Churchill over that frozen ground is concerned, I do not think that the contention—

Mr. COCHRANE: Probably I forgot to mention that there are about nine feet of moss and muck and stuff of that kind, deeper at some points than at others. By ditching the right of way at each side and carrying off the water and letting the wind and air into it, it might be possible to make a change in the condition of that material.

Mr. OLIVER: The experience in the Yukon is that, when the first wagon roads were being built, the builders were careful to avoid the low ground; they carried the roads over the tops of hills in order to keep to the dry ground, but since that time they have built wherever the levels were most favourable and roads have been carried through muskegs. The ground, being permanently frozen, provides an absolutely solid foundation which is as secure as if it were solid rock, and roads built in that way have proved most satisfactory.

Mr. COCHRANE: You are referring to traffic roads?

Mr. OLIVER: I believe that the conditions which apply to the one would hold good in regard to the other. I am putting that forward as the experience in the Yukon and therefore I maintain that the contention of my hon. friend does not hold. As to the length of the road, as to the capital expenditure that will be involved in the construction of that road and as to the cost of operation, if Port Nelson can be constructed and equipped for less money, or for an amount of money equal to that which it would cost to build the additional mileage to Churchill, I say, certainly, Nelson is the proper choice.

But it is just possible that the cost of establishing a satisfactory port at Nelson will really be greater than the cost of the construction of the 85 miles of extra railway line and it is possible that the maintenace of that port when constructed will cost more than the construction and operation of these 85 miles. That may seem to be an extreme statement about conditions at the mouth of Nelson river. My hon. friend speaks of an engineer who has had experience in regard to ports at the mouths of many rivers of the world. I will venture to say that in not a single one of these cases is the condition approximately similar to that at the mouth of the Nelson river.

Mr. COCHRANE: This man spoke from his own experience. He was not an engineer, he was a navigator and his experience was applicable to this case.

Mr. OLIVER: I think that what he spoke of was the port after it was created, not the condition as it exists at the present time. There is no similarity between the conditions at the mouth of the Nelson river and those at the mouths of any of the rivers that he has mentioned. I do not condemn the selection of Port Nelson on that account—not at all, but I think the Government has scarcely appreciated the serious character of the work that will be required to make Nelson a satisfactory port.

Mr. COCHRANE: We certainly have.

Mr. OLIVER: I think they scarcely appreciate the amount of work or the expenditure that will be necessary. It would appear to me that the mishaps of the present season afford evidence that the Government did not appreciate the difficulties they had to face. Beginning many years ago, examinations have been made at the mouth of the Nelson river, and they have been continued from time to time. The Government had the whole of the season of 1912 to inform itself regarding the difficulties to be encountered. Hon. gentlemen will remember a discussion in the House when the Government was criticised very severely, even by some of its own supporters, because work on the Hudson Bay railroad had been stopped for a time, and in the session of 1911-12 it was finally announced that the policy of the Government was to build the railway and to select the terminal port as soon as possible. The Minister of Railways himself visited Hudson bay in 1912, and yet in 1913 an expedition was sent up to begin the great work of establishing a port at Nelson, which expedition ended largely in disaster and disappointment.

Mr. COCHRANE: Oh, no. I must take exception to that. There were only two

ships that had any trouble, and I have shown that it was their own fault. The other ships had no trouble, and two of them made two trips each without encountering any difficulty.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: How many ships went up?

Mr. COCHRANE: Six.

Mr. OLIVER: The loss of one of the ships—

Mr. COCHRANE: The loss was completely covered by insurance.

Mr. OLIVER: Oh, yes.

Mr. COCHRANE: Then, it is not a loss.

Mr. OLIVER: It is not a financial loss, but I am speaking of the loss of the ship, and the bringing back of one of the cargoes, to say nothing of the reports that have been published as to the destruction of supplies, and the admission of the minister himself that the wireless apparatus arrived there only in part, and that for that reason he has not been able to get into communication with the port.

Mr. COCHRANE: I said we were unfortunate that the principal part of the wireless was put on the Beothic, which had an accident along the coast of Newfoundland and had to go back. Some of the apparatus went by another of the ships, and we got that landed there.

Mr. OLIVER: That part of the wireless apparatus was saved by the salvage company.

Mr. COCHRANE: No; there was no salvage company up there at all.

Mr. OLIVER: That was the statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean).

Mr. COCHRANE: I know, but he made a lot of statements that were not right.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The statement I made was that part of the wireless equipment had been saved by the representative of Lloyds who was up there, and that it might have been saved by some of the employees of the steamer Acadia, if they had just made a little effort.

Mr. COCHRANE: It was saved by people employed by the Government up there, who took it off the steamer, and not by any one sent up there for that purpose.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I take my information from the statements made by captains who were there.

[Mr. Cochrane.]

Mr. COCHRANE: By captains who were in trouble and had to give some reason for getting into trouble.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Perhaps the officials of the Department of Railways are in trouble and are trying to get out of trouble.

Mr. COCHRANE: Oh, no.

Mr. OLIVER: I am glad to know that the conditions are better than they have been reported.

Mr. COCHRANE: They certainly are.

Mr. OLIVER: But giving the minister credit for the very best, from his own statement to-day, it cannot be said that the work at Hudson bay last summer was a startling success.

Mr. COCHRANE: If you take the conditions into consideration I think the operations were successful.

Mr. OLIVER: Much as I do not wish to disagree with the minister, I am sorry to hear him say that, because it indicates that he and the Government do not appreciate the magnitude of the task they have undertaken. They do not seem to be fully alive to the adoption of the best means for carrying out that task with the rapidity and perfection which the enterprise requires. The tendency on the part of the Government and its engineers, has been to minimize the importance of this work. Because of a choice having to be made between Churchill and Nelson, it has been sought evidently to minimize the cost and difficulty of making the harbour at Nelson. If it is to be at Nelson, let it be at Nelson, but let it be understood that it is no boy's job to make a port at Nelson.

Mr. COCHRANE: That is true.

Mr. OLIVER: The Government must take hold of the work as a great enterprise. The country cannot afford that the Government should tinker with it and bring to bear upon it means and expenditures that are not adequate, and which not being taken with due foresight, result in loss, and damage, and delay, and discredit to the enterprise. There is no doubt that the reports which have been circulated in regard to the lack of success of the expedition of last summer have had the effect of creating a very bad impression in the public mind with regard to the practicability of the route. That is felt by every man in the prairie west as something that affects his personal interest, and it is for that reason that I dwell very strongly upon the matter. I maintain that the Government

had ample time to take due precautions with regard to the buoying of the channel, and with regard to arriving at a conclusion as to exactly what kind of vessels would be required, and what kind of material was necessary. That the Government failed to arrive at sound conclusions is demonstrated by the result. I am not suggesting that it is because of any lack of good will on the part of the minister; I am suggesting that it is because of a desire to minimize the difficulty and expense. This is an enterprise with which the future welfare of the prairie West is absolutely bound up. The completion of the Hudson Bay railway and the inauguration of the Hudson bay route cuts practically 1,000 miles of interior transportation out of the cost of delivery of grain by that route, between the West and Liverpool. Such a cut in the cost of transportation is worth an incalculable amount. It might mean the difference between success and failure, in a given state of the wheat market, for the men who are producing in the Prairie West. So that it is of the utmost importance that every step taken towards the accomplishment of this enterprise shall be taken with due forethought, with due judgment and with a due appreciation of the necessity that the route shall not be a failure and shall not create the impression that it is a failure. It is not that I am urging undue haste; I am not urging that the road should be completed this year, or next year or the year after. What I am urging is that the Government shall take due time, shall use due forethought, shall use sound judgment, and shall be prepared to make the necessary expenditures—not slackening the work, but so proceeding that when the road is completed there shall be a satisfactory port established and equipped to transact the business of the road, and so that the route may be a success once it is opened and the expenditure upon it thereby made profitable. There are many interests and many prejudices against this route, and I need not say that when the road is completed to the bay, if the port facilities are not as they ought to be it will take very little to establish in the minds of the public at large a prejudice against that route that will take years to overcome. It is absolutely necessary that nothing should be done, that no chances should be taken, to allow such a prejudice to be formed. It is because of this that I speak of it and criticise the minister for the condition of the enterprise of last summer and the results that have been achieved. The road is under construction. It is not being pushed with great rapidity, but we are told that about one-third of the total length is now graded, and some 80 miles actually under steel. At that rate of progress, and certainly it is not a rapid rate, the road will reach Port Nelson before that port is fit to handle the business, judged by the progress of last summer. I would be glad to see the work on the road proceeding more rapidly than it is now, but I urge still more strongly that the port facilities shall be completed by the time the road reaches Port Nelson. Otherwise, the route and the enterprise will receive injury from which it will take it years to recover.

Mr. J. A. M. AIKINS (Brandon): I should consider myself remiss in my duty to Western Canadians if I did not express on this occasion our gratitude to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) for his prompt and energetic action in respect of the Hudson Bay railway and the Hudson bay route. Something is being done. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has made the statement that he would not like to urge on the Minister of Railways undue haste in the construction of this harbour. I imagine that when he was sitting on this side of the House as Minister of the Interior he was perhaps saying to the then Minister of Railways the same thing—that he did not wish to urge undue haste; and certainly they did not make it. If the advice of the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) were taken, that we should take very cautious steps one after another, year after year, then the Hudson bay harbour might be built, perhaps, when the millennium arrives. Any misadventures that have arisen during the year have arisen out of the prompt and energetic action of the minister, who did not wish delay. But

> The best-laid schemes of mice an' men
> Gang aft agley,

it has been said. The statement of the minister has shown that he took every possible precaution to have the expeditions that went out last year to Hudson bay a success. It was not because the arrangements were not properly made, but because the human equations did not work out right. For instance, the scows did not arrive in time, and other plant was not constructed in time, and so when these vessels came up to Nelson there had

not been carried out by some persons the arrangements which the minister had very wisely made. Had they been carried out, there would have been no such accidents or misadventures. I do not intend to dwell further on this point, but I will say that I do not think the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) made out even a prima facie case against the minister. He read to us statements made by Mr. Beach, who, it was well known, is interested as one of the townsite owners at Churchill, and who, naturally, would favour the idea of the terminus being at Churchill. Then he read statements from newspapers, not verified in any way. If we are to accept statements contained in the papers, it seems to me we shall have a very poor basis for action by this House.

In respect of the harbour itself, the late Government let a contract for the Hudson Bay railway, at least the first part of it commencing at the Pas, but they did not then know where it was to terminate. It had a loose end—which might be anywhere from Newfoundland to the North Pole.

Mr. GRAHAM: Don't be extravagant, now. Newfoundland as a terminus for a Canadian railway is stretching it, rather.

Mr. AIKINS: Over toward the bay of Fundy, then, we will say.

Mr. GRAHAM: They are not very close together.

Mr. AIKINS: These hon. gentlemen had not determined, seemingly had no idea, where the eastern end of that railway was to be, although they were sixteen years in power. They now say that surveys should have been made and preparations begun. I charge upon the late Administration that it did nothing toward the construction of any harbour on Hudson bay, wherever the terminal should be, nor in providing aids to navigation through the straits or bay. When the present Minister of Railways took his place he immediately commenced to carry out that undertaking, and it is by reason of his very despatch that some of the trouble has arisen.

We are not objecting to the despatch; we say it is a little unfortunate that there were unfortunate occurrences, but would rather have despatch and some trouble than no end of delay and no progress, such as the late Administration favoured. It is quite true that great care will have to be taken in respect of the buoying of the channel and in the signal and pilot lights, and also the wireless apparatus that should be constructed on the strait and on some of the islands in the bay.

We agree with the hon. member for Edmonton that steps should be taken immediately in that direction, so that when the railway is completed the port will be completed also, and the grain and other produce will go out from the West by that route.

In respect to the propriety of the selection of Port Nelson as the terminal, the very facts that have been stated in the House to-day have justified the action of the minister in making the selection of that port. It must not be forgotten that during the past year six or seven vessels were sent up the Nelson river. One was the Bellaventure, another the Bonaventure, together with the schooner Neophyte and the tug, which have been referred to; the Alcazar, the Sinbad, the Beothic, the Cearense and the Alette. Of all these vessels the only one that had any trouble in the channel was the Cearense, and for the reason given by the hon. minister—the fault to a large extent of those who were navigating that vessel. This shows clearly that the channel and harbour at Port Nelson are navigable, even though not perfectly buoyed. These vessels had no trouble getting up there and going away again. This shows vessels can enter that channel, even with its imperfect buoying and with practically no lights, in absolute safety and can return. A hydrographic survey was made, I understand, in 1911, and was proceeded with in 1912 and 1913, so that the conditions at the mouth of the Nelson river are well known, and satisfactorily known. As I understand it, what was stated by Mr. Saunders was that in their natural condition the rivers Mississippi, Hoogley, Mersey and Thames were, for purposes of navigation, no better than the mouth of the Nelson. If that be so, and if the artificial work done on the Thames, the Mersey and other rivers, makes them perfectly navigable, the same can be done at the mouth of the Nelson. It has been said that Churchill has a natural harbour. So it has; it cannot be said that at the mouth of the Nelson river there is a natural harbour, but the mouth of the Nelson river is a good roadstead and it can be made a good harbour.

Another thing that has developed in the discussion is this: The Bonaventure, I think, was the first vessel to go up the Hudson bay in 1913, arriving in the straits some time in July with the Bella-

venture. A little difficulty was experienced in the straits by reason of the ice, and the Neophyte, the Bellaventure, the tug, the Kathleen, were left there and the Bonaventure went on. The Bonaventure struck some ice, I understand, about the middle of the bay, but kept going through that ice for a number of days. When the boat did get through, it wired back to the Bellaventure advising her to take a more northerly and westerly course, and the boats following came in without touching ice. That shows the importance of having good wireless apparatus. With regard to the difference in the harbours let me repeat to the House what I have said before—that the Nelson river is 100 or 120 miles farther south than the Churchill, and that it is open later in the fall and earlier in the spring. Mr. Freakley says that he was there on December 5, 1913, and that the Nelson river was still open. Further, it must not be forgotten that, as the minister has said, if the railway were constructed to Churchill the railway line would be 70 or 80 miles longer than to Nelson. That does not involve merely the expense of construction; it means the continuous expense of operation every year, and the 140 miles additional rail haul back and forth means an additional expense to the farmers. The shorter the distance to get their grain to the seaboard, the better, and if they can get a lower freight rate by reason of the shorter route, it is so much more to their advantage. Fort Churchill is in the barren land, and the Nelson river is not. The latter port has been selected, and I say that the very fact that its waters have been navigated successfully in the year 1913 justifies the minister in having made that selection. We of the West agree entirely with what has been said by the hon. member for Edmonton in that we are very anxious that the terminal should be constructed at the earliest possible moment, to take out the large surplus of grain which is being grown in the West, thus relieving the conditions of the farmer in western Canada. Even if accidents have happened, we would rather that there should be some mishaps than that we should be indefinitely delayed in having that railway constructed and the harbour made ready for transportation.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): In following the remarks of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), I understood that he was speaking not of the expedition with which the railway might be constructed, per se, but rather of the question as to which should be completed first, the railway or the harbour improvements. I think the hon. member for Brandon took my hon. friend up wrong when he endeavoured to create the impression that the hon. member for Edmonton had said that he was in no hurry for the railway. What the hon. member for Edmonton did say was, that in any event, even if only very moderate progress were made, the railway should be completed at least as soon as the harbour improvements. I think it goes without saying that the railway in itself is of no use until the harbour improvements are effected.

The hon. member for Brandon, as he usually does when he has a very weak case, endeavours to make some disparaging remarks with regard to the Government that went out of office in September, 1911. My hon. friend is an old and eminent practitioner at the Bar, and it is probably not the first time that, finding his own case weak, he has endeavoured to lend it a spurious strength by abusing the other side and introducing into the discussion matters entirely irrelevant. That is exactly what he is endeavouring to do in this case. I may tell the hon. member that the late Government is not guilty of the irrelevant charge that he brings in against it—because, I say, it is irrelevant; it has nothing to do with the responsibility of the present Government or the gentleman who holds the portfolio of Railways and Canals. However, even if it were not irrelevant, the Government is not guilty of the accusation brought against it by the hon. member for Brandon. It is true that during all the years the late Government was in office, requests were made of them from time to time that the Hudson Bay railway should be undertaken as a matter of government policy. Some years after I became a member of this House the matter was still a moot point, although neither party in this House was committed to it. Resolutions were moved by private members; the matter was spoken to by the leaders on both sides of the House, and in the course of time—I think it was in the year 1908—the late Government for the first time declared itself as being committed to the policy of the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. After that year the Government remained in power a little less than three years, and, in view of the number of preliminary steps that were necessary, I submit that there was no great

delay in entering upon the carrying out of this project. Within three years the project was well under way, and a substantial part of the construction of the railway had been let to the J. D. McArthur Company. The hon. member for Brandon, referring to the attitude of the Liberals and my hon. friend the member for Edmonton with regard to the matter, spoke sarcastically of what he termed their undue haste. Since he has taken upon himself to say that there was no undue haste in this matter, I wonder why the Government does not employ a little more haste in connection with the Hudson Bay railway? They have been in office quite a while now, and are practically no further ahead—that is the unfortunate part of it. The grain growers on the prairies are not looking at this question to-day as the hon. member for Brandon does; they are not comparing the attitude of the late Government with that of the present Administration—about that they do not care a rap. They look at it not from a partisan standpoint, but from the viewpoint of men who want the railway built and the harbour improvements effected as soon as possible so that they can get their grain out. They are not concerned with the rhetoric of the hon. member for Brandon, nor with his scoffing at the late Administration.

These men in the constituency of Brandon wish that their representative would do what he could to urge the Government to really get down to work and get this railway built and in operation to carry out their wheat, 60 pounds to the bushel. The grain growers are in a bigger hurry for this than they are for any great sum to be spent or squandered on navies; they are in a bigger hurry for this even than they are for free wheat, although the hon. member for Brandon, I think, will walk arm and arm with me on the wheat question before the session is much older. We will see whether he will come along with us. If he has the interests of his constituents at heart he will show some of his undue haste in the alacrity with which he will ally himself with the Liberal party on free wheat. The farmers of the West are desirous of having the railway built; but they wish this Government to first carefully consider what should be the proper policy to adopt and then get down to practical work and carry that policy to fruition. If there is anything the hon. member for Brandon can do to aid the Government, well and good; but if he cannot do that, let him at least urge the Government that they must satisfy the demand of the grain growers of the prairies and get the road built; because all the people of Canada, irrespective of politics, are committed to this as a great national enterprise, now, no matter what the differences of opinion may have been in the past.

The Government seem to be very sure that they have given us good reasons for going to Nelson instead of to Churchill. The hon. gentleman who holds the portfolio of Railways and Canals tells us that he gave us those reasons last year. I do not think he is correct in that; I think he is under a misapprehension. I have looked through 'Hansard' and after a careful search I do not see anything there in the way of reasons. The minister, as far as I am able to gather, never gave any real, public reason for deciding on Port Nelson, and I think his reasons are such that he is not telling us all of them. I think the hon. member for Brandon probably could tell us more reasons than he has told us. I think if we got next a few club friends in real estate firms in Winnipeg he might get a different opinion from that of Mr. Beach.

Mr. COCHRANE: The land is all withdrawn for one half mile on each side, so nobody can get in there; there is no real estate proposition there.

Mr. KNOWLES: I think I am correct in saying that the land around what is supposed to be the town of Port Nelson is, some of it, taken.

Mr. COCHRANE: That is withdrawn too.

Mr. ROCHE: To the extent of two miles.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Your Government sold the lots at Fort Churchill.

Mr. KNOWLES: We are not dealing with that now. There was evidently nothing wrong about it or it would have been brought up in this House long before. It was not like the Donaldson homestead, anyway.

Mr. OLIVER: I may say that there was no land sold at Fort Churchill by the late Government or while the late Government was in office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My information on the subject came from the deputy of the hon. gentleman who just rose, and who was formerly Minister of the Interior.

Mr. OLIVER: The deputy misinformed my hon. friend.

Mr. KNOWLES: The Minister of the Interior answered a question on January 16, 1912, with regard to this precious land which he has withdrawn—although I tell you we will all be surprised if there are not a few good Tories who get in on that half mile, knowing them as we know them, the Minister of the Interior to the contrary notwithstanding. I would like to get all the land the Tories will get inside that half-mile. If I had it I do not think I would have to work any more.

Mr. COCHRANE: You will find out before you get through.

Mr. KNOWLES: The question was asked:

Has a strip of public land one-half mile in width along the line of the Hudson Bay railway been closed against settlement?

And the answer was, 'yes.' That land was closed against settlement, according to the Minister of the Interior, before Port Nelson was finally decided upon as the terminal. That answer was given on the 14th of January, 1912.

Mr. COCHRANE: It was decided on then.

Mr. KNOWLES: It was decided on then, very good. The Minister of Railways says it was decided on then, on January 14. On February 26, 1913, the Minister of Railways answered this question:

Mr. Martin (Regina):

1. Has the Government as yet decided upon Churchill or Nelson as the terminus of the Hudson Bay railway? If so, which point has been settled upon?

Mr. Cochrane:

1. Nelson, unless upon completion of the surveys and inspection it might be thought advisable to decide otherwise.

I do not think any House of gentlemen, taking the minister seriously, would take that answer as a final answer. I think we would be only fair to the Minister of Railways and Canals if we said the answer given on the 26th of February meant that the matter was not decided, but that the Government were inclined to Nelson and were keeping their minds open in view of the probability of further information coming to them from their surveyors. If the answer did not mean that it did not mean anything, as from one fair-minded man to another. The Minister of Railways said on the 26th of February, 1913: Nelson will be the place, but we will keep our minds open, there may be some information, for he said:

Unless there be some information upon the completion of the surveys—

Mark, they have not been completed——

—and explorations it might be thought advisable to do otherwise.

His mind open, there was nothing decided unless his surveys teach him differently. He was going to rest his decision on what the surveys might show. The same minister, according to his own declaration, had already told everybody that it would be Nelson. I do not think the minister will deny that. He said in February: My mind is not decided yet, because I must get further information; and months before that he had told everybody it would be Nelson.

Mr. COCHRANE: When did I tell that?

Mr. KNOWLES: The following question was asked on December 4, 1912, two months before, if the minister wants to know; it will be found at page 623 of 'Hansard,' in the middle of the page:

Mr. Graham:

1. Has the Government decided on the ocean terminus of the Hudson Bay railway? If so, what is its decision?

2. How many miles of railway are under contract between Pas Mission and the Hudson bay?

3. Who were the successful tenderers in each case?

4. How many miles were graded?

5. How many miles of steel are laid?

6. How many miles of right of way are cleared?

7. How many men are now employed in actual construction work?

8. Has the Government completed any arrangements for the construction and operation of a line of ships between Hudson bay and a British port? If so, what is it?

Mr. Cochrane:

1. Yes. Port Nelson.

2. 418.5 miles.

3. John D. McArthur.

4. 50 miles were graded.

5. No steel laid.

6. Seventy miles cleared.

7. 200 men were at work on November 16, about 150 at present time.

8. No.

The people of Canada could not be told more categorically and more publicly than they were in this answer, and the minister says: When did I tell the people? On the 4th of December he told them, and his mind was not made up, but he eventually made up his mind,—not on what the surveyors told him,—his mind was made up prior to his having told us the surveyors' reports were not in. On the 26th of February, 1912, the surveyors' reports were not in, and it had slipped his memory that he had told where the terminal was to be, because he had made up his mind for other reasons. He said,

on the 26th of February, that this was not final yet because they had to get the surveyors' reports; but on the 4th of December of the previous year he had said: It is all settled, it is going to be Nelson. A decision made in that way is one that justifies the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in casting the greatest suspicion upon the whole fishy business.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE: Which report are you in favour of?

Mr. KNOWLES: I am in favour of getting good information and deciding it on the merits of the case. I am not in favour of doing anything to hurt Beach, or to help Beach. I shall tell my hon. friends, and I appeal to the hon. member for Prince Albert, if he has not heard it said many times by people who have gone into this matter, that Port Nelson was chosen for some ulterior reason not given to the public. It may be the best place, I do not know. I think my hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. McKay) will bear me out when I say that there is a belief in the minds of many people, that all this was not done above board.

Mr. McKAY: As my hon. friend has referred to me, I may say that I have heard nothing of it. So far as I know, the people are satisfied with the decision of the Minister of Railways, and are most gratified at the expedition with which he has taken hold of that matter.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE: As my hon. friend has referred to me, I may say that I have never heard this point discussed and the people of western Canada, at least so far as Manitoba is concerned, are quite satisfied with the decision of the minister.

Mr. KNOWLES: I was not asking my hon. friend from Lisgar—he interrupted me—but I accept his statement without the slightest hesitation and the statement of my hon. friend from Prince Albert also, but I can tell my hon. friend from Prince Albert that I know some very great political friends of his, big men, and some of his clients, with whom I would like him to have a talk some day, just to hear the other side of the story. I am not saying that there is necessarily anything wrong in it. I do not care to make that statement as I cannot back it up, but I do say that we should have the fullest information, such as these papers call for, and that there should be an investigation. I do not say that the minister was actuated by ulterior motives in his decision. I am not going to say that, but I do say there is enough suspicion in the minds of the people of western Canada to justify an investigation; and I think I am justified in saying that the minister decided this matter before he had full information. If he decided in December, 1912, on Port Nelson and two months later, was awaiting the report of a surveying party before making a final decision, then I say he is moving in a strange and mysterious way. If Port Nelson turns out to be the best place, it will be a lucky thing for the Government, because I believe they have gone blind into this matter. As my hon friend from Edmonton has said, it is a very expensive undertaking and of extreme importance to the people of Canada. At its commencement, it was a matter into which party politics very little entered. There was no opposition to the vote when it went through under the late Government. It seemed to be the common desire of all the people of Canada, even the people of eastern Canada, and I have never had occasion to observe any matter in this House which showed the national spirit to better advantage. All we ask is that the project be persisted in and that we may have the fullest possible light on it. The minister attributed a lot of his trouble to bad luck. Perhaps he may be lucky; and it may be that he has chosen the better place for the harbour, but if he has, it is mere luck and not after a thorough investigation of the relative merits of the two places.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE (Lisgar): My hon. friend has said that politics entered into this matter very little at the outset. It was only within the last few years that the people of this country have been committed to this proposition. I remember quite well contesting a constituency in western Canada in 1904 when I was practically defeated on this proposition because the Reform party had taken it up and promised the people of western Canada that they would put the matter through. My hon. friend has said that we are no farther ahead than we were two or three years ago. Last fall I was over a portion of this road. I went over seventy miles of it, where they had the steel laid, and I want to tell this House that in my opinion it is one of the greatest pieces of work that has ever been carried on in this country; because, so far, not a single horse has been used in the construction of the road. It has all been done by hand work and you can have some idea of the work that had to be done by these

men in order to get as much done as they have at the present time. My hon. friend from Edmonton talks of tinkering with this proposition. If any proposition was ever tinkered with by any government, I am sure it is this question that was tinkered with by the Government of which the hon. member for Edmonton was a member. As to the selection of Port Nelson, I think the Government have made a very wise choice, because as my hon. friend from Brandon has said, Port Nelson is open much longer in the fall, and open much earlier in the spring than Fort Churchill. Not only that but the railway will run pretty nearly all the way alongside the Nelson river, and in time to come there is no doubt in my mind that a very large proportion of the wheat now grown in western Canada will be milled by the power of the Nelson river. I am a great believer in the Hudson bay route. Some people tell us that it can only be navigated for two or three months out of the year. The Hudson Bay, and
5 p.m. the Hudson strait never freeze over, and the mouth of the Nelson river is open practically all the the year round; and I claim that with proper aids to navigation we shall be able to navigate the Hudson bay and Hudson strait from eight to ten months in the year. In the early days they had a great deal more trouble navigating the St. Lawrence than they have had in navigating the Hudson bay for the last 200 or 300 years. In that time only two or three vessels have been lost in the Hudson bay and it has been navigated every year. I have read almost everything I can get my hands on, in connection with this proposition, and I believe the day will come, and is not very far distant, when 70 per cent or 80 per cent of the export wheat of western Canada will be going by this route. I believe, further, that in time ocean going vessels will be brought right up to the city of Winnipeg. I think the present minister deserves a great deal of credit, rather than censure, for the way he has handled this matter since he has taken hold of it.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.): I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to another phase of this question, which is of considerable interest to the workingmen who live in the city of Halifax and who were engaged in the Government service at Port Nelson during the past summer. The return of one of these steamers brought some fifty men who had been employed in Halifax under contract with officials of the Government to work at Port Nelson. It is alleged that by their contract they were entitled to receive $3.75 a day for every day excepting Sunday after they had arrived at the scene of their employment. After being there but a short time they were made to understand that for every day, owing to unavoidable conditions of weather, they were unable to work, their pay would be kept from them, notwithstanding that their board bill continued. The consequence was that they saw no chance whatever of saving any money with the large expense they were under for board. When a change of superintendents took place they were asked to work at night instead of during the day. These men objected to that and they were told that if they were not willing to accept the altered conditions they would be taken back to Halifax. They were taken back to Halifax, and were charged $100 for their passage. Fifty-two men contributed $5,200 to the funds of the Department of Railways and Canals in respect of their transportation from Hudson bay to the city of Halifax. I do not profess to say that the Department of Railways and Canals might not have been justified under the terms of this agreement in charging these men for their transportation, but I desire to ask my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) to amend his motion so as to include all agreements that have been entered into between labourers in the city of Halifax and officials of the Government for the purpose of ascertaining what the rights of these men are in the premises.

The Minister of Railways and Canals endeavoured to minimize the effect of the indictment laid against his department by the junior member for Halifax by retorting across the floor that the statements which he quoted were chiefly those of the captains, who were themselves responsible for the accidents which occurred in Hudson bay, and who felt sore on account of their failure to discharge the duties which had been entrusted to them. I have before me the Canadian Courier of January 17, which contains an article signed Montague Vesey. I do not know the gentleman who contributed this article, but I am quite sure that he was neither captain, mate nor bo'sun bold upon any of these vessels chartered by the Government to go to Hudson bay. This is what Mr. Vesey says:

The work has cost one life and two ships already. The Cearense was wrecked, almost at her journey's end, and became a total loss. (Her crew and passengers had to be taken off in the lifeboats.) She is to be seen on the horizon yet, breaking up; and within a gun shot of her lies all that is left of the Alette, which, unable to make the open sea, on account of ice, returned to Nelson, ran on to a sand bar, was abandoned, and has since been totally destroyed by fire (thought to be due to combustion of gas in the bunkers).

These were the worst happenings; but illfortune, in a hundred minor degrees, has dogged the footsteps of the pioneers, from the very outset of the expedition. The Beothic went ashore on a jagged reef at Point Rich, Newfoundland, and had to sacrifice 300 tons of coal before she could be hauled off into deep water by a warship; after which it was found necessary for her to return to Halifax, where she remained in dry dock for a month. The Alcazar, the Alette, and the Sinbad all had to leave Port Nelson with only a portion of their cargoes unloaded, owing to the poor and fearfully inadequate facilities for discharging. The $3,000 gasolene launch brought up by the Beothic sank before she was a week in the bay; and one-half of a large steel scow, which was brought up in sections, went down within a few hours of touching the water. The dredge, Port Nelson, built by the Polson Iron Works (a photo of which appeared in the Courier of August 16 last), experienced such bad weather while being towed from Halifax by the Bonaventure, that it will be a long time before she can grapple with the bed of the Nelson. She lies with her back practically broken.

An hon. MEMBER: Where?

Mr. KYTE: At Port Nelson.

Mr. COCHRANE: Which statement is absolutely untrue.

Mr. KYTE: (Reading):

Labour troubles broke out quite early in the operations, and nearly a hundred men, declining to remain any longer under existing conditions, treated their contracts as waste-paper, and demanded to be sent home on the 'Beothic' and 'Bellaventure.' This reduced the strength of the camp by nearly one-half, to say nothing of leaving the remaining half in a condition of extreme discontent. Finally, there is scarcely any oil or coal in the whole place.

The Minister of Railways and Canals interjected the observation, while I was reading this article, that there was not a word of truth in it, or something to that effect.

Mr. COCHRANE: In reference to the fact of the dredge being broken.

Mr. KYTE: Any statement that the minister has made, with authority as I assume, is all the more reason why the motion of my hon. friend from Halifax should prevail, and that all the papers should be brought before the House. But, I believe, in view of the circumstances and in view of the flat denial which comes from hon. gentlemen supporting the Government as to the truth of these charges, something more than the motion of my hon. friend from Halifax as it stands to-day is necessary. I believe that a thorough investigation into the whole conduct of this expedition ought to be made by a select special committee of this House. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) intimated that in substance all these charges were made by a man named Beach, who was a real estate agent at Fort Churchill. The quotation I read is not based on the statement of any interested parties as far as I know, because my information is to the effect that Mr. Vesey went to Port Nelson for the purpose of writing up this matter and the articles which have appeared in the Halifax newspapers and the Canadian Courier are the results of his observations.

There are two or three other matters that call for some consideration at the hands of the members of this House. The Minister of Railways, while attempting to make a defence of this matter, only succeeded in entering a plea by way of extenuation. He stated that there was bad luck, that the conditions were not familiar to those who had undertaken to carry on the work, that the season was short and backward, and that it was impossible to anticipate the difficulties that stood in the way of the successful carrying on of this undertaking. I have been long enough a member of this House supporting the Government led by my right hon. friend who to-day leads the Opposition to have heard, day after day, charges hurled across the floor by hon. gentlemen who now sit behind the Government benches in respect of public works carried on by the late Government and in no instance did I hear of any circumstances in extenuation of what they regarded as maladministration by the late Government in the matter of these public undertakings. I merely say this for the purpose of pointing out that circumstances have changed in the last few years, and that, while hon. gentlemen allowed no extenuation in respect to what they regarded as mismanagement by the members of the late Government, they are now willing to shelter themselves behind the plea that the circumstances which led to these disasters were such as they could not control. Mr. Vesey further, in an article in the Halifax Chronicle, writes as follows:

The cause of the prevailing unrest is, in outline, thus: It is quite clear that during the severest of the winter months all outside

work, will for a great part of every week, be out of the question. But work or no work, five dollars a week has to be paid for board, and clothing has to be bought. Now, every man who possesses a contract (ninety per cent of the whole) was under the impression when he signed it, that he was to receive his pay for every day in the twelve months; exclusive of Sundays.

That, in fact, is what the agreement implies —almost states indeed in so many words (though a lawyer would find it a simple matter to read more or less into the thing than actually appears). But the men discovered upon the very first day that rain rendered outside work impracticable, that they received no pay for that day.

In fact, if they ceased work, say at four in the afternoon, owing to bad weather, they received only eight hours' pay. This, in effect, is hourly pay, and in direct disregard of the terms of the contract. However, after a meeting between the men and Mr. Pratt it was agreed that when the various foremen considered the weather too inclement for the men to remain out, the latter should receive a full day's pay. This, undoubtedly, was a concession—a step in the right direction—but it still remains—and this is the rock upon which the ship will ultimately split—that if the weather is too bad for the men to turn out at all in the morning they receive nothing. They are actually each in debt to the amount of seventy-five cents for their day's board. This is an undesirable condition of affairs. What the men ask for and what they certainly are entitled to, is straight time. Whether they will receive it or not is a question for the future to decide.

I desire especially to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to this phase of the matter. If these men have a substantial grievance, as the writer of this article represents, it is only right and fair that this grievance should be removed, and that the conditions of the men who are to carry on the work at Port Nelson in future be rendered as bearable as possible, and their wages paid to them without any deductions.

With reference to the tug Kathleen, which was the only tug, as I understand it, employed in the towing business at Port Nelson last season, I quote:

> The purchase of a Halifax lobster tug by the Government for use at Port Nelson to pull massively heavy tows laden with the heaviest of construction material up Nelson river, eight miles, against a seven knot current, comes in for considerable ridicule. This chapter of mismanagement rivals all previous records in the story of Hudson bay.
>
> The Kathleen's history on Halifax harbour showed her to be a nine knot craft, with a possible speed of eleven knots under pressure. When she tied up with an ordinary tow of lobster boats she could make two knots an hour. On the Nelson river, against the current of seven knots an hour, with a heavy tow, the Kathleen slipped back faster than she went ahead.

The Minister of Railways told the hon. member (Mr. A. K. Maclean) that the Kathleen was purchased from a gentleman in Halifax, who I believe is a political supporter of the Prime Minister. I do not desire to intimate for a moment that the political relationship existing between the owner of the Kathleen and the right hon. gentleman had anything to do with the purchase, but I do say that the Kathleen was utterly unfit, in respect to her machinery and towing power, for the service for which she was acquired. The inadequacy of the Kathleen was one of the reasons why so many thousand dollars worth of costly material was lost in the Hudson bay last year. The whole record of the expedition indicates that gross mismanagement characterized it from start to finish, and I believe that when the losses are figured up the total loss to the Dominion of Canada, resulting from this mismanagement, will be in the neighbourhood of $200,000. When the papers are brought down, I presume the information we seek will be contained in them.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.): When the papers are brought down, if there is any real discrepancy in the facts as given to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) by those who were in Hudson bay last season, and the information possessed by the Department of Railways, the House will be in position to judge of the merits of the question.

Mr. COCHRANE: With reference to the men who came back, I am only awaiting the report of Mr. McLaughlin, the engineer in charge down there, to arrive at a decision as to whether they should be paid or not. I have heard only one side of the question so far.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The hon. minister and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins) both stated that the conditions at the mouths of the rivers Mersey and Thames are similar to the conditions at the mouth of the Nelson river. Would these gentlemen state what the natural conditions are that bring about this similarity?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentlemen have already spoken, and it is not permissible for them to speak again.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: My information is that very powerful dredges have to be kept at work throughout the entire year to render navigation practicable at the mouths of the Mersey and Thames. That is particularly true of the Mersey because of the

shifting sand, and if there be a like condition at the mouth of the Nelson, it would go far to militate against the success of that port from a commercial point of view. I trust that the Minister of Railways, or the member for Brandon, will give us information on that point now or at some future time.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): The argument of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has been well supported by hon. gentlemen who have taken part in this discussion, but what I want particularly to refer to is a remark of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins) criticising the action or non-action of the late Government. I can realize, that, desiring to make a speech to his constituents, and not having looked into the question, finding that the nearest thing at hand to hit was the late Government, he acted accordingly. This is a question which is too big to be discussed from a partisan standpoint. It has been in the public mind for over half a century.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE: How many years were you surveying before you started the work?

Mr. GRAHAM: If my hon. friend looks at the records he will find that we gave a contract within two years from the time we sent the parties out to make surveys. But the fact that my hon. friend asks such a question, shows that he is ready to make a point politically, if he can, regardless of what effect it may have upon the project itself. Were I to follow his example, I might ask him how long after this Government came into power was it before it sent the boats up to the Hudson bay, two of which were destroyed. Such a question might make somebody in an audience laugh, but it would not have any bearing on the matter. This is a question of better transportation for the products of western Canada; it is a question which also affects the cheap transportation of goods into that western country, and therefore it concerns the consumer as well as the producer. It is evident that somebody made a mess of the management of the expeditions to the Hudson bay this last year. The minister says the accidents were the fault of the navigators; the navigators in turn say that the proper aids to navigation were not furnished them and that the ill success was due to the Government. That has been dealt with at some length. But I would point out that the aids to navigation ought to be supplied by the Marine Department, and the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) ought to be here to defend himself for not having buoyed out this channel, if that was not done, as the Railway Department's business was to take care of the traffic when it got there—at least, that is what I should have said were I Minister of Railways. The late Government did take some interest in this matter, notwithstanding what has been said by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins). Taking a trip through western Canada with the then Prime Minister and several other members of the Government, we were met at every place at which we stopped after reaching Winnipeg with the request for the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. That request was not made by Grits alone or by Tories alone, but by both; they seemed to vie with one another in trying to impress upon the Government the necessity of bringing to a head the discussion that had taken place for many years on the subject of utilizing this route as an outlet for the products of the great West. That it had been utilized for many years by the Hudson's Bay Company was a matter of history; and I have always felt that the Hudson's Bay Company were not ready to give us more information than was necessary lest it might lead to the conclusion that the route could be used by others than themselves. This request of the people of the West was listened to. After coming back to Winnipeg, I returned to the Pas Mission, not to get information as to the beginning of the project—for that had been entered upon—but to get as close to it as I could to understand as much of it as posback to Winnipeg, I returned to Pas Mission, and there I decided to recommend to my colleagues not only a railway bridge but a traffic bridge as well, for a traffic bridge would be needed in the future and the extra cost would be light. I came back convinced that Pas Mission was the point from which to start the Hudson Bay railway. Hon. gentlemen opposite ask why we did not hurry. If they knew the conflict that took place even as to the question where the road should start they would not ask such a foolish question. Prince Albert wanted the starting point; nearly every contiguous town wanted some other starting point; and these matters had to be considered before a start could be made. They were considered, and it was decided that Pas Mission was the proper place to begin the construction of

the Hudson Bay railway. A contract was let for the construction of a bridge across the Saskatchewan river at that point, and that was the beginning of the construction of that railway. My hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe) said that he had enjoyed a 70-mile rail run on that road. Well, he could not have had that run had it not been that I let the contract for the building of it. The hon. gentleman does not give us credit for starting the project, but the Minister of Railways would not have had made so much progress as he has made if the late Government had not started the construction of the road and carried it on as far as they did. It is not to be forgotten that in these matters a great deal of preliminary work must be done. For instance, you must organize your engineering staff. It is not easy to find the right man as chief, nor is it easy to get the right men to accompany him. And after they are at work they make mistakes; they have to get a preliminary line, and have to make two, three, perhaps four surveys before they get the location. This work was carried on during the last two years of the late Government's term of office. The road would not have been nearly where it is to-day had not this been done. This preliminary work must be done in all great undertakings, and the time occupied in such work is not wasted by any means, but is essential to final success. The decision of the Government to proceed with the Hudson Bay railway was not made without a great deal of consideration. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) is strongly in favour of that route, and so is every member for the West, and so is every citizen of the West whom I have met. And not in favour of the railway alone, but in favour of a connecting steamship line. In other parts of Canada there was strong objection and a good deal of hesitation. There are men to-day, and perhaps some of them in this House, who lack the faith that some of us have in this Hudson Bay railway. When the late Government came to a conclusion and actually started the work, it had overcome one of the greatest obstacles in the carrying out of that project—which was to decide to carry it out. And when hon. gentlemen opposite chide the late Government, I must point out to them that if they are ever fortunate enough—or unfortunate enough—to become members of a government and to be called upon to decide one of these great undertakings, they will find out that the greatest part of the work is—to decide. That decision was reached, and the contract was let to McArthur & Co. for the large section—I have forgotten how many miles, but that portion over which the hon. member for Lisgar rode.

Now, I wish to call attention to a jocular remark of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins), one which, even as a jocular remark, was unfair, and particularly unfair coming from him. He made the statement that we had begun the line without knowing where it was to end. I will guarantee that the present Government believes we were right in starting the line at that time, for, otherwise, we should have had to wait until some time in 1912. There is a point known, if I remember well, as Split lake; and, starting from the Pas Mission, whether the road went to Churchill or to Nelson, it would traverse the same route until Split lake was reached. It made no difference in the construction of the first 200 miles which point was made the terminus, and had we delayed construction until a decision were reached as to the port, we would have lost a year or two on the work. So, the hon. member for Brandon is entirely unfair in saying that the late Government made a mistake in starting the line without knowing where it was to end.

Now, the project is a big one. I am here to say that, notwithstanding that I differ with some people, I believe the Hudson Bay route is feasible and will be a great assistance in solving the transportation problem of the Canadian West. Had I not thought so, I would not have proceeded, as head at that time of the Railway Department, with the construction of the work. The undertaking has many difficulties, the smallest of which, probably, is the construction of the road itself. There is no trouble in constructing a road four or five hundred miles long, even when the physical difficulties are considerable. It is a matter of engineering and labour. The great difficulty with this project is as to the harbour and the equipment of that harbour and as to obtaining a commodious steamship line to carry the traffic arriving at the port in the West and to bring the west-bound traffic across the Atlantic to the port. I would point out to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) that he is not making as much progress as we would like him to make if he waits until his road is completed before starting actively to provide for the handling of the traffic when it goes

to that port. And that is not easy. I am not surprised that he rubs his brow when he gets up against this end of the scheme.

Mr. COCHRANE: That belongs to another department.

Mr. GRAHAM: The responsibility of making the whole project successful, I am afraid, will be left mainly with the Railway Department—I believe it would have been had the former Government remained in power. If it is to be a success, you cannot relieve the Railway Department of responsibility, even though the building of the railway is the smallest part of the project Of course the Marine Department is responsible for buoying the channel No one department of the Government is responsible for this scheme; it is the Government in its entirety that is responsible. Under the late Government, the Marine Department, if I remember rightly, sent a steamer up to the Hudson bay and made a hydrographic survey. The Marine Department should have carried this work on up to the point at which the Railway Department could take hold of it and carry out the improvements, whichever harbour were chosen. Whatever censure should be placed upon any department in reference to the non-buoying of the channel, or the neglect to mark it out, should be placed upon the Marine Department, and I am sorry the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here to discuss that phase of the matter. Something was done by the late Government when they sent the steamships up to the straits of Hudson bay to make a hydrographic survey with a view to assisting in this great project. As to the harbour itself, as I pointed out a moment ago, the work is only half done—no, not half or nearly half done—when the railway reaches the seaboard on Hudson bay. What seaboard is the minister going to reach? It is no difficult thing to see which harbour is the best. There are no two ways of viewing the matter. Approaching it from the railway standpoint only, there is no doubt at all, but that Nelson has the better harbour. It affords the best terminal facilities, and, so far as the railway is concerned, saves 85 miles of hauling which would be involved in the case of the adoption of Fort Churchill as a terminal port. As I say, from a railway standpoint, there is no question as to which port is advisable; I am inclined to think that Nelson is the port anyway. I do not want to pose as an expert or authority in the matter; I base my opinion upon the reports I received from the various engineers.

The House will pardon me if I again go back to what the late Government did in the matter. We had a staff of engineers at Nelson and at Churchill during the whole of one winter, making observations and soundings. Their report to me was that there was a safe channel in the Nelson river, but that it would need some dredging to make it straight, to put it in ordinary terms. The Nelson river is not a small stream; it is a river into which flow the Saskatchewan, the Red river and other tributaries. It is a large and comparatively swift-running stream; hon. gentlemen of the House must not get the idea that in discussing this river they are dealing with some small stream like the Nation river. The Nelson is a mighty river. I think the Ontario Government has secured a right of way in order that they may, if they so desire, build a railway up to the Nelson river; I imagine they consider that Nelson harbour will be a fairly good one. To make a comparison between Nelson and Churchill from the information given me by the engineers —and that is the only information upon which I base my opinion—Churchill at the present time is the better harbour for a limited amount of shipping accommodation. If a large business is to be done on this Hudson Bay route, Nelson is the harbour. In other words, Nelson is capable of being made into a harbour that will take care of any amount of traffic, while Churchill could not possibly be enlarged, except at enormous expense, to take care of any more traffic than it can take care of at the present time, which is comparatively small. If we expect the Hudson Bay route to be successful, it is worth while considering whether we should adopt the harbour that will eventually lend itself to development for increased trade. The engineers of the Railway Department pointed out to me the difficulties at Nelson, and they pointed out some of the advantages of Churchill; I have summed up very briefly the opinions I formed. For several miles out, Nelson harbour is practically the Nelson river. The channel of the harbour at the present time is undoubtedly crooked, but that there is a channel there I am convinced by soundings, the record of which I have in my possession, and which I looked for to-day but could not find. I am convinced that there is a channel from the Hudson bay right up into the Nelson river. The bed of the river is, I think, composed of what they call boulder clay, and it is capable of being cleared out and the channel straightened to a width of say 800 feet. The con-

dition to which the hon. member for Kings, P.E.I., (Mr. Hughes) referred may prevail; that is, the department may have to do periodical dredging on acount of the washing of sand down the river. That I am not prepared to say, but that the channel can be made at Nelson is quite evident, unless the engineers of the Railway Department were all wrong. Take, for instance, the entrance of one of the Empresses to Liverpool. They have a pretty narrow channel there, and it is subject to high seas, but no person would say that it is impracticable, as it is used all the time by the larger vessels. I am convinced that Nelson harbour can be made a magnificent harbour, but the entrance to it will always be narrowed in proportion to the width of the Nelson river, which really gives us the harbour. What will be the cost of the entire project: railway, elevators, docks, harbours, demarcation of channel by Marine Department, steamship line, and possibly elevators on the other side? It is a problem which, when you come to carry it out to its ultimate solution, may well demand the serious consideration of the House and the Government, and we should not dismiss it after but a few moments' discussion. Should the Government proceed to arrange at once for the construction of docks, having selected a port? Every one will say yes; they should at once proceed with the making of the harbour by clearing out the channel. If it is to be a harbour at all, that must be done. When that is done, and the elevators constructed, what are you going to do with the wheat or the merchandise coming in or going out? Will the shipowners come to Hudson bay of their own accord and enter into this traffic? I had discussions with some of them, and the different views they took upon this question were remarkable. Some large companies said to me: Yes, we will enter into this carrying trade if the Government will encourage us by cash subsidies. Others said: We will enter into this trade during part of the year, but we have to have specially constructed ships. I am not sure that the latter is the case. The bay itself is free from ice during many months of the year.

Mr. HENDERSON: How many?

Mr. GRAHAM: During a longer time than the harbour is at Montreal. The bay itself is free from ice for months, but the difficulty with the navigation will be in the straits. There will be no difficulty unless on account of the ice coming down the river into the bay. The late Governor General pointed out that the Hudson bay is the Mediterranean of the north; he was surprised with the extent to which the bay was free from ice. But, as I say, the difficulty is in the strait. For two or three months in the year I do not believe specially constructed vessels will be necessary, but I may be wrong in that; vessel owners themselves seem to disagree on that point.

I am merely making these interrogations to impress on the minds of the Government—perhaps that is unnecessary—but on the minds of the country, the extreme necessity of proceeding at once if this is to be made a substantial aid to the solution of the transportation problem, in not only building the road, which is a small portion of the scheme but in completing the terminals finally and adequately, and looking out for some means of handling the traffic once it is established. I have tried to speak on this not in a controversial way. I feel that somebody has made a bad blunder this year and the bad effect is not so much the loss of the money but the fact that to those who say that the road is impracticable this is a sweet morsel, and I have had a good many thumps from some of my friends, not in the West, in the last year, pointing out what a muddle I got the Government of Canada into inaugurating this Hudson Bay project. To those who are opposed to Nelson, whatever the object may be, this is also a sweet morsel, because they have pointed out to me in the last few months that if Churchill had been selected none of these calamities would have taken place. But the project is a good one and can overcome even the black eye of this year, and if the Government will proceed, I do not say rashly, to close up the gap and make arrangements suitable for the completion of the project, arranging for the water end of the route as well as the land end, I believe we in this House will yet see the goods conveyed from the West to the mother country and from the mother country to the West, at a profit to all concerned and a special profit to the people of western Canada.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT VESSELS' MOVEMENTS.

Mr. SINCLAIR—for Mr. Law—moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, and written resquests during the years 1912 and 1913, addressed to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or the Naval or Marine branches of said department, or any officer or persons of either branch, by any person or persons,

relating to proposals or requests that the vessels or any vessel or vessels under the control of the Naval Branch of said department, should be present at any regatta or celebration of any description held anywhere on the Atlantic or Pacific coasts of Canada during said years; also of all replies to such letters, telegrams and written requests.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN: I would suggest to my hon. friend from Guysboro, who is acting for my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Law), a slight amendment. The motion reads:

Addressed to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or the Naval or Marine Branches of said department,

The Naval Department, of course, is a department just as much as the Department of Marine and Fisheries is, and it is evidently the Naval Department that is wanted here. I would suggest that the motion be amended as follows:

6 p.m.

Addressed to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or the Department of Naval Affairs, or any officer of either department.

That would cover the information which I think the hon. member for Yarmouth is seeking.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would like to know what is to be the business of the House to-morrow—whether it is to be a Government day or a private Members' day.

Mr. BORDEN: I understand it is a Government day, so the Clerk of the House informs me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It all depends upon what we are to understand by the word 'week.' Rule 25 says that on Thursdays, after the expiration of the first four weeks, Government orders shall have precedence. The question is, when does that commence? It will be four weeks to-morrow since we met, and if you count Thursday as the first day on which the week is to commence, to-morrow will be the fourth week; but it seems to me hardly fair that the commencement of the week should be the day on which we first met. It ought to be the day following, Friday, and then we would have to-morrow as a private Members' day.

Mr. BORDEN: I think the four weeks will be completed with the conclusion of this day's business. So far as the question of Thursday is concerned, my right hon. friend will remember that it was his proposal to have Thursday as a Government day from the very beginning of the session, and that it was I who secured the four weeks for private members. I do not see that there is anything unfair in following the obvious intention of the rule. Heretofore the rule has not come into question, so far as I remember at the moment, because the fourth Thursday happened to come in the Christmas vacation. This is the first time the question has actually arisen. I understand the four weeks will terminate with to-day's business, and to-morrow we commence with the practice provided by the rule.

At six o'clock the House adjourned without question put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, February 12, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Bill No. 63, respecting The Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 64, respecting The London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—Mr. Beattie.

Bill No. 65, respecting The McClary Manufacturing Company.—Mr. Beattie.

Bill No. 66, respecting The patent of the National Wood Distilling Company.—Mr. Clements.

Bill No. 67, to incorporate The Norfolk and Elgin Railway Company.—Mr. Marshall.

Bill No. 68, respecting The Western Central Railway Company.—Mr. Henderson.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY INVESTIGATING COMMISSION.

Mr. COCHRANE presented report of the National Transcontinental railway Investigating Commission. He moved that this report be printed forthwith, and that rule 74 relative to the printing of papers be suspended for that purpose.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

EMPLOYMENT OF H. P. DUCHEMIN.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What was the gross amount paid by all departments of the Government to H. P. Duchemin, commissioner, from the date of his appointment to December 31, 1913, for his services in connection with investigations of partisanship, including travelling and living expenses?

2. Is he still in the employ of the Government? If not, when did his employment cease?

3. How many days was he employed during the year 1913?

4. How many dismissals of officials did the said Mr. Duchemin recommend in all departments in which he held investigations during the course of his employment by the Government?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. $1,664.85.

2. If necessity required his services would be still available under his Commission, so far as the Department of Marine and Fisheries is concerned.

3. Four and one-half days.

4. Sixty-seven.

GRANBY POST OFFICE.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. Is the Government aware that the post office box accommodation in the post office at Granby, Quebec, is said to be far from sufficient to meet the requirements of the population?

2. Does the Government propose to increase the number of boxes in the said post office? If so, when?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. There have been no complaints of inadequate lock box accommodation in the Granby post office.

2. Inquiry will be made on the subject.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

*Mr. KYTE:

1. Excluding vacations, how often have the Civil Service Commissioners, or either of them, been absent from Ottawa since October 15, 1911, on business not connected with the commission?

2. Was permission obtained for each such absence? If so, from whom?

3. Since October 15, 1911, have the commissioners, or either of them, received remuneration for services not connected with the discharge of their duties as commissioners? If so, how much, and for what?

4. How much has been paid to each commissioner for travelling expenses since October 15, 1911?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Commissioner LaRochelle, 20 days. Commissioner Shortt, addressing Canadian clubs and similar institutions, 12 days. In western provinces in connection with duties as member of Statistical Commission, 4 weeks. As chairman of Board of Conciliation, Winnipeg, 13 days.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Commissioner LaRochelle, $60.85. Commissioner Shortt, $576.01, in connection with duties as member of Statistical Commission. $132.45, as chairman of Board of Conciliation, Winnipeg (paid by Department of Labour).

OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION, HULL.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. What sum or sums of money, if any, have been expended by the Government, or by the Ottawa Improvement Commission for the beautifying of the city of Hull, or that portion of its surroundings in the province of Quebec?

2. If so, how has such money been expended?

Mr. CODERRE:

1 and 2. $3,989.03 has been expended for beautifying the Hull city hall square during the fiscal year 1911-12.

IMMIGRATION FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How much has been paid to the Western Newspaper Union of the United States, since November, 1911, for immigration advertising matter?

2. How many American immigrants have settled in Canada during the calendar years, 1911, 1912, and 1913?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. $113,775.38.

2. 1911, 131,114; 1912, 140,143; 1913, 115,751.

MONTREAL CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to increase the salaries of the Circuit Court judges for the district of Montreal?

2. Has the Minister of Justice considered the advisability of raising the status of said judges to that of Superior Court judges?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. The matter of judicial salaries is under consideration.

2. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the minister say whether he has considered it favourably or unfavourably?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have considered it, but perhaps it deserves further consideration.

QUEBEC SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to increase the salaries of the Superior Court judges residing in the rural district?

2. Has the Minister of Justice received any memoranda to that effect?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. The matter of judicial salaries is under consideration.

2. Yes.

DR. J. N. ROY.

Mr. C. A. WILSON:

1. Is the Government aware of the following item published in the newspaper La Patrie of the 10th of December, 1913:

'Dr. J. N. Roy in the Argentine.

'Our fellow citizen is visiting in Los Toldos, and attention is being called to his presence there.

'The correspondent of La Nation, one of the Buenos Aires leading Spanish papers, points out in the following words the visit of our fellow countryman at Los Toldos and his studies there.

'Dr. J. N. Roy, entrusted by the Canadian Government with the care of conducting special studies on compared pathology of the eye, ear, nose and throat diseases among the different races, is at present time in Los Toldos, back from a trip to Africa. Mr. Roy is travelling in South America, studying amongst the Indians the diseases relating to his special knowledge. Accompanied by Dr. Dias Icasto and by a son of Sam Cauligueo, actual chief of the important tribe of the Arancanas, he has spent three days visiting the native schools and the principal places where the Indians live.

'Dr. Roy is delighted with his stay with us, and says he has learned in the Indian centres most interesting things as far as medicine goes, and which he intends publishing when he is back home.

'He will leave in a few days for Chili, and from there to Bolivia and Peru, so as to pursue his studies with the Incas. Mr. Roy, who has been travelling for fifteen months, will be back at Montreal Canada, about the end of December.'

2. Are the facts contained in that article true?

3. Has Dr. J. N. Roy been instructed by the Canadian Government to make the above mentioned studies on compared pathology?

4. Is Dr. J. N. Roy back in Canada?

5. Has he made a report of his trip and studies to the Government? If not, when is he going to make it?

6. Has Dr. J. N. Roy been sent on such mission, and on what conditions?

7. Has Dr. J. N. Roy received any fees or payments whatever for his services up to the present time, and how much is he to get when his work is completed?

8. Are there any orders in council or other documents in connection with Dr. J. N. Roy's appointment? If so, what are the conditions thereof?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No.

2. As far as the reference to the Government is concerned, yes.

3. Dr. Roy's mission was given official recognition in view of the scientific value of the research work in which he was to be engaged.

4. No information.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

5. No. No information.

6. Answered by No. 3.

7. No.

8. No,—except as answered by No. 3.

HON. R. LEMIEUX'S ASIATIC TRIP.

Mr. SEXSMITH:

1. Who accompanied the Honourable R. Lemieux on his Asiatic trip?

2. How many stenographers accompanied or were employed by him or his staff, and at what cost?

3. How many servants or valets were in or were engaged for the party?

4. How many ladies, including wives, daughters or other persons, accompanied the party?

5. Were the expenses of the said ladies, or any portion thereof, paid by the Government of Canada, directly or indirectly?

6. What was the total cost to Canada for the whole party?

7. What sums or contributions were paid by the Government of Great Britain and Ireland towards the expenses of this trip?

8. What sums or contributions were paid of the Government of any other colony or country towards the expenses of this trip?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. His private secretary. The Under Secretary of State, and his secretary.

2 and 3. The department has no official knowledge about this.

4. The wife of the ex-Postmaster General.

5. There is nothing in the department about this.

6. $10,000.

7 and 8. None, to the knowledge of the department.

HON. R. LEMIEUX'S SOUTH AFRICAN TRIP.

Mr. BEST:

1. Who accompanied the Honourable R. Lemieux on his South African trip?

2. How many stenographers accompanied or were employed by him or his staff, and at what cost?

3. How many servants or valets were in or were engaged for the party?

4. How many ladies, including wives daughters or other persons, accompanied the party?

5. Were the expenses of the said ladies, or any portion thereof, paid by the Government of Canada, directly or indirectly?

6. What was the total cost to Canada for the whole party?

7. What sums or contributions were paid by the Government of Great Britain and Ireland towards the expenses of this trip?

8. What expenses were paid by the Government of any other colony or country for this trip?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. His private secretary.

2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8. The department has no official knowledge.

6. $5,866.67.

NANAIMO STRIKE—PRISONER'S DEATH.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the attention of the Minister of Justice been called to the following extract from an article published in the Ottawa Citizen of February 4 inst. on the Nanaimo strike:

'One miner's boy, innocent of any offence, died in prison a few days ago. He had been advised that if he pleaded guilty he would be let off with a nominal sentence. He took the advice, but instead of an acquittal he received a heavy sentence and died in jail. The editor of the Vancouver World, Mr. L. D. Taylor, refers to the miner boy's death as "blood that calls from the ground."'

2. Is the fact above stated true?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Not otherwise than by the present question.

2. The minister has had a letter informing him that a prisoner of twenty-one years of age died at the Oakalla, B.C., prison farm in the month of January, 1914. In a letter of the 29th December last, asking for clemency, the parents of this prisoner stated that his own counsel advised him to plead guilty 'but that it was as the prisoner understood, he would get off with the time already served namely three months.' The minister has no information that any advice was given save by the prisoner's own counsel. The information of the department is that the prisoner took an active part in the rioting in connection with which he was prosecuted. In the letter referred to asking for clemency, no representation was made that the prisoner was in bad health. The prison farm in question is a provincial institution, over which the Department of Justice has no control.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—EXPROPRIATION CASES.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many expropriation cases are still pending before the Exchequer Court in connection with the right of way of the National Transcontinental railway for its entrance to Quebec, between the site of the Quebec bridge and the terminal station in said city?

2. What is the total amount claimed?

3. What is the amount offered?

4. Who are the counsel representing the Crown in each case?

5. Who are the counsel representing the claimants in each case?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The King vs. M. P. Davis; the King vs. Alf. Dombrowski; the King vs. Frank Ross.

2. Amount claimed: M. P. Davis, $326,675; Alf. Dombrowski, $4,627.47; Frank Ross, $250,000.

3. Amount offered: M. P. Davis, $7,275; Alf. Dombrowski, $1,729; Frank Ross, $79,700.

4. Counsel for the Crown: The King vs. M. P. Davis, L. Moraud, Quebec; the King vs. Alf. Dombrowski, Gagne & Gagne, Quebec; the King vs. Frank Ross, E. Belleau and E. J. Flynn, Quebec.

5. Counsel for Claimant: The King vs. M. P. Davis, Pentland, Stuart, Gravel & Thomson, Quebec; the King vs. Alf. Dombrowski, Belleau & Belleau, Quebec; the King vs. Frank Ross, Pentland, Stuart, Gravel & Thomson, Quebec.

The case of Frank Ross was tried by Judge Audette and judgment delivered November 18, 1913, awarding defendant $134,760.84, with interest and costs, but the amount has not yet been paid.

THE KING vs. FALARDEAU.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the indemnity been paid in the expropriation case of His Majesty the King vs. Alfred Olivier Falardeau and Constant Napoleon Falardeau?

2. What was the amount offered by the Crown?

3. What was the amount paid?

4. What was the date of the payment of said indemnity?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.

2. $39,000 in court.

3. $69,256, judgment of court; $3,381.37, interest at 5 per cent; total, $72,637.37.

4. January 12, 1914.

ONTARIO EQUIPMENT COMPANY.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Have any purchases been made by the Post Office Department from the Ontario Equipment Company since 1st March, 1913?

2. If so, what is the nature of such purchases, and the quantity and prices paid?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2. Locks, 4,435 at 80 cents, $3,548; 15,000 at 70 cents, $10,500; $14,048. Steel ferrules for ends of cords on newspaper sacks, 150,000 at $12.50 per 1,000, $1,875. Metal slip fasteners and label holders, 30,930 at 25 cents each, $7,732.50; 'Attached' label cases, 10,000 at 5 cents each, $500. Keys for mail locks, 12,959 at 20 cents each, $2,591.80; $26,747.30.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY PACIFIC TERMINUS.

*Mr. EMMERSON:

1. What port on the Pacific coast, if any, has been selected by the Canadian Northern railway corporation and approved by the Minister of Railways and the Board of Railway

Commissioners, as the western terminus of their Transcontinental railway system?

2. Did they ever select, with such approval, Port Mann, in British Columbia? If so, has any change in location of such terminals been made?

3. Is the Government aware that it was said to have been announced to the public that Port Mann, B.C., had been so selected, and that the result was that lands at that place were sold in eastern Canada at high figures, on the strength of that announcement?

4. Is the Government aware that it is now announced, as alleged, that Vancouver has been selected by that railway corporation as to their western terminus with the result that the lands so sold and purchased at Port Mann are practically worthless?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The Minister of Railways and Canals has given no approval.

2, 3 and 4. The department has no information.

NOVA SCOTIA COLD STORAGE PLANTS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What assistance was given by the Department of Marine and Fisheries or the Department of Agriculture, in the years 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913 to firms and joint stock or other companies operating cold storage plants in the province of Nova Scotia, excluding the smaller companies known as Fishermen's Bait Association, and what is the name of each of the said firms or companies and the amount paid to each for each of the years above mentioned?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Under the 'Cold Storage Act' assistance has been given through the Department of Agriculture as follows:

Halifax Cold Storage Company, Port Hawkesbury, N. S.:—

Fiscal Year.	
1907-08	
1908-09	$ 6,685 06
1909-10	1,215 46
1910-11	1,607 73
1911-12	
1912-13	607 73
Total	$ 9,115 98

The Lockeport Cold Storage Company, (Maritime Cold Storage Company) Lockeporte, N.S:—

Fiscal Year.	
1907-08	
1908-09	
1909-10	
1910-11	
1911-12	$ 8,527 53
1912-13	3,979 51
Total	$ 12,507 04

Assistance was given through the Department of Marine and Fisheries as follows:

1907-08—Halifax Cold Storage Co..	$ 2,000 00
Canso Cold Storage Co... ..	682 11
1908-09—Halifax Cold Storage Co..	2,000 00
—Canso Cold Storage Co. ..	413 98
1909-10	Nil.
1910-11	Nil.
1911-12—J. Arch. MacDonnell.. ..	1,000 00
— " "	1,000 00
1912-13—Gardiner & Doon	1,043 50
1913-14—J. Foster Rood	712 33

ST. THEODORE D'ACTON RURAL MAIL SERVICE.

*Mr. MARCILE:

1. Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to establish a rural mail service in the parish of St. Theodore d'Acton? If so, when?

2. Have tenders been advertised for the conveyance of the mail between the Acton Vale and the district known as No. 1 of such rural service and also for the one known as No. 2?

3. How many tenders have been received by the department?

4. What is the respective names of the tenderers and the amount of each of them?

5. Will the contract or contracts be granted to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes, as soon as satisfactory offers have been received for the performance of the mail services.

2, 3, 4 and 5. Tenders have been invited, but the prices asked are considered too high, and the department is now endeavouring to secure lower offers.

ACTON VALE MAIL CARRIER .

*Mr. MARCILE:

1. Has Mr. Ed. Heneault, mail carrier between the Canadian Pacific railway station and the post office at Acton Vale been replaced? If so, by whom?

2. What salary does the latter receive?

3. What was Mr. Ed. Heneault's salary as mail conveyer?

4. Did the department offer Mr. Heneault the same salary?

5. Have tenders been asked for?

6. If so, what is the name of each tenderer and the amount of each tender? If not, why not?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Mr. Heneault objected to completing his contract unless paid $150 per annum. Later he asked $125 per annum. His contract contained a clause providing for its termination by three months' notice. This was given and a new contract made with E. Leclerc.

2. $125 per annum.

3. $75 per annum.

4. No. When a contractor fails to complete a contract the department prefers to deal with other persons.

5. No. The amount was under $200 per

annum, and the department considered the offer of Leclerc a reasonable one.

6. Answered by No. 5.

FASTENING OF MAIL BAGS.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Is the Postmaster General aware that the mail bags at St. David de l'Auberivière, county of Lévis, deposited alongside the road where they are taken by the mail conveyer, are said to be closed by means of nails?

2. Does the Postmaster General intend to supply with padlocks the mail bags of St. David de l'Auberivière?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. No.

2. The Postmaster General is not aware that any mail bags in use in this vicinity are not properly fastened. Inquiry will be made about it.

ARCADIA RURAL MAIL ROUTE.

Mr. LAW:

1. Has the application been made to the Post Office Department for a rural mail delivery route between Arcadia and East Chebogue post offices?

2. If so, has it been established? If not, when will it be?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2. No. Inquiry into the matter has not yet been completed, and until the inspector's report has been submitted it is impossible to give the probable date of establishment.

ST. MALO CAR SHOPS.

*Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Has any change been made in the schedule prices of Mr. Joseph Gosselin's tender for the locomotive and car shops at St. Malo, Que., since the contract for the said shops was awarded to him by Order in Council on October 8, 1913?

2. If so, to what class of material does the change relate?

3. At what price per yard did Mr. Gosselin tender for the said material?

4. What increased price, if any, is he to be paid for the said material?

5. Who conducted the negotiations by which such increased price, if any, was arranged?

6. Were the said negotiations carried on by correspondence or telegrams? If so, between whom?

7. Was an Order in Council passed authorizing an increase in any of the prices contained in Mr. Gosselin's tender? If so, what is its date?

8. Did the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company agree to a change in price? If so, what is the date of the document signifying their agreement?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1 and 2. A schedule price has been arranged for excavating frozen earth.

3. 85 cents per cubic yard was tendered for common excavation, including backfilling, distributing, levelling off, &c., but no tender for frozen earth.

4. During the months of January, February and March, 1914, $2.30 per cubic yard is to be paid for the excavation of frozen earth only.

5. Mr. W. J. Press, mechanical engineer under instruction from the chief engineer.

6. Both by correspondence and telegram (See answer to No. 5).

7. Yes, January 14, 1914, approving the price of $2.30 per cubic yard for frozen earth only as stated in answer to No. 4.

8. No.

THORBURN RAILWAY COMMUNICATION.

Mr. MACDONALD:

Does the Railway Department intend to provide any railway communication with the town of Thorburn on the line of railway now existing there?

Mr. COCHRANE: The matter has not been decided.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND WINTER SERVICE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

What was the cost of labour in connection with the handling of freight and loading of coal respectively at the ports of Pictou, Charlottetown and Georgetown, respectively, in connection with the winter service to Prince Edward Island for January, 1914?

Mr. HAZEN:

Pictou: handling freight, $1,281.36; handling coal, $846; total, $2,127.36.

Charlottetown: handling freight, $1,234.34.

Georgetown: handling freight, $265.72.

PURE BRED STOCK.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has the Minister of Agriculture announced or authorized the anouncement in Nova Scotia of any policy of providing pure bred stock?

2. If so, when was the announcement made and by whom?

3. Does the minister intend to permit the existing agricultural societies in Nova Scotia to take advantage of any arrangements he is making in regard to pure bred stock in that province?

4. What arrangements has the minister made in regard to the distribution of pure bred stock in Nova Scotia and with whom?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.

2. Under date of April 26, 1913, by the Live Stock Commissioner.

3. No. All applications submitted must be presented by associations formed in accordance with the regulations outlined in

the pamphlet announcing the policy of the department, which will be tabled.

An association may be organized amongst the members of an agricultural society in Nova Scotia, but their application, when presented, must then be approved under the conditions outlined in the pamphlet pertaining to the location in any district of pure bred animals.

4. Arrangements have been made for the distribution of pure bred stock in Nova Scotia through the Live Stock Branch of the department, in accordance with the conditions outlined in the pamphlet above mentioned.

Supplementary information connected with this question is being laid on the table of the House.

ELMIRA POST OFFICE.

*M. J. J. HUGHES:

1. Has the Post Office Department received a petition from the residents of Elmira, P.E.I., complaining of the manner in which the post office of that place is managed, and of the uncivil and discourteous conduct of the postmaster, and asking for an investigation?

2. If so, will the Postmaster General have an investigation held, and report the result to the House?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Complaint was received and duly referred to the inspector for report.

2. It would appear from the report of the inspector that the postmaster, who was only appointed in November last, did not fully understand his responsibilities, but he has now been fully instructed and has promised to render proper service to the public.

FISHERY ADVISORY BOARD.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM:

1. What amounts have been paid to each of the several members of the Fishery Advisory Board for time spent in discharge of the duties of the office?

2. What amounts have been paid to each for travelling, and what amount for other expenses?

Mr. HAZEN:

	Allowance.	Travelling expenses.
C. H. B. Longworth	$230 00	$224 56
H. B. Short	220 00	225 90
Gideon Hemeon	220 00	202 80
W. C. Smith	210 00	185 70
Andrew King	.....	.....
F. T. B. Young	200 00	191 21
A. B. Carson	160 00	129 80
P. P. Russell	180 00	154 10
Azade Arseneault	290 00	151 85
D. F. Reid	90 00	109 50
J. E. Sinclair	110 00	178 75
C. D. Melvill	140 00	219 40
D. M. McIntyre	280 00	475 00
F. H. Cunningham	.....	515 05
Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries	.....	45 40
Deputy Minister of Naval Service	.....	.....
Superintendent of Fisheries	.....	87 85
Commissioner of Fisheries	.....	96 55
Assistant to Superintendent of Fisheries	.....	.....
Fishery expert	.....	79 26

NEW GLASGOW ARMOURY SITE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has any examination been had or report been made as to the site of a proposed armoury at New Glasgow, Nova Scotia?

2. If so, on what street has the site been recommended?

3. Has the department been advised that the town of New Glasgow has agreed to donate a site for an armoury in that town?

4. If so, on what street is the site located which they propose to donate?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES:

1. Yes.

2. Not finally settled.

3. Yes.

4. Not finally settled.

ONTARIO DRILL HALLS AND ARMOURIES.

Mr. PARDEE:

1. How many drill halls and armouries have been built in the province of Ontario during the years 1912 and 1913?

2. At what places have they been built?

3. What is the cost of each?

4. How many are now under construction?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES:

1. 23.

2. and 3. Built by Department of Militia and Defence.

Kincardine, Ont.	$ 8,394 00
Mount Forest, Ont.	3,000 00
Wingham, Ont.	11,503 00
Watford, Ont.	12,154 00
Port Elgin, Ont.	2,916 00
Oshawa, Ont.	53,450 00
Meaford, Ont.	17,720 00
Markdale, Ont.	14,278 00
Simcoe, Ont.	30,336 80
Brampton, Ont.	17,765 00
Orillia, Ont.	24,657 60
Gananoque, Ont.	15,456 00
Omemee, Ont.	11,434 64
Norwood, Ont.	10,006 50
Picton, Ont.	65,570 00
Millbrook, Ont.	11,991 00
Madoc, Ont.	20,861 00
Orono, Ont.	12,758 50
Blackstock, Ont.	13,661 00

Alexandria, Ont. 18,285 50
Kemptville, Ont. 12,154 00
Renfrew, Ont. 39,502 00
Lindsay, Ont. 46,946 00
4. 15.

CANCELLED MAIL CONTRACTS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Why has the Order of the House, passed in February, 1913, asking for a return showing the number of mail contracts cancelled in the province of Nova Scotia, not been complied with?

Mr. PELLETIER: A general return of contracts terminated in all provinces of the Dominion was prepared by order of the House. The return was sent to the Secretary of State on the 11th instant.

CANSO LETTER BOXES.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Referring to the reply given to a question asked by the member for Richmond, Nova Scotia, in which it was stated that on October 17, 1913, letter boxes were placed in the village of Chesley, South Bruce, which has a population of 1,710, is it the intention of the Post Office Department to furnish letter boxes for the town of Canso, Nova Scotia, which has a population of over 2,000?

Mr. PELLETIER: In establishing street letter box services, the department does not consider population so much as the amount of postal business transacted as indicated by the revenue, and also the local conditions which would make such accommodation necessary in the public interest.

The revenue of Chesley, in South Bruce, for the last fiscal year, was $5,346.93, and that of Canso, N.S., $2,329.69.

No application has been received for the establishment of a street letter box service at Canso. The population of Canso, according to the census of 1911, was 1,617.

BLACK CAPE POST OFFCE.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Was an inquiry held by the Post Office Department before the closing of the post office of Black Cape East, Bonaventure, Quebec, by a disinterested official of that department, as requested by J. Narcisse Cyr, mayor, Rev. J. Thomas Fortin, parish priest, Dr. Ernest G. Cyr, and fifty other citizens of that locality, in their petition to the Postmaster General, dated February 24, 1913?

2. If such inquiry was held, by whom was it held, when and what were the conclusions arrived at?

3. If no inquiry was held, why not?

Mr. PELLETIER: No inquiry was held in this matter, as an inquiry was not considered necessary. Representations were made to the department that the office, the revenue of which was only $25 per annum, while it cost for maintenance $83 per annum, was not required and was a cause of useless expense to the department. Instructions were, therefore, given for the closing of this office.

DUTHIE POINT LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries ordered that the Duthie Point lighthouse be discontinued after the present season?

2. If so, on whose recommendation is this being done and on what grounds?

3. Is the building itself to be removed and where to?

4. Is it true that the light is to be placed on Maria wharf? If so, at whose request is this being done, and what official of the department, if any, has advised to this effect?

5. If this change is to be made, who is to be in charge of the new light, what is to be his salary and who recommended his appointment?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The department has ordered the discontinuance of the light at Duthie Point.

2. (a) On the recommendation of the Lighthouse Board of Canada; (b) on the ground that the abolition of Duthie Point light and the establishment of a light on Maria wharf would better safeguard navigation.

3. Not yet decided.

4. (a) Light is to be placed on Maria wharf; (b) at the request of the Lighthouse Board of Canada; (c) Lieut. Col. W. P. Anderson, C.M.G., chief engineer; Mr. J. G. Macphail, commissioner of lights; Mr. V. W. Forneret, superintending engineer St. Lawrence ship channel, being members of the lighthouse board.

5. No arrangement has yet been made for keepership.

BROME RURAL MAIL ROUTES.

Mr. KAY:

1. What are the names of the tenderers for the rural mail routes leading from Brigham, county of Brome?

2. What was the amount of each tender, and who was the successful tenderer?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1 and 2. Tenders for Brigham rural route No. 1: Napoleon Dupuis, $595 per annum; Alfred Gordon, $781.50 per annum. The lowest tender was accepted.

Tenders for Brigham rural route No. 2: George T. Burnett, $585 per annum, reduced to $560; Arthur E. Moynan, $563 per annum; Roy Stowe, $600 per annum. The contract was awarded to George T. Burnett at the amount of his reduced tender.

LA HAVE ISLANDS MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Who is the contractor for the mail service between West Dublin and La Have Islands, Lunenburg county, N.S.?
2. What is the amount received therefor, and when was the contract awarded?
3. From whom were tenders received, and for what amounts respectively, when tenders were last solicited for this mail service?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Elijah Corkum.
2. The amount is $135 per annum and the contract was awarded on September 26, 1913.
3. Elijah Corkum, $170 per annum, reduced to $135; Gorden Romkey, $140; Z. Publicover, $158; C. E. Publicover, $160.

HALIFAX ARMOURIES.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Has an assistant caretaker been recently appointed for the Halifax armouries? If so, whom? If not, when will the vacancy be filled?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES:

1. No. A labourer has recently been appointed, Mr. Timothy Regan.

SESSIONAL MESSENGER.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Is there a special messenger for the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Commons? If so, what is his name and salary?

Mr. BORDEN: Yes. Thomas Boles, a sessional messenger; paid $3 per diem.

EDMUDSTON IMMIGRATION OFFICE.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Has the Government rented an office to be used by the immigration agent at Edmunston, N.B.?
2. If so, why is said office not occupied?
3. How much rent was paid to the lessor till the 31st of December last?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.
2. Department understands office is used, for purposes for which it is rented.
3. $100 at the rate of $10 per month, heat, light and telephone included.

UNOPPOSED AND UNDISCUSSED MOTIONS.

Mr. Bourassa.—For a return showing the names of the postmasters who have been dismissed in the county of Levis since the month of September, 1911; the number of dismissed postmasters since the month of September, 1911, who have been appointed in the place of the postmasters dismissed under the late Administration, and the names of the postmasters who were dismissed under the late Administration.

[Mr. Pelletier.]

Mr. McCraney.—For a return showing how many towns in the province of Ontario have a population larger than the town of Chesley, South Riding of Bruce, which was 1,734, according to the last census, and how many of such towns are served by letter boxes on the street.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a return showing what was the local minimum rate of freight on small parcels on the Intercolonial railway prior to October 10, 1911, and also the present rate on the same.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. R. LEMIEUX: I wish to rise to a question of privilege, having regard to the answers given by the hon. Postmaster General to certain questions asked to-day by the hon. member for Peterborough East (Mr. Sexsmith) with regard to an official trip I made in 1911. I do not take objection to all of the answers, but, in order to elucidate matters, some little explanation is required on my part with regard to one or two of them. The first question is as follows:

Who accompanied the Hon. Mr. Lemieux on his Asiatic trip?

The answer to this is absolutely correct:

His private secretary, the Under Secretary of State and his secretary.

The second and third questions are:

How many stenographers accompanied him or were employed by him or his staff, and at what cost?

How many servants or valets were in or were engaged for the party?

The very able answer given by my hon. friend is as follows:

The department has no official knowledge about this.

I say that my hon. friend could have had the information for this, as he had for the other questions, from my secretary, who is still in the employ of his department; and my hon. friend, in courtesy to myself, would have been able to answer that there were no servants, no valets and no stenographers except my private secretary, as my hon. friend answered question one.

Question 5 reads:

Were the expenses of the said ladies or any portion thereof, paid by the Government of Canada, directly or indirectly.

To this the reply was:

There is nothing in the department about this.

I say this answer is not clear, and my hon. friend should have been able to ascertain from my private secretary, who is still in the employ of the department, if any moneys were paid for ladies accompanying

the Postmaster General on that trip. To questions 7 and 8, I have nothing to say, except that if my hon. friend would inquire from the gentleman who was my private secretary at the time, he would know that there were contributions, not from the Imperial Government of Great Britain, but from the Government of Japan, in connection with that trip. I want to elucidate this matter so as to leave no doubt in the minds of hon. gentlemen.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER: Surely the hon. member for Rouville is not very serious in saying that I should have gone to his former private secretary to get information for the House. I would think that I was bound to give an answer from the files in the department. I once gave information to the House which came from my hon. friend's former private secretary, and it has been used against me to such an extent that I am not going to do so any more.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Then I say that the answer given by my hon. friend is not honest.

Mr. PELLETIER: The answer is straight and honest, much more than Berard, of Gouin, Lemieux & Berard could give.

Mr. SPEAKER: The observation of the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) is scarcely in order, as the rule is laid down quite clearly that the answer as given by a minister must be accepted, whether it covers the whole of the question or not. The point raised by the hon. gentleman is scarcely a question of privilege, but rather an explanation, which, of course, the hon. member would be quite entitled to make.

MOTOR BOATS AND THE MILITIA.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON: I would ask the Minister of Militia and Defence if his attention has been called to an article in one of the Government organs, the Mail, published in the city of Montreal, in this morning's issue. It bears the following headline:

Propose to organize fleets of power boats. Militia Department plans picturesque auxiliary to fighting forces of Canada, utilizing yachtsmen and boatmen of the Dominion.

Is there any truth in this rumour?

Hon. SAM. HUGHES (Minister of Militia): I know nothing whatever about the matter. It may have been all prearranged but I do not know anything about it. I have no information about anything of the kind.

PUBLIC WORKS AT FREDERICTON.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. CARVELL: I desire to call the attention of the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Public Works, to an article in the St. John Globe of February 10, copied, as I understand, from the Fredericton Gleaner of a previous date, which paper I was unable to get in the reading room as I was told that a member had it out. It is this statement from the hon. member for York (Mr. McLeod):

Moreover I am in a position to announce that Hon. Robert Rogers, Minister of Public Works, has promised me two new concrete wharfs for Fredericton and instructions have already been wired to Mr. J. K. Scammel, Public Works Department divisional engineer, to have his staff of engineers come here at once and make the surveys preparatory to getting the plans and specifications out so that tenders can be called for and the work started at the earliest possible moment.

There is an election pending in York for the local legislature, the nomination takes place to-day and the election one week from to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is scarcely keeping within the rules of order. In the first place, I may say that the practice of bringing in papers, reading articles from them and basing on those articles charges, is not one that has been tolerated to any great extent in the Imperial Parliament. I think the same rule would be a very good one here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: But it has been followed to a great extent in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Unfortunately it has, but when that is done I do not think it is permissible to go on and comment on it. If it is desired to ask a question, that will be allowed.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know how I could make my question intelligible to the hon. member if I did not explain the matter as fully as I have done. I want to ask if it be a fact that the Minister of Public Works has promised the hon. member, Mr. McLeod, two new concrete wharfs in the city of Fredericton and the instructions have been wired to Mr. Scammel, the department engineer, to make the surveys preparatory to beginning the work at once.

Mr. BORDEN: I hope my hon. friend will realize that I really am not able to keep in touch with all the administrative affairs of thirty different departments of the Government, and therefore I have no information whatever on the subject. I shall direct the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the hon. gentleman's question without delay.

PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS AND DOMINION OFFICIALS.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. OLIVER: The day before yesterday the Minister of Public Works promised to give information to me and to the House as to the source of an alleged interview from which he read during the course of the discussion. He has not seen fit to do it and I am awaiting the information.

Mr. BORDEN: I shall direct the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the hon. gentleman's inquiry.

RULES OF THE HOUSE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. VERVILLE: I rise to a question of privilege in respect to the taking of to-day (Thursday) as a Government day. I raise this question owing to the fact that there are many Public Bills now on the Order Paper that may not be reached again this session. In the session of 1910, November 17 was the opening day and I presented my Eight-hour Bill for its second reading on the 15th of December, which was the fifth Thursday of the session. On the previous night the leader of the Government to-day, who was then leader of the Opposition, asked the minister who was leading the House, Hon. Wm. Paterson, about this matter, and he was told by Mr. Paterson that the next day was not a Government day. The right hon. leader of the Opposition will find that at page 1338 of the 'Hansard' of 1910. At page 1407 of the same volume he will find the report of the second reading of the Eight-hour Bill. I would like to know why this thing has been changed. I have no doubt there are many members anxious to present Bills who will now not have a chance this session.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I was consulted about that, I may say that it seems clear to me that as the House opened on Thursday the 15th, the first four weeks of the session ended on Wednesday last. The rule provides that during the first four weeks of the session, Thursday shall be reserved for private members, after which it becomes a Government day. My impression is, and I am so advised by the clerk, that the four weeks were up on Wednesday night last, and therefore of course Thursday becomes a Government day.

Mr. VERVILLE: I think it would be unfair if I were not allowed to proceed with my Bill. I am just speaking for myself, and I would like to ask whether the Prime Minister will give me an opportunity of bringing it before the House at some future date. I am registering this protest, because I remember in a previous session, private members were granted the first five Thursdays.

Mr. BORDEN: I am informed by the clerk—I have no personal knowledge of it—that the question the hon. gentleman has raised was debated on one occasion in this House, and that the practice under the rule was settled some years ago. However, I shall obtain exact information and furnish it to my hon. friend and to the House generally on some future occasion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The question really is: when does the first week of the session commence. We met here on Thursday. The question is whether the session commenced on Thursday or on the following day. It is clear we cannot do anything on the first day we meet, and I think the first week should commence on the following day, Friday. But, if you are going to count the week as beginning from the day we first met the contention of Mr. Speaker is right. I think a liberal interpretation should be given to the rule, and that the week should commence on Friday.

Mr. BORDEN: There was a tradition a number of years ago, that the first day was not to be counted in respect to the attendance of members, but I think that practice is entirely done away with and that the opening day is now counted as the first day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It would be counted as one of the 15 days of absence.

Mr. BORDEN: If Parliament opens on Thursday, then following the terms of the rule I suppose the week ends on the following Wednesday. However, the clerk tells me the subject has been discussed—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not remember.

Mr. BORDEN: I do not either. I shall make inquiry, and if there is anything further to be said, I shall be glad to inform my right hon. friend.

COLD STORAGE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. LEMIEUX: Might I ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture whether the statement appearing in this morning's Gazette, is true: that a Bill for cold storage is going to be introduced by the hon. gentleman. I wish to ask whether it is a substitute for the Bill already introduced this session by my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. G. H. Bradbury).

Mr. BURRELL: The whole matter is under consideration and it is quite probable the Government will introduce the measure. I cannot give any further information.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS: I desire to say a word or two on a question of privilege. Yesterday's Toronto Globe, unfair and untruthful as usual, reported me as having expressed myself hostile to labour unions. The article is headed: 'Hostile to unions is Minister of Labour'; and, referring to myself, it says:

> He practically declared that the Government was against international labour unionism in Canada.

I said nothing whatever on the occasion referred to by this reporter, which by any honest man could be twisted into any such statement. I have addressed working people from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and on every occasion I have advised them, in their own interests, to join labour unions regardless of whether they were national or international. There is no ground whatever for the statement contained in The Globe, and I think the man who wrote it, knew that.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I wish to ask the Prime Minister for an explanation of a statement he made on Tuesday last, when introducing the Redistribution Bill. The Prime Minister, referring to Prince Edward Island, said as reported in 'Hansard.'

> It has been noted that in 1882 the Redistribution Bill did not diminish the representation of the province of Prince Edward Island, although according to the census of 1881, Prince Edward Island was at that time entitled to no more than five members. At first I was very much impressed by this circumstance, but I observed that in a speech made by the hon. member for Kings, Prince Edward Island, in 1903, who argued strongly and forcibly against the claims put forward on behalf of the province at that time, he attributed this result to the fact that there was no previous census with which the census of 1881 could be compared for the purposes of subsection 4 of section 51 of the British North America Act so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, and probably that accounts for the result in 1882.

I wish to ask the Prime Minister what claims were put forward on behalf of Prince Edward Island at that time, and by whom? I also ask him when and how I argued against such claims. I have looked through 'Hansard' of 1903, and I can find nothing there to warrant, in my judgment, the Prime Minister making that statement.

Mr. BORDEN: I certainly read in the debate of 1903 the observations to which I alluded. I will endeavour to find them again and send the hon. gentleman a memorandum. I do not think there will be any difficulty about that.

RULES OF THE HOUSE.

On the order being called for Committee of Supply:

Mr. BORDEN: Would it be convenient for me to take up the estimates of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have no objection at all, but before we pass to the discussion of the Estimates there is a question of procedure which I would like to settle with my right hon. friend. On Tuesday the House was moved into Committee of Supply, and we discussed the Labour Department Estimates. Then I understand that to-day, the Speaker leaving the Chair, we can go again into Supply on the Department of Labour Estimates, because they were taken up on a day other than Thursday or Friday. When my hon. friend moved the House into Committee of Supply for the first time some days ago—it was on Friday and, Mr. Speaker was in the Chair—I raised the point that the Chair could not be left on that day and no Supply taken because no department had then been discussed. My right hon. friend seemed to agree with me, and I understood him to say that on that day we were proceeding by consent of the House, and that therefore it would not constitute a precedent.

No Estimates of a department could be

taken up unless it had been discussed on a day other than Thursday or Friday. If my construction is right, my right hon. friend could not go into the Department of the Northwest Mounted Police to-day because it has not been discussed on any other day except the days to which I have alluded. I raise the point, not because I want to prevent my hon. friend from going on, but just to ascertain what his idea as to the rule is.

Mr. BORDEN: I think that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and I are absolutely at one in regard to that. We can take up, as I understand it, without consent, Customs, Marine and Fisheries, Railways, Indian Affairs and Labour, all of which have been partially discussed, and some items passed on days other than Thursday or Friday. I understand that outside of these departments we cannot proceed either to-day or to-morrow except with the consent of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am satisfied.

Mr. OLIVER: Do I understand my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) to say that Indian Affairs has been taken up ?

Mr. BORDEN: I understand so.

Mr. OLIVER: Civil Government has, but I understood that Civil Government in connection with all departments was put through by consent, and that it did not affect the principle which has been alluded to and which would be applicable to the other estimates of the department,

Mr. BORDEN: I would not like to commit myself as to that for the moment, as I have not considered it. I understood that Indian Affairs had been discussed to some extent outside of Civil Government. I may be in error in regard to that.

Mr. OLIVER: I did not know that they had been.

Mr. BORDEN: I do not know that they have either. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche) tells me that my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) is right in that regard, and that only Civil Government has been discussed. As to the point which the hon. gentleman has raised, I will give it consideration. I would not be prepared to say at the moment without thinking it over. In the meantime, pending consideration of that, I would not go on except by consent, saving my right, however, to form a conclusion after I have examined the rule.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

Royal Northwest Mounted Police—North west territories, Yukon territory, provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan—pay of force, $478,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In looking over the report of the Northwest Mounted Police, I find that there have been 54 men stationed at Churchill in the territory which was annexed one or two years ago to the province of Manitoba. I do not know what arrangements have been made by my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) with the province of Manitoba in regard to the pay of that force. The province of Saskatchewan pays $75,000 towards the maintenance of the police, the province of Alberta pays a similar amount, and I would like to know what amount is paid, if any, by the province of Manitoba.

Mr. BORDEN: The force in Manitoba is a very small one, consisting of 22 men.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: More than that, I believe. I think it is given at 54 men in the report.

Mr. BORDEN: No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes, my right hon. friend is right; it is 22.

Mr. BORDEN: I am informed that the arrangement made with the province of Manitoba is that they pay $5,000 a year. There was a question asked about recruiting. I am prepared with the information on that point if hon. gentlemen would like it. It is contained in the following memorandum which has been furnished me by the comptroller:

It has been extremely difficult during the last two or three years to obtain recruits in Canada, nothwithstanding the increased rates of pay.

In April, 1912, recruiting was carried on in Winnipeg for one month resulting in the acceptance of only 11 men out of 75 applicants.

About the same time an officer was employed recruiting in Ontario for a couple of months and engaged only 26 men, 19 of whom were obtained in Toronto,—the rest of western Ontario furnishing only 7.

An officer was also sent to the Maritime provinces who secured 26 men in Nova Scotia, but none in New Brunswick.

Recruiting posters were sent to every post office within a radius of 50 miles of Ottawa, but no application for engagement resulted therefrom.

From the foregoing it will be seen that notwithstanding due notice of the recruiting having

been given by the distribution of posters throughout the towns and advertisements in the local newspapers, only 63 men were accepted for service throughout the whole of Canada, as a result of this recruiting. A few more men were engaged from time to time at Regina and Ottawa.

An officer being on leave in England during the summer of 1912 was instructed to secure from 25 to 30 men as an experiment and he brought out 29 men, who either paid their own expenses, or agreed to repay the advances made by the Government.

In the spring of 1913, the force being about 100 under strength, recruiting was carried on in Winnipeg for over a month and only 23 men were engaged. It was then decided to recruit in England and in the month of July 98 men of a very superior class were engaged, out of about 1,300 applicants, and sent to Regina, the Government advancing the transport, the men repaying the cost of the journey from Quebec to Regina, namely, $27.98,—that from London to Quebec $24.33 being borne by the police appropriation.

During the year 1913, 259 recruits were accepted for service, 161 of whom were engaged in Canada and 98 in Great Britain.

Of the 161 engaged in Canada 19 only were Canadian born, 127 being natives of the old country, a large number of whom came out to join the force after the engagement of recruits in London. Of the balance of the 259, 6 were born in India, 4 in the United States, and 1 each in Jamaica, Australia, France, Germany and Denmark.

The force is now up to its full strength, namely, 760, and the engagement of men in England last summer has resulted in a continual flow of applications from young men of good education, well fitted for the work, who are willing to come out to Canada at their own expense to join the force.

Attached hereto is a statement showing the countries of birth of recruits engaged during the calendar years 1912 and 1913.

Respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) Lawrence Fortescue.
Comptroller Royal
Northwest Mounted Police.

Statement showing the countries of birth of recruits engaged during the calendar years 1912 and 1913.

Country.	Year 1912.	Year 1913.	Total.	Percentage.
Canada	50	19	69	14
Great Britain	154	225	379	79
Newfoundland	1	..	1	
Australia	3	1	4	
South Africa	1	..	1	
United States	5	4	9	1.8
Germany	2	1	3	
Austria	2	..	2	
Denmark	1	1	2	
Sweden	1	..	1	
West Indies	..	1	1	
India	..	6	6	1.2
France	..	1	1	
	220	259	479	

Mr. PROULX: Is it not necessary that a man should be a British subject before being engaged in that service?

Mr. BORDEN: The comptroller tells me he must take the oath of allegiance and of office but that he need not be a British subject.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: From the memorandum which has just been read by my right hon. friend, I understand that he has had some difficulty in recruiting.

4 p.m.

From a perusal of the report my impression is that conditions at the present time seem to be excellent for recruiting. The report says that the force lost 300 men as follows:

Time expired	17
Purchased	71
Invalided	3
Pensioned (including 3 officers)	6
Died	3
Deserted	43
Dismissed for bad conduct	49
Dismissed for inefficiency	7
Special constables discharged	101
Total decrease	300

The total increase for the year 1913 was 109 men.

I now read this from the report:

284 recruits were engaged during the year as compared with 203 last year; 98 of these were engaged by the comptroller in England last July and arrived at headquarters in batches during August. They were carefully selected and a fine lot physically; 45 were old soldiers, a large proportion from the Guards and Cavalry. All promised to be very serviceable members of the force.

The present conditions of recruiting are excellent. Applications are received daily. Only those of apparently superior merit are accepted. I attribute this to improved conditions, to the very substantial increase of pay granted this year and the lack of suitable civil employment.

Some time ago my right hon. friend said there was insufficient recruiting for the Mounted Police. I was surprised at that statement and looked up the report, and I found my case strengthened by the statement there that there is no difficulty in securing recruits; that the present conditions of recruiting are excellent; that applications are received daily, and that only those of superior merit are accepted.

Recruiting in England is very valuable because among the ex-army men there can be found candidates admirably suited for the service. An equally as good source of recruiting, however, is to be found among our young Canadians, many of whom are always ready to enter this adventurous service. I wish it were even better known than at the present, that the Royal Northwest Mounted Police service affords a very attractive opening for young men of courage, good physique, and intelligence. If

young man enters the force at the age of twenty, after twenty years' service, when he is still a comparatively young man, he receives a pension, which though not large, is sufficient to support him. He knows the country thoroughly; he has had occasion to patrol it, and to see it from the American boundary to the Arctic ocean, and consequently he can settle down where his enterprise may lead him. For these reasons the force has always been rather popular.

Mr. BORDEN: I think my right hon. friend has perhaps not fully appreciated the clause which I read just now as to the source of the recruiting available at the present time:

> The force is now up to its full strength, namely, 760, and the engagement of men in England last summer has resulted in a continual flow of applications from young men of good education, well fitted for the work, who are willing to come out to Canada at their own expense to join the force.

The composition of the force at the present time is as follows:

Born in the United Kingdom	490
Born in Canada	76
Born in other British possessions	24
Born in the United States	10
Born in other foreign countries	17
Total	617

The recruiting of native born Canadians has not been quite so successful as might have been expected, considering that the force undoubtedly possess a certain attractiveness for those who are disposed to enter upon a life such as the right hon. gentleman has described. There has always been full opportunity given for promotion from the ranks, under the Administration of my right hon. friend and of his predecessor, and under the present Administration.

Mr. OLIVER: At what date did recruiting in England begin?

Mr. BORDEN: In July, 1913. The force being about 100 under strength, recruiting was carried on in Winnipeg for over a month and only 23 men enlisted. It was then decided to recruit in England and in the month of July, 98 men of a very superior class were engaged, out of about 1,300 applicants.

Mr. OLIVER: When was recruiting entered upon in England?

Mr. BORDEN: During the previous year some recruiting was carried on and 29 men were procured.

Mr. OLIVER: While it is easier to secure a sufficient enlistment by opening recruiting offices in England, I do not think the results in the efficiency of the force are going to be as satisfactory as if the recruiting was carried on solely in Canada; quite irrespective of the fact of whether the recruit is of Canadian or of British birth. If a man has left his original home in the British Isles on his own initiative and has fought his own way in Canada for a greater or lesser period thereby becoming familiar with the conditions of life and with the people, I would consider him to be very much more eligible and better fitted for the work than if, never having shown that initiative, he has enlisted in England, and is without any previous knowledge of Canadian conditions. Just in proportion as it is easier to get men on the other side, are those men liable not to be as efficient after entering upon their duties as if they had been enlisted on this side, after a residence in Canada.

The Mounted Police force differs radically from a military force. In a military force, until very recent years at any rate, obedience, conformity to discipline, was the great requirement, but in the Mounted Police force where men are operating at vast distances from headquarters, perhaps individually or with only a very small number and with, possibly, only a very subordinate officer in charge, unless they have individual initiative—which no training can supply but which must be in a man to begin with, to be developed—they cannot act with desired efficiency. I wish to place these views strongly before the minister for his consideration.

Mr. BORDEN: I appreciate what has been said by my hon. friend, but I would like him to remember that recruiting was not undertaken in England until every reasonable effort had been exhausted in this country, efforts made not only in the West, but in Ontario and the Maritime provinces. I am informed by the Comptroller that the men who have recently come from England have made very satisfactory members of the force. I know that we are supposed to have in this country a people possessed of greater initiative than those of countries where conditions of life are more stereotyped; but I think my hon. friend will remember that the native of the British Islands, when he has been tested, has been found possessed of very remarkable powers of initiative. The Civil Service of India contains many

examples of men scattered all over the country, at very great distances from headquarters or from those who can give them instructions, who have acted in times of urgency or danger in a way which forbids us to think that the natives of the British Islands are not possessed of a great initiative when the demand is made. We have recruited in the British Islands because it seemed necessary, and so far as my information goes, the result of that recruiting, up to the present time, has been absolutely satisfactory. The men are of good education, and perform their duties in a thoroughly capable and reliable manner. While I should be glad if more Canadians had been attracted by the inducements to join the force, I am bound to say that the results of recruiting in the British Islands are all that we could reasonably have expected.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: While no one would condemn the recruiting of the force in the British Islands at the same time I think we have a good recruiting ground in Canada. I should be far from discouraging recruiting in the British Islands. The men recruited there are chiefly old soldiers, and naturally would make excellent members of the force, but I do not think we could expect them to reach the standard of excellence of Canadians recruited very early in life. The example of the Civil Service of India is not at all apposite to the question. The members of the Indian Civil Service are sent to their work in their youth, after having received a special training for their duties, and, as all the world knows, they perform those duties most admirably. The fact that these young men direct the affairs of so many millions of people is the best testimony to their fitness; but the men who are brought over from England to serve in the Mounted Police are not of that character. If they are officers and men who have taken their discharge from the army, they must be relatively older, and, as the hon. member for Edmonton says, they have not the pliancy and the elasticity required in a constable of the Mounted Police. The Mounted Police constables, as my right hon. friend knows, must discharge not only the duties generally discharged by policemen, but duties of an infinitely varied character. Their best work is not so much seeing to the enforcement of the law and looking after offenders, but in rendering service to the settlers. If it has been deemed necessary to go to England for recruits, I am glad that recruiting there has been so successful.

There is one thing to which I would call the attention of my right hon. friend. I see by the latest report of the Mounted Police that the number of crimes has largely increased in the three provinces in which the force operate, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, as might be expected, because with the large immigration, even though those immigrants be of the best element, such as are coming at the present time, there must be in a new community a greater number of crimes than in the old-settled portions of the country; but I notice with regret that there has been an increase in the number of the graver offences, especially murder. I do not know how far the administration of justice may be responsible but I observe also that there have been quite a number of commutations of the death sentence. We had a discussion the other day on the death penalty which I am sorry was not concluded, but, whatever opinion we may have formed on that subject, I am sure we must all hold that, so long as the law remains as it is and murder is punishable by death, then, only under the gravest possible circumstances should the sentence of the court be interfered with. I regret that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) is not in his place, but even in his absence I would call attention to cases referred to in which the sentence of death has been commuted. I read from the report, page 18, section 3:

> Rex vs Bertrand. Convicted and sentenced to death; latterly commuted to life imprisonment. A cold-blooded case of uxoricide. He was charged with having murdered his wife at High River, Alta., by wilfully shooting her with a shotgun. It appears that Mrs. Bertrand owned certain property which her husband endeavoured to get control and possession of, but she steadily refused to let him get title or control. This matter seems to have been a bone of contention between them, leading to violent quarrels, and ultimately to the crime of which Bertrand was convicted.

This was a shocking crime; it is difficult to appreciate what reasons induced the Minister of Justice to recommend to clemency in this case. The next case is that of Rex vs. Verri:

> Convicted and condemned to death, but latterly commuted to life imprisonment. A Calgary police case, result of drunken brawl. Verri stood indicted with the murder of another half-breed by name of Alfred Glenn. It appears that the former was intoxicated, quarrelled with his wife, went out of the tent in which he was living and announced that he was ready to fight any one. The late Alfred Glenn,

a neighbour who lived in an adjoining tent, and had nothing whatever to do with the family quarrel, stuck his head out of the flap of the tent to ascertain the cause of the trouble, whereupon Verri smashed him on the head with a beer bottle, and inflicted serious injuries. Glenn was taken into hospital but succumbed in about ten days' time.

Here another horrible crime is reported, for which no possible excuse could be given on behalf of the convicted man. The next case is that of Rex vs. Stokely:

Convicted and condemned to death, but latterly commuted to life imprisonment.

Edwin Stokely stood charged with having wilfully shot and killed his brother, Frederick Stokely. They resided on adjoining quarter sections near Webber, Alta., and were recent arrivals from the United States. Bad blood seems to have existed between them for some time over certain family affairs, and to which, latterly, difficulties over money matters were added.

This is even more shocking than the others. The next case is that of Rex vs. Luzinski, a Galician:

Convicted and sentenced to death; latterly commuted to life imprisonment.

The body of an unknown man—afterwards identified as one Paul Malowski, a Galician in the employ of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, was found in small bluff covered with brush, within the town limits of Melville, Saskatchewan. The left side of deceased's face had evidently been struck with some heavy instrument, and the post mortem revealed that the jaw and cheek bones had been badly fractured. One of the Crown witnesses at the trial deposed that on Saturday evening, December 30, 1911, the accused persuaded Malowski to go with him on the pretext of visiting a farmer three miles away. Malowski at first demurred, because he said he had not suitable or sufficient clothes for the journey, and Luzinski thereupon lent him some of his own. The two men left together, and in about an hour afterwards Luzinski came back alone. He explained that they had met the party on the road, whom they went out to visit, and that Malowski drove on with the farmer, while he (Luzinski) turned back. Malowski was never seen alive again. It was known that Malowski was carrying a considerable sum of money on his person. Robbery was undoubtedly the motive of the crime, because, when the dead body of Malowski was discovered his pockets were rifled, and all his money and valuables missing.

In this case the evidence was evidently circumstantial, though it pointed strongly to the fact that Luzinski was the murderer. Still, there may have been something missing in the circumstances which induced the department to come to the conclusion that the prisoner ought to be given the benefit of the doubt, and that the sentence of death should not be carried out. But the other three cases, those of Bertrand, Verri and Stokely, seem to be cases of absolutely heinous murder, in respect of which nothing could possibly be said in favour of the accused. It is admitted that the law in the western provinces, from the time the police force was established more than thirty years ago, has been most admirably carried out, and that the country has been comparatively free from crime. It is also apparent that the sight of the uniform has had a deterrent effect upon evil doers. There is no doubt but that the administration of the law has been just and merciful, and that where the court has come to the conclusion that a man is guilty, the penalty allotted by law should be carried out. But in these four cases there has been an interference with the sentence of the court. I do not want to attach any blame to the department, because there may have been good reasons for the course taken, but if there were good reasons they do not appear here, and it seems to me that some explanation should be made by my right hon. friend or by the Minister of Justice as to why these sentences were not carried out.

Mr. BORDEN: With respect to the cases to which my right hon. friend has called attention, there are two of them that I do not at all recall, but as to the other two, I do recall the circumstances which were brought to our attention by the Minister of Justice.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Which were they?

Mr. BORDEN: I remember the case of Stokely and the case of Luzinski, but I do not remember them with sufficient clearness to discuss them. Indeed, I would not care to discuss them in the absence of the Minister of Justice, as certain principles have been laid down as to the discussion of such matters, the exact nature of which I do not recall at the moment, but from which I would not like to depart. My right hon. friend of course knows that in every one of such cases the presiding judge is consulted and makes a report, and a good deal of importance is attached to his recommendation. Although I do not intend to suggest—because I do not remember—that in all these cases there was any such recommendation from the judge, it is my impression that in at least one of the cases to which reference has been made there was such a recommendation. In some of the cases, if I remember correctly, the evidence was somewhat circumstantial.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The case of Luzinski?

Mr. BORDEN: Yes, and possibly one of the others. I would not like it to be understood, from the reading of the cases to which the right hon. gentleman has called attention, that so large a percentage of capital cases as would be suggested by the enumeration of these four, have resulted in commutation. In a great many of these cases the questions submitted to the consideration of the Minister of Justice are rather difficult, and, as has always been the case, the report to council is always carefully considered. I think our practice in that regard is different from that prevailing in Great Britain, because I believe that there these cases do not go before the Cabinet at all; I think they are dealt with by the Home Secretary. Here the practice is to have them considered in the first instance by an officer of the Department of Justice who has had large experience.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Who is that officer now?

Mr. BORDEN: Mr. Coté, I think; he has had a large experience in performing duties of that character. After he has made his report upon the case, not only his report but the whole of the evidence is read by the Minister of Justice himself, and if there has not already been a report from the judge who tried the case, that report is asked for. In fact I know that the Minister of Justice has addressed letters to all the judges of the country asking that in every case such a report should be sent to him at the earliest possible moment, in order that certain delays which have taken place in a few instances may be avoided in the future. The Minister of Justice, upon consideration of Mr. Coté's report and of the evidence itself and of all that may be urged by any person on behalf of the man convicted, makes his report to Council, and then all these reports are very carefully considered in Council, and we endeavour to discharge what seems to be our plain duty in every case. Naturally in such matters those who are called upon to consider the question of commutation may not always entertain exactly the same opinion. The duty of deciding upon such cases is not only a very responsible but a very difficult one. I appreciate thoroughly the importance of what the right hon. gentleman has said as to the necessity of a strict adherence to the verdict of the jury and the sentence pronounced thereon. We have not departed from that principle except in cases where it seemed our manifest duty to do so. I shall inform the Minister of Justice of the observations which the right hon. gentleman has made with regard to cases which have been mentioned, and ask him to give his consideration to what may properly be said in regard to them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have no doubt whatever that the advisers of His Excellency, no matter who they may be, in the advice which they give to His Excellency with regard to these extreme sentences of the law, are actuated only by their own honest and conscientious convictions. Indeed it would be horrible to suppose anything to the contrary. But even while this is a principle which is well known, I have known, in the course of my life, such advice to be discussed in Parliament and very seriously criticised. I do not want to find any fault in the present instance; but on looking over the report I find that we have four cases of brutal murder, and on the face of the report it is impossible to conceive, in at least three of the cases, what reasons could have existed to induce the Minister of Justice to advise the commuting of the sentence. In the fourth case, the Luzinsky case, the evidence was circumstantial, and while it strongly pointed to the man who was indicted, perhaps there was in this case some link missing which did not satisfy the Minister of Justice that, after all, the case was beyond all doubt. I do not say this by way of criticism. This report goes to the whole country and upon the face of it there are four cases there which would appear to have been commuted without sufficient reason. I will be glad to hear, at some future date, what were the reasons of the Minister of Justice for advising commutation in such cases.

Mr. BORDEN: There was another case, the Stokely case, where there were very peculiar circumstances. It was a dispute over land, over a boundary as well as over cattle, and the evidence placed before us would indicate that both parties had gone armed to the scene of action. There was evidently a disposition on both sides to use firearms. The evidence rendered it uncertain, if I remember correctly, as to whether there was not a very strong attempt on both sides to get the opportunity to shoot first. That case was a very painful case. It was a quarrel between members of the same family.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Two brothers.

Mr. BORDEN: And evidently both sides had been determined to use firearms if necessary for their purpose. There was also a good deal of conflicting evidence as to the facts in the case, and I am not clear as to what the recommendation of the judge was. However, there will be an opportunity of discussing that later.

Mr. OLIVER: If I might revert to the views I expressed a little while ago in regard to the locality of recruiting of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police and the remarks of the Prime Minister, apparently what I said was misunderstood. My hon. friend seems to have thought that I was drawing a contrast between the respective ability of Canadians and old country men.

Mr. BORDEN: As to initiative only.

Mr. OLIVER: I can quite see that my hon. friend was under a misapprehension. I was drawing attention to the difference in initiative between different classes of old country men. The old country man who has come out here on his own initiative has demonstrated his initiative by coming out here and rustling for himself for a period before entering the force. As I understood the return, the large majority of the members of the force at the date of the information read by the Prime Minister, were of that class, in the proportion of something like 75 Canadians to 400 old country men. The condition that my right hon. friend has mentioned of the large proportion of old country men in the force is not new. From the very inception of the force and all through its history, a very large proportion of its membership, and of the most distinguished members of the force, were old country men, men who had become apprenticed to the conditions of life here and who were therefore well fitted to discharge the duties required of them. I speak of this, not for the purpose of mere discussion or argument, and I do not wish it understood that I make criticisms for the sake of criticism. I would like to have it understood that my only object is to secure the best possible result from the organization and efforts of the force. I am compelled to suggest that if it was possible to recruit sufficient men in Canada for the force up to a certain date, and that after that date it ceased to be possible, there is prima facie evidence that there was a change of conditions in the force, that rendered it less desirable as a vocation. That may have been because of conditions outside the force, or because of conditions inside the force. I draw the Prime Minister's attention to the point, for the purpose of suggesting to him the very great desirability of his dealing with this prima facie case, and finding out why, although up to a certain date, we had been able to get sufficient recruits in Canada—not all Canadian born it is true, but men who had Canadian experience—after a certain time we had to go outside of Canada to engage those with no Canadian experience, who had shown no individual initiative, and whose worth remained to be tried. It is desirable that there should be a careful examination in regard to that point. I wish to say further that there has been a serious increase in unpunished crime in the western provinces within recent years, the perpetrators not having been discovered. That also is a matter that should receive very, very, careful attention. It may be because of a change of conditions in the population of the provinces; it may be because of a lessening of efficiency in the force, and it may be because of the measure of divided authority that now exists as between the Dominion and the provinces. The arrangements as to the several responsibilities of the force as a force, and the responsibilities of the provinces, as responsible for the administration of law and paying for the upkeep of the force, may or may not be satisfactory, and such as lend themselves to efficiency. Or, is there a difficulty existing that in any way militates against the results that in former years were unquestioned, as the result of the direct administration of the mounted police force ?

Mr. BORDEN: The executive or military head of the force is exactly the same as it has been for a number of years. The Commissioner is Mr. Perry, a man of long experience who has been at the head of the force for some ten years or more, and who has been a member of the force for some 32 years. I do not know of any reason why the force should seem less attractive than formerly, and I should suppose that failure to obtain a sufficient number of recruits in Canada under arrangements made by the Comptroller and the Commissioner, must have been due to the fact that other opportunities for useful activity proved more attractive. Recruiting in England was not undertaken until we had failed to obtain a sufficient number of men in Canada. Of the 225 men natives of the British Isles who were enlisted in 1913 I think that only 98 were actually engaged in the British Isles; the

remainder being engaged in Canada, although I am not at all sure that those men had been in this country for a very long time. From the reports which I read a moment ago, I gathered that a great many came over to this country in the hope of an opportunity to enlist. The Comptroller informs me that many of them had been in this country, one or two years at the time of enlistment. Others, no doubt, only came over a short time before enlisting. With regard to the suggested friction or lack of harmony between the force and the provincial authorities who primarily are responsible for the administration of justice in those provinces, no such friction or lack of harmony has been brought to my attention and the Comptroller informs me that nothing of the kind has been brought to his attention by the Commissioner. In the absence of evidence to the contrary I am disposed to think that it does not exist.

Mr. OLIVER: I would like to impress this point because the credit of the force and the credit of Canada is very deeply involved. We have always prided ourselves upon the maintenance of law and order and the punishment of crime, particularly of serious crime, in the western provinces. When we find a condition in which, to an increasing degree, serious crime is unpunished the matter certainly calls for consideration and a search for whatever the cause may be.

Mr. BORDEN: Is my hon. friend referring to cases where the author of crime has not been detected?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. BORDEN: And no arrest made?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. The reason I ask as to the division of authority is that in the city of Edmonton, in the year 1912, a murder was committed; a woman was shot in her house and the perpetrator of the crime was never discovered. During the past summer a man named Hargraves was found murdered on the street and a man named McNulty was shot in his house. The perpetrators of these crimes were never discovered. I quite realize that primarily the responsibility rests upon the police of the town but, generally speaking, it rests upon the provincial authorities and I presume that in general the police force is called into question. If there is any friction, if there is any division of responsibility that tends to prevent the effective discovery of crime, it should be searched out and done away with. If there is no such disability, then, certainly the reason is all the greater why every consideration should be given to these terrible instances; because what has occurred in Edmonton is only what is occurring elsewhere. It is a feature of present conditions that the perpetrators of serious crimes are not discovered in the same proportion as prevailed in former days. If it is a question of jurisdiction or division of authority, let it be searched out and done away with in some way or another and let some readjustment be made. If it is a question of efficiency, that should be attended to. This changed condition is serious and I take this opportunity of bringing the attention of the Prime Minister and of the Government to it.

Mr. BORDEN: I shall send the hon. gentleman's observations to the Commissioner and ask him if he has anything to offer in regard to the situation which the hon. gentleman describes. If there is any friction, or lack of harmony, or division of responsibility, that has brought about any such results as are suggested, I certainly want to know that fact and to find a remedy for it if it can be found. Up to the present nothing of the kind has come to my attention. Should it come to my attention I will endeavour to provide a remedy.

Mr. MURPHY: The right hon. gentleman has given us the information as to the manner in which recruiting is carried on I would like to inquire how vacancies among the officers are filled. Is it by promotion or by bringing in others from the outside?

Mr. BORDEN: In some cases by promotion, and in some cases by the appointment of persons who are not in the force. I think the rule generally observed has been that at least half, and generally more than half, of the appointments to inspectorships are made from the force itself.

Mr. MURPHY: Has it been the custom for a certain number of years, when a vacancy occurs in the department at Ottawa, to bring in a person from the staff of officers to fill such vacancy?

Mr. BORDEN: No. Nothing of that kind has ever been done, and
5 p.m. the Comptroller informs me that it would be impracticable because these officers are under different pension enactments.

Mr. OLIVER: While there have been a considerable proportion of promotions from

the ranks of the non-commissioned officers to the commissioned officers, there have been a number of appointments of officers from the outside. That does not tend towards the retention of the best men in the force, nor does it tend to attract capable, ambitious and useful men from the outside. It may be said by my right hon. friend that the late Government, as their predecessors, on occasion appointed men from the outside to the force. At that time it was possible to recruit sufficiently for the force in Canada. Conditions, for some reason or other, have changed, and I would respectfully suggest that one improvement that might be made by the Government would be to let it be thoroughly understood that commissions in the Mounted Police force are available only to members of the force who have earned them by merit.

Mr. BORDEN: The Comptroller informs me that there have been about 12 appointments—I am not speaking with absolute accuracy—to inspectorships since the office has been under my administration, and that all have been filled from the force itself except two. I also gather that about a similar proportion to that prevailed under the Administration of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I mentioned a little while ago that at least half were filled from the force. Of course, the proportion is much greater than that—about five-sixths have been filled from the force according to the figures which I have just given to my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER: I believe it would have a good effect if the Prime Minister were to anounce as a measure of policy that hereafter commissions in the force would be filled from amongst the non-commissioned officers.

Mr. BORDEN: Yes. It sometimes happens that there is an opportunity to appoint some one from outside of the force who seems to possess the most excellent qualifications for the purpose. It sometimes happens that it is a little difficult to appoint from within the force on account of a question of seniority, or in view of the fact that persons who may be considered to have very strong claims by reason of length of service are perhaps a little advanced in years and have not the vigor and initiative which may be desired for certain posts on the force. Considerations of that kind have been urged upon me I think, in the two cases to which I have alluded, and these appointments were made from outside of the force for special reasons.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to suggest that the appointments made from outside may not be very meritorious.

Mr. BORDEN: I understand my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER: The fact that they are made from the outside has the effect upon the esprit of the force that my right hon. friend has mentioned.

Mr. BORDEN: I appreciate what my hon. friend has stated.

Royal Northwest Mounted Police—To compensate members of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police for injuries received while in the discharge of duty, $3,000.

Mr. OLIVER: So far as the matter has come to my attention in the past, the compensation paid for injuries received has hardly been on a scale proportionate to the injury suffered. I may be wrong in that, but that is the impression I have gathered. I think the department would be well advised to make liberal compensation to men who have suffered injury in the discharge of their duty, to the extent of liberal provision for closely dependent relatives in case of death or disablement resulting from such injury. The occasion may arise at any moment when a policeman must face death. He must take his choice between the discharge of his duty and his possible permanent disablement or the loss of his life. While there is no money compensation that will ever put the spirit of sacrifice into a man—if it is not there already it will not be there when the crisis comes—at the same time I think the country can well afford to let its servants know that the country at large has an interest with them in the discharge of their duty and is prepared to show that interest by liberal provision in the case of disablement or death, by provision for closely dependent relatives on a scale not based upon the conditions of a regular army in a European country, but based upon the conditions of life as they exist in this country and based further on the fact that the man who faces this danger does it, not because of discipline, not because he has been told to walk in a certain direction under a certain order, but with a full appreciation of the consequences to himself and simply because he has the highest regard for the duty that he has undertaken to perform.

Mr. BORDEN: I will bear in mind what my hon. friend has mentioned. If he will send me the names of the persons to whom he alludes, I shall be very glad to have their claims considered.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not speaking of a particular case; I am speaking generally. I am asking for information as to what the scale of compensation is. Is there any consideration for the widow of a constable killed in the discharge of his duty, and what is it?

Mr. BORDEN: Yes. The Commissioner informs me that the pension to a widow amounts to one-half of the pay of the man who has been killed. In some cases, as my hon. friend knows, special compensation has been voted by Parliament, for example, in the case of Inspector Fitzgerald.

Mr. OLIVER: Within the year some of the constables at Edmonton were required to arrest a settler who had suddenly become insane. One, if not two of them, were killed in making the arrest. I do not know if they left any dependents, but if they did, it was a case that came very close home. A constable, if he is to be efficient, must make up his mind on the instant as to whether he is to face death or disablement or not, and I think the country should be substantially behind him in that very difficult circumstance.

Mr. BORDEN: I agree with my hon. friend. In the case to which the hon. gentleman alludes, I understand that the immediate relative is a father who is in very comfortable circumstances, and no application for a pension has been made.

Mr. OLIVER: I was speaking generally. I only mentioned that case as one coming under my own notice and quite near my own home.

Mr. BORDEN: I quite concur in the spirit of the hon. gentleman's observations.

Royal Northwest Mounted Police—Pensions to families of members of the force who lost their lives while on duty: Beatrice Maud and Laura May Grundy, $36.61; Margaret Johnson Brooke, $273.75; Annie Eva Emily and Arthur Stewart Mountford Brooke, $109.50; Mrs. Elizabeth Willmett, $54.75; Mrs. Elizabeth Fitzgerald, $525; pension to J. B. Allan, $450.

Mr. OLIVER: These seem to be very small pensions.

Mr. BORDEN: In the case of Beatrice Maud and Laura May Grundy, the mother has remarried, and the pension, as reduced, continues to the children.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the vote for Margaret Johnson Brooke a pension to a widow?

Mr. BORDEN: Yes, the widow of a sergeant who was drowned while on duty.

Mr. OLIVER: It does seem to me that $273.75 a year is a very small pension for a woman in the prairie west, especially for the wife of a sergeant. If this sergeant lost his life in the discharge of his duty I think the country could well afford to pay a larger pension.

Mr. BORDEN: This is the same amount that has been voted for a number of years. In this case we do propose a supplementary estimate, for the reason that Mrs. Brooke has become insane, and there are circumstances, which I will explain on the Supplementary Estimates, which make it reasonable to make further provision.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: These pensions seem small, but they were recommended by a board whose recommendation was confirmed by Parliament. The pensions were thought to be the best that could be done at that time. These cases are of old standing.

Mr. BORDEN: They were all fixed after recommendation by the board.

Mr. OLIVER: The point I am trying to get at is that in view of the difficulties in recruiting for the force, it may be desirable to improve conditions in the force to correspond with the changed conditions of the country. One of the improvements I suggest is the granting of commissions only to members of the force, and another might be an increase of compensation in cases of injury or death.

Mr. BORDEN: I will ask the Comptroller to give consideration to what my hon. friend suggests and report to me with regard to it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the case of J. B. Allan?

Mr. BORDEN: This is an officer who was totally incapacitated by an Indian named Almighty Voice.

Mr. OLIVER: Last year he was paid $2,702.50, and the present vote is only $450.

Mr. BORDEN: We have acted along the line already suggested. In this case there was a question whether this officer should be superannuated under one Act or under

another. He made application to us indicating that he should have been superannuated under an Act which would give him a slightly increased pension. We gave him the increased pension and also paid him the arrears.

Civil Government—Office of the Conservation Commission, $35,800.

Mr. BORDEN: Some information was asked in regard to the Conservation Commission, and I had a memorandum prepared on the point which is as follows:

The work can be conveniently considered under the various branches of work:

(1) Forests:

The Trent watersheds survey report is now in the press. This area was selected because it is typical of thousands of square miles of cut-over lands in eastern Canada, and because the $10,000,000 invested in the Trent waterway gives the Dominion Government a special interest in this region. The report contains valuable recommendations respecting the reforesting of this area and data respecting the possible returns from it, if reforested.

The railway fire protection work is now organized in the West, and, so far as possible, in the East. The tremendous decrease in fire damage and the cordial co-operation of the railway companies demonstrate the wisdom and economic results of the railway fire legislation.

Material progress in collecting statistics of our forest resources has been made in British Columbia and Saskatchewan. Much attention has been given to forest conditions on Dominion lands, particularly as regards disposal of waste in cutting and to natural reproduction through control of methods of cutting.

(2) Fur-bearing animals:

A report on fur farming was published in 1913 and has already gone through two editions. Requests for it have been received from the principal European countries, Australia and the United States and Alaska. An enlarged and revised edition will be published in 1914. In Prince Edward Island there are 171 fox-farming companies with a capitalization of sixteen and one-quarter millions.

(3) Fisheries:

A report of the Canadian oyster by Dr. Jos. Stafford was published in 1913. The total cost of the report to the commission other than the printing and binding, was a small honorarium to the author, the cost of the field investigations having been borne by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

As a result of the interest excited by the Sea Fisheries report, published by the commission in 1912, the Government of British Columbia, in 1913, engaged Dr. Stafford to report on the transplanting of Atlantic oysters to the Pacific coast. The increasing interest in oyster-farming in the Maritime provinces, particularly Prince Edward Island, demonstrates the economic development of this industry.

(4) Agriculture:

The agricultural surveys were continued in 1913. They are carried on to ascertain whether agriculture is improving or the reverse, whether weeds, insect pests, etc., were increasing or decreasing. Thirty illustration farms—not experimental farms in any sense of the word—were carried on at a cost of less than $100 per farm They are designed to demonstrate that any farmer who will follow the recommendations of the agriculturists of the commission can obtain increased crops, can rid his farm of weeds and can increase its fertility. Farmers' improvement associations have been formed near each illustration farm and numerous addresses given by the agriculturists.

(5) Public health:

Special attention has been given to the pollution of waters used for civic water supplies. Evidence has been presented to the International Joint Commission respecting a sanitary survey of international waterways, and to the Pollution of Streams Committee.

The collection and disposal of garbage in urban municipalities and sewage disposal have received attention. Town planning and housing have been studied and, next June, the commission will act as hosts to the National City Planning Conference in Toronto. This convention is exciting interest throughout Canada and it is hoped that it will result in the passage of enabling legislation along the lines suited to Canadian conditions.

(6) Water-powers:

During 1913, the report on the proposition to dam the St. Lawrence at the Long Sault was published.

It contains in systematized form full information respecting Canada's rights on that river.

The water-powers of the Nelson, Hayes, Berens and Dauphin rivers in Manitoba were gauged, and in 1914 the work of the last three years will now be published as a report on the water-powers of the prairie provinces.

Work was continued on the water-powers of northern British Columbia. In 1914, the investigations of 1912, 1913 and 1914, covering the portion of the province lying between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the international boundary, will be published as a report on water-powers in British Columbia. A report of the waterworks and sewage systems of the Dominion was published in 1913.

(7) Coal:

The conservation of coal report is now in the press. It advocates more economic methods of utilization, such as briquetting and use of by-product coke ovens, and emphasizes the advantages of the leasehold system. The programme of work during the 1914 has not been finally decided upon, but will deal, in general, with the power situation in Canada, utilization of lignite to develop power at central plants, &c.

The bulletin 'Conservation' is issued monthly to all newspapers in Canada and to individuals who take an interest in the conservation of our natural resources.

The duty of the commission is to investigate, inquire, advise and inform. In so doing, they avoid, whenever possible, doing work that can be regarded as falling within the function of a governmental department. If it is occasionally necessary to do such work, it is only carried far enough to arouse interest in the work, or to indicate possible improvement, or to obtain the information necessary for intelligent judgment.

I was also asked for information as to the staff of the commission. Following is a list of the permanent officers and clerks

on the staff, together with their official titles and salaries:

James White, assistant to chairman, salary, $5,000; Clyde Leavitt, chief forester, $2,800; Leo. G. Denis, hydro-electrical engineer, $2,400; Wm. J. Dick, mining engineer, $2,400; F. C. Nunnick, agriculturist, $2,300; Thos. Grindlay, draughtsman, $1,800; Allen Donnell, assistant editor, $1,650; Helen A. Grange, librarian, $750; Lucy Hawkins, clerk, $650; Nellie Pepper, clerk, $600; Lorna Burwash, clerk, $600; Nauma F. Johnson, clerk, $600; Alice Beaulieu, clerk, $550; J. A. Macdonald, clerk, $800; Kathleen McElroy, clerk, $550; James Carrol, messenger, $550; W. J. O'Connor, messenger, $500.

Mr. OLIVER: I notice that mention is made of a considerable amount of practical work done by the commission, particularly in agriculture and in water power investigation. I was under the impression that when the commission was organized it was intended to be educative and not administrative. It would appear to me, from the list of its activities which has been read, that the commission has, to a considerable extent, become administrative. There is no objection to that so long as the work is necessary and is well done, and so long as that work does not cover ground occupied by any of the departments. It may be said —and it is absolutely true—that there is room for all the work that can be done by the commission and any one of the departments in many of these lines, but it is surely much better to have a single than a divided responsibility. If we are to look to the Department of Agriculture for agricultural demonstration and education, then the activities of the Conservation Commission in that line are not required. There is, to some extent, a waste of money, and there is what strikes me as being much worse than the mere expense—the fact that the Agricultural Department, may as well as the Conservation Commission, fail to take notice of matters that they would otherwise deal with, the Department of Agriculture assuming that the Conservation Commission will deal with it, and the Conservation Commission assuming that the Department of Agriculture will take it up. It may be that there is a well-defined sharing of responsibility and consequently no overlapping or omissions, but so far as we are informed there has been no such arrangement. If not, either the Conservation Commission should confine itself to purely educative work, or else, if it is going into administrative work, the measure of its administrative responsibility should be thoroughly understood and defined, as it is not likely to be by a general vote covering the total expenses in one sum.

Mr. BORDEN: I appreciate the importance of what my hon. friend has put before the committee. I may observe that the report which I have just read states that there is a desire and intention on the part of the commission not to duplicate the work of any department, and that in case they undertake any work which might seem to be the work of a department rather than that of the commission, they do so only for the purpose and to the extent of arousing interest in the subject. That is the intention they have; my hon. friend may have some doubt as to whether they give full effect to that intention. I know that the question of duplicating work is a very important one, and I entirely agree with what my hon. friend has said in that regard, but even among the departments of the Government, as he knows, there is sometimes a good deal of difficulty in avoiding some duplication. As between the commission and the several departments, I shall certainly use any influence I have to avoid duplication of the character alluded to by my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER: I said there were two points, of which the duplication was the minor point. The major point is the blank that may occur between the responsibilities assumed by the Conservation Commission and those assumed by the department. There may be, on the one hand, a duplication of over-lapping of work, and on the other hand—which is, to my mind, even more serious—a condition under which each party leaves the responsibility to the other, the result being that what should be done is not done.

Mr. BORDEN: From the report which I have read, it would seem that the commission endeavours to exercise a certain amount of vigilance with regard to matters which, although properly coming within the activities of the various departments of Government, nevertheless have some relation to the work which the commission is supposed to carry on. If the commission observes that some such work or some particular phase of any work is not receiving the attention which, in the opinion of the commission, it should receive from the department, then the commission, for the purpose of arousing interest, undertakes some work of that kind. If that is a correct statement of conditions, it would not be very likely that the difficulty to which my hon. friend has alluded would arise. I shall bear his observations in mind and if

he can suggest anything that might be done to avoid the detriment to the public interest which he regards as possible I would be very glad indeed to have the benefit of his suggestions or observations.

Mr. McCRANEY: There is a matter which I fancy is not irrelevant to this item, but which I wish to draw to the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister. There are in this country landmarks and national monuments which we wish to preserve. I notice, in looking through the London Times, that the Board of Works in the old country have the right to prevent the sale or demolition of property or houses, by issuing an order so as to give the Board of Works a period of eighteen months in which they may purchase the property on behalf of the Government if they so decide. I do not know if there is a department in this Government which has that power or whether it would be wise for the Government to acquire such power. I should think it would, and as we are dealing with the question of conservation, perhaps not in a sense intended when the commission was formed, I make the suggestion that perhaps the Prime Minister might think it well to give the Conservation Commission the power to obtain such an order and later on, if Parliament so thought, acquire the property for national purposes.

Mr. BORDEN: The question to which my hon. friend has called my attention hardly seems to pertain to the scope of this commission; nevertheless, it is deserving of very serious consideration. The same question has been under the consideration of the Government. The hon. gentleman will remember that a commission was formed for the purpose of preserving and beautifying the battlefields in the vicinity of the city of Quebec. Representations have been made to the Government from various parts of the country pointing out the importance of acquiring and preserving monuments or building or places of especial historic interest. That subject has been under the consideration of the Minister of Finance and one or two other members of the Government, but at the present moment I have nothing to announce except that it is under consideration, and that we may possibly be able to make an anouncement in regard to this at a later date.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am glad to hear the declaration made by the right hon. gentleman. We should do for our old fortifications and historic buildings what we have done for the Archives. For instance, it is well known that Dr. Doughty, a very able archivist, has practically authority to purchase any document of value to Canada; as a matter of fact, we know that for the last five or six years he has succeeded in getting from various countries, especially England, France and the United States, and I think even Russia, some most valuable documents for Canada. It seems to me that the Government should preserve historic fortifications. My hon. friend has referred to the Quebec Battlefields Commission. Everybody to-day acknowledges that no money could be better spent than in beautifying the surroundings of Quebec, and maintaining the landmarks around the battlefield. A commission, under the chairmanship of Sir George Garneau, has performed some very excellent work, and for my part I would not begrudge any sums of money that would be spent for like purposes.

The Art Commission appointed by the Government has also done some excellent work last year. Not very long ago I had occasion to visit the museum in Ottawa and I found that some very valuable paintings and sculptures, which are a credit to our country, had been purchased by the Government. The museum is now open to the public on Sundays, and this experiment has been such a success that it should induce the Government to also open the Archives on Sunday, and to enlarge the Archives building. Everybody knows that the building is already too small for its purpose, and I hope to see this year a vote for the enlargement of that very important building.

Mr. BORDEN: I appreciate the observations and suggestions of my hon. friend. It is very important that we should preserve, as far as possible, these objects of historic interest. The subject is under consideration. The Archives building will undoubtedly require enlargement in the near future. The subject has been brought to my attention by Mr. Doughty and I have already placed a communication before the Minister of Public Works about it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Did the right hon. gentleman impress on my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works the idea that if the building is enlarged space should be provided for the Royal Society of Canada? The members of the Royal Society meet here generally once a year, sometimes more

frequently, and they have no accommodation. The members are obliged to hold their sittings either at the Carnegie library or at the Normal school. It is not proper that this state society should hold its meetings outside of a public building belonging to the Government. As they also have a library and collections, etc., it seems to me that it would be proper for the Minister of Public Works to make provision in the Archives building for the accommodation of this society. It would be the most convenient place for the meeting of the members of this society.

Mr. BORDEN: I think the Minister of Public Works a few days ago stated that he had that suggestion under consideration.

Mr. OLIVER: Has the Conservation Commission considered the conditions that were proposed to be dealt with by the Bill introduced last year by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) in regard to the pollution of streams ?

Mr. BORDEN: The memorandum which I read, stated that special consideration had been given to that Bill.

Mr. OLIVER: Has any report been published in regard to it?

Mr. BORDEN: If I remember the memorandum correctly, there has been some report upon it. I cannot speak with absolute certainty, because the document has gone out to 'Hansard,' but that is my impression.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM: Shortly after the formation of the Conservation Commission; in connection with the investigation of other water-powers throughout Canada they looked into the water-powers that were created on the canals, such as the Lachine canal and the Welland canal. It is a matter of history that on both these canals there were a number of old leases which are somewhat difficult to deal with. Some of them were in perpetuity, I think, and those to whom these leases were granted having passed away, their estates were receiving some benefit as the leases were sublet to others. The Department of Railways and Canals in some instances, if I remember correctly, took means to get rid of these old leases and make new ones. The commission, I think, sent an officer to look over the situation in the Department of Railways and Canals, but I have not been able to find out just what conclusion they arrived at; whether they made any report as to the situation of all these water-powers, or whether any suggestions were made as to the best way of dealing with them. They are very difficult to deal with, because these old lease-holders, or their heirs, have certain rights which cannot be disposed of without a great deal of consideration. Perhaps my hon. friend can tell me if the commission has made any report on that.

Mr. BORDEN: I imagine that the report in question would appertain to the Department of Railways and Canals rather than to the commission, and the Minister of Railways can give my hon. friend more information on that than I can. At the moment, the only thing I can say on the subject is this: I know from reports of the Minister of Railways that a good many of the leases have been surrendered or cancelled, and new leases made. I could not give my hon. friend any reliable information as to the number of cases in which that has been done, but I do know that several cases of very long standing have been disposed of within the past twelve months. If my hon. friend desires, I will ask the Minister of Railways to prepare information on the subject.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. gentleman could hand me a synopsis of what has been done. There are quite a number of these leases, and as the new Welland canal is being constructed possibly some of the old rights will be interfered with in the new construction, and it is interesting to know what has been done. The Conservation Commission asked if they might be allowed to send their officer to investigate in the department, and I think he was given a free hand, but I have never been able to find out the result of his investigation.

Mr. BORDEN: Will there be any objection to taking up Civil Government—the Department of Finance and the Department of the Secretary of State?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: On the same condition.

Mr. BORDEN: Quite so.

Mr. OLIVER: Would it be possible, in this connection, to have the officers of the House take note of the business with a view to having a permanent and impartial record as to where the rights of the Opposition begin in regard to the moving of motions on going into Supply and how far they go? There has been a good deal of discussion across the floor of the House, and nothing has been passed except by consent, and there may be some dispute hereafter.

Mr. BORDEN: There could not possibly be any dispute with regard to this, because the rule says specifically that it must be taken up on some other day than Thursday or Friday. That is my recollection.

Mr. MARCIL: It might be possible to state in the Votes and Proceedings when the Estimates are called for the first time.

Mr. BORDEN: I will consult with the officers of the House. I do not think there will be any difficulty in that regard.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY.

Civil Government—Department of Finance and Treasury Board, $117,875.

Mr. PERLEY (Acting Minister of Finance): There is no alteration in the number of employees. One of the clerks, Mr. Russell, who has been in the service for a great number of years, has been given a promotion to subdivision 1A. His salary has not been increased, but he has been given promotion to the next grade. Otherwise, the condition is the same as it was last year.

Department of Finance — Contingencies, $23,000.

Mr. MURPHY: What is the reason for the increase in contingencies?

Mr. PERLEY: It is to cover the additional travelling expenses for inspecting outside offices. This amount used to be paid out of charges of management; it is now paid out of contingencies.

Civil Government—Departments generally—Contingencies—Care and cleaning of departmental buildings, including amount of $50 each to E. Snowden and W. E. H. Jeffrey for firing noon gun, $160,000.

Mr. MURPHY: The minister might explain the increase in that item.

Mr. PERLEY: This is the item out of which the cost of cleaning the different Government buildings is paid; it is to provide for the charwomen and charmen. Owing to the great increase of the business it has been found necessary to take more buildings, and this is to provide for the additional service for that purpose. It is carried on under the direction of a very competent officer who has been in the department for a great many years and who seems to be very careful about his expenditure.

[Mr. Oliver.]

Mr. MURPHY: I thought it was understood that when any outside buildings were rented the rent would cover such services as are provided for by this item?

Mr. PERLEY: I am not aware of any such arrangement. I have always understood that all the buildings rented by the Government were to be taken care of by the Government. I think that has always been the case where the whole building is rented.

Mr. MACDONALD: An increase of one-fourth is a pretty substantial one.

Mr. MURPHY: What is the custom in the case of a building only part of which is rented by the Government and in which there is a janitor service?

Mr. PERLEY: The particular rooms that are occupied by the Government are cleaned by us. I think that is the custom in most buildings which are rented for private purposes. We usually have to pay for that service or we have to get some one to do it.

Mr. MACDONALD: What are the additional buildings?

Mr. PERLEY: There is the Union Bank building at the corner of Sparks and Metcalfe streets, in which we have several of the upper stories; the Booth building; the Birks' building, and the building that is known as the Robinson building on Queen street between Metcalfe and Elgin streets. Last year there were 280 of these employees and now there are 355.

Civil Government—Department of Insurance—Salaries and contingencies, $43,262.50.

Mr. PERLEY: There is one clerk additional in the 2B at a salary of $1,000. I have the details as to certain clerks who have been promoted to the next subdivision.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the minister let us know who they are?

Mr. PERLEY: A. J. O'Reilly and G. D. Finlayson, from 1B to 1A; F. R. Crosby, W. H. Gilliland and A. N. MacTavish from 2A to 1B; F. A. Evans from 2B to 2A; and Miss Moyer from 3B to 3A. The rest of the increases are all statutory.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is the Finance Department acting with the Attorney General of Ontario in the prosecutions that are being carried on against the directors and manager of the Union Life Insurance Company?

Mr. PERLEY: I will get that information.

Civil Government—Office of the Auditor General—Salaries and contingencies, $139,950.

Mr. PERLEY: There is an increase of four clerks in that branch due to increase in the public business generally. I think we may trust the Auditor General to see that he does not employ a larger staff than is absolutely necessary for this important work.

Mr. MACLEAN: At the close of the last session of Parliament it was intimated by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) that some legislation would be introduced this year to assist in repairing the losses made by the depositors in the Farmers' Bank. Is that legislation to be brought down, and what is the nature and extent of it?

Mr. PERLEY: I am unable to give the information except to say that, so far as I know, the Bill has not yet been prepared.

Mr. MACLEAN: Is it likely to come down this session?

Mr. PERLEY: That will be in the hands of the Minister of Finance himself and as soon as he is able to get about—

Mr. MACLEAN: But a matter of Government policy will not be in the hands of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. PERLEY: My hon. friend may rest assured that the promises of the Prime Minister are always carried out.

Mr. MACDONALD: Except the Halifax platform.

Mr. SINCLAIR: May I suggest to the Government that when the legislation is introduced it be of a general nature, not referring particularly to the Farmers' bank. I am told that a number of other banks got into trouble in the past, and are in somewhat the same position as the Farmers' bank; instead of having an Act referring particularly to the Farmers' bank, we should have an Act which would apply to any bank in which the shareholders and depositors have made losses under similar circumstances, if we are going to become responsible.

Mr. PERLEY: The attention of the hon. Minister of Finance will be drawn to the suggestion of my hon. friend.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend might also call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that a great loss has been suffered by the shareholders of the Union Life and subsidiary companies. A great many shareholders have been practically ruined and a great deal of distress has resulted from the winding up of these companies. I hope we can have the promise of the acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Perley) that this matter will have the attention of the Government.

Mr. PERLEY: Does my hon. friend consider that the loss to the shareholders of the Union Life was caused by anything that was or was not done by the Department of Finance at the time that company was incorporated?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would say, just as much as in the case of the Farmers' bank, and the evidence and the report of the Royal Commissioner would fully sustain that position.

Mr. PERLEY: As to whether the Department of Insurance is acting with the Attorney General of Ontario in the cases against the directors of the Union Life, the superintendent of insurance is not here this evening, but the deputy informs me that he is quite sure that the superintendent of insurance is in touch with the Department of the Attorney General of Ontario in regard to the matter.

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the honourable Minister (Mr. Perley) what the Government intends to do abut refunding to the shareholders of the Farmers' Bank their money? Last year I asked the honourable Prime Minister the same question, that is, I asked him whether he intended to bring down a measure whatever to the effect of refunding the amounts deposited at the Farmers' Bank, mentioning at the same time, the people who had deposited money at the Banque de Saint Jean.

I wish that the honourable Minister, when he speaks to the Prime Minister about this, should also submit to him the case of the Banque de Saint Jean and of the Banque Ville Marie.

May I add that I would see with pleasure everybody indemnified for the losses he has suffered?

Mr. PERLEY: I will give to my hon. friend the same answer as I gave to the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). I will see that my hon. friend's remarks are brought to the attention of the Minister of Finance himself.

Civil Government—Department of the Secretary of State—Salaries and contingencies, $82,725.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the minister explain what the two decreases in the staff are?

Mr. CODERRE: A clerkship at $1,600, which has been in the Estimates for several years, has been dropped this year.

Mr. MURPHY: There were sixteen employees in the third division, subdivision B, last year, and only eleven this year; has there been a decrease in the work?

Mr. CODERRE: There have been promotions to subdivision A of the same division.

Mr. MURPHY: There are only two promotions apparent.

Mr. CODERRE: There is a decrease of five, made up of two existing vacancies and three that will be caused by promotion.

Mr. MURPHY: What is the increase in the item of contingencies for clerical assistance?

Mr. CODERRE: The number of returns brought down last year was three times the number brought down the previous year. We required temporary help for work connected with the granting of charters. The number of charters granted last year was larger by about two-thirds than the number granted the previous year.

Mr. MURPHY: What would the temporary help have to do with the granting of charters?

Mr. CODERRE: We required that help for the recording, the indexing and the typing of those charters.

Mr. MACDONALD: Have any steps been taken in the direction of appointing a King's Printer?

Mr. CODERRE: Under consideration.

Mr. MACDONALD: No appointment has yet been made?

Mr. CODERRE: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: I was told that the evening papers announced that an appointment had been made.

Mr. CODERRE: There have been hopes here and there, but I do not know if those hopes will be fulfilled.

Mr. MACDONALD: No announcement has been made?

Mr. CODERRE: No.

Civil Government—Department of Public Printing and Stationery—Salaries, including Assistant King's Printer and Controller of Stationery at $4,000, and contingencies, $79,862.50.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the minister explain the difference in the number of employees?

Mr. CODERRE: There is an item here for an Assistant King's Printer. That does not mean that the appointment will be made; but, in case there is need for the appointment the money will be there. During the year, the question has come up whether it would not be in the interest of the Printing Bureau to have an Assistant King's Printer appointed, but we had no money, and so the appointment was not made.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend says that some time during the year the question arose of appointing an Assistant King's Printer. That question is always present, as is the question of appointing men in every other department. But, he has not pointed out the reasons why this appointment should be made. The statute provides for four positions—King's Printer, Superintendent of Stationery, Superintendent of Printing and Accountant, and the occupant of each of these positions must, according to the Act, possess certain qualifications. In the past it has always been the custom to have the Superintendent of Printing replace the King's Printer when the King's Printer was absent through illness or other cause, because the King's Printer and the Superintendent of Printing are usually men of the same class of knowledge and technical ability. My hon. friend proposes now to change that by creating a new position which is not provided for under the statute, and for the creation of which, I venture to submit, he has not advanced any sufficient reason. The situation would probably be better understood if he would explain to the committee what duties the Assistant King's Printer would perform if appointed.

Mr. CODERRE: First of all, I must say that the appointment of an Assistant King's Printer is quite authorized by the law. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that there are four positions specifically provided by the law, and which he has mentioned, but there is in the law also a general clause authorizing the Governor in Council to appoint any other officers deemed necessary for the welfare of the department. During the illness of the late King's Printer, which lasted about six months, I believe, it was deemed desirable to have an assistant King's Printer to per-

form the duties which the law attaches to the King's Printer, but the appointment was not made, because unhappily the King's Printer died a few weeks ago. Other occasions might arise in the future making it necessary for the welfare of the Printing Bureau to appoint an assistant. The Superintendent of Printing, of course, is a good man and a faithful servant, but we find that in every department there is an assistant deputy minister, and I do not think there is any good reason why the same provision should not be made in the Printing Bureau. The hon. gentleman knows that there are between twelve and fifteen hundred men employed there.

Mr. MURPHY: No, I do not know that.

Mr. CODERRE: Then, I give the hon. gentleman that information. There are over twelve hundred men and women employed in the Printing Bureau to-day. That branch of the Administration is doing a large business, as the hon. gentleman knows, and I do not believe that any good reason can be given why, as it has been found necessary to have assistant deputy ministers in the other departments, it should not be desirable to have one in the Printing Bureau. This would not be the creation of a new position, because, under the very law passed in 1906, under which the King's Printer was appointed, Mr. McMahon, superintendent of printing, was appointed Assistant King's Printer. I assume that the reason was that an assistant to the deputy minister was found as necessary in this as in any other department.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend has completely proved my contention by citing the case he mentions. Mr. McMahon, in the absence of the King's Printer, was appointed Assistant King's Printer. But that did not involve the creation of a new position or an increase in the salary list. The Superintendent of Printing is supposed to possess the knowledge which will enable him to fill the position of King's Printer in that officer's absence. Under the law no special provision is made for the creation of the position of Assistant King's Printer, nor has provision been made for the salary by vote of this House. The hon. minister has not answered my question. I asked, in the event of this position being created and filled, what are to be the duties of the Assistant King's Printer as distinct from those allotted to the King's Printer and the Superintendent of Printing?

Mr. CODERRE: We must make a distinction between the case of the King's Printer being there at his work and the case of the King's Printer being compelled to be absent. Of course, in his absence the duties allotted to him will be performed by his assistant. But, even with the King's Printer attending to his duties, I submit, the task of controlling that branch of the Administration is too heavy for one man, however capable and competent he may be. The task should be shared with somebody else.

Mr. MURPHY: Does the hon. gentleman mean the printing branch?

Mr. CODERRE: I mean the whole thing, because the King's Printer has control of this whole department.

Mr. MURPHY: At that rate, the Assistant King's Printer will have control not only over the printing branch, but also over the stationery branch.

Mr. CODERRE: Yes, he will have to act in everything controlled by the King's Printer, under the King's Printer's orders.

Mr. MURPHY: If my hon. friend's contentions were well founded, he would have to have an assistant superintendent of stationery as well. He must know the provision of the Act whereby two superintendents are created, one for the printing branch and one for the stationery branch, relieving the King's Printer of the work to which he refers. There is no more reason for appointing an Assistant King's Printer who would look after the printing branch, than there would be to appoint an assistant superintendent of stationery, and very few possess the technical knowledge to look after both branches; in fact, I do not think there are any such men. But if he appoints one, he will find—even if it has not already been urged upon him—that demands will be made for the appointment of an assistant in the stationery branch.

What, then, would be that assistant's rank? Would he rank higher than the Controller of Stationery? The demands made upon my hon. friend were made upon every one of his predecessors, none of whom, however, yielded to them, knowing perfectly well that the department could be run properly with one responsible head, aided by two superintendents. I submit that my hon. friend has not given the committee any reason why this new position should be created. I sympathize very sincerely with him in the demands that I know are made

upon him for the creation of this position, but I say that he should not yield to them. If the position has been created and filled, I can only say that in my judgment it is simply a waste of public money to create a position for some gentleman whose friends have been clamorous enough to succeed in inducing the hon. gentleman, for whom I have the greatest respect, to do something that none of his predecessors would do.

Mr. CODERRE: I am in a position to say that no such demands have been made, so far as this position is concerned. I was the first who thought of it, and I thought of it after the two or three months had elapsed during which the King's Printer was unable to come to his office.

Mr. MURPHY: Who was looking after the Bureau during his absence?

Mr. CODERRE: The Superintendent of Printing was the acting King's Printer. Before these Estimates were presented, no one but myself and the officials of the department knew there was such an item in the Estimates. Some time before the death of the King's Printer, I thought such an appointment should be made, but we had no money, and that is why an appointment has not been made. In the future the same circumstances might arise, and I believe that in the interests of the department we should have the money ready to pay any man who might be thought fit to fill that position. This vote does not mean that the appointment will be made, but in the case of such a necessity arising we would like to have the money to pay the man who might be appointed. I do not know whether or not I understood my hon. friend correctly, but I may say that there is no intention of appointing an assistant to the Superintendent of Printing or the Controller of Stationery.

Mr. MURPHY: There is just as much reason for appointing one as the other.

Mr. CODERRE: I do not think so. We want a King's Printer, and we want an assistant to the King's Printer. The assistant would have as much authority over those persons whose functions have been mentioned by my hon. friend, as the King's Printer himself. He would act in the same capacity as an assistant deputy minister in any of the other departments. My own experience, while it has not extended over a very long time, has been such as to lead me to believe that this appointment is needed. Although it is not intended to make this appointment at once, I may say that the need for such a position was felt six months previous to the death of Mr. Parmelee, the late King's Printer.

Mr. MURPHY: Having some intimate knowledge of my hon. friend's office, I would be the last person in the House to object to the creation of this position, or even to criticise it, if the hon. gentleman advanced any reason why it should be created. In the same breath my hon. friend refutes himself; he says this position is badly needed, and at the same time he says it is not going to be filled.

Mr. CODERRE: Was badly needed.

Mr. MURPHY: It must be more badly needed now, when there is no King's Printer.

Mr. CODERRE: We expect to have one soon.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has he been appointed yet?

Mr. CODERRE: No.

Mr. MURPHY: Judging from the observations of my hon. friend, I should think that he intends to make the position of King's Printer a sinecure, and then have the assistants do the work. That will not contribute to the well-being of the institution. This Assistant King's Printer, according to my hon. friend, is to have authority over the stationery branch, that is, over the Superintendent of Stationery as well as over the Superintendent of Printing. My hon. friend says he did not hear anything about the appointment of an Assistant King's Printer. I take that cum grano salis, because several times during the past year the newspapers announced the appointment of an Assistant King's Printer, even mentioning the name of the gentleman who was to be appointed. This question of the appointment of an Assistant King's Printer has been rife for years, and I venture to say that every person who has occupied the position which I am glad to see my hon. friend filling has had that pressed on him from time to time. Heretofore those who pressed for the appointment were never able to satisfy the minister that there was any necessity for it. It is all very well for my hon. friend to say that the money will be voted and that the position will only be filled in case of an emergency. We understood the

day of emergency had passed; even this emergency at the Printing Bureau. Is it a fact that my hon. friend has leased premises outside the Printing Bureau, to which he has transferred the Stationery Branch?

Mr. CODERRE: Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: Then there is all the less reason why he should appoint the Assistant King's Printer. In all kindness, I wish to tell my hon. friend that the leasing of such premises and the dividing of the institution was what led to mismanagement and waste and loss a few years ago. The remedy for the over-crowded state of the Printing Bureau is not the leasing of new premises or the appointment of an Assistant King's Printer, but the building of a new Printing Bureau with ample accommodation for both branches. I presume my hon. friend has been obliged to seek premises elsewhere for the purpose of accommodating the stock of supplies and giving those employed in the Stationery Branch a chance to fill the orders from the different departments and from the Houses of Parliament. But that removes a large body of officials, some of whom occupy very responsible positions, from the Printing Bureau proper, and from under the eye of the official who, under the Act, is responsible to the minister and to Parliament for the proper conduct of both branches of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.

I would urge my hon. friend to secure a site at the very earliest date and proceed with the erection of a Printing Bureau which would be ample for the needs of the Government for the next fifty years. This division of labour, of stock and of supplies is one of the worst things that can be done. It was owing to it that great losses took place in years past. It is impossible to properly carry on an institution if it is divided in this way. There can be no proper check on deliveries or outgoings and in the end there will be loss, dissatisfaction, and endless trouble for the hon. gentleman or his successor. I again urge that neither the appointing of an Assistant King's Printer nor the leasing of new premises in different parts of the city will constitute a remedy for existing troubles. The remedy lies in the erection of a new building.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand that the selection of the new King's Printer has not yet been made by the Government?

Mr. CODERRE: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I suppose he has many applications and the names I see in the papers are all excellent names. I have seen especially the name of Mr. de la Broquerie Taché who is a gentleman from our province and well fitted for that position. Mr. Taché, although he is a political opponent of mine, is certainly well able to fill that post. He has been connected with the press and with printing establishments for over twenty-five years. He belongs to a highly respectable family, and I think he deserves well from the Government. If the choice should be that of Mr. Taché it would meet with the approval of the entire province.

I would like to say a word about another appointment, to fill the position of the late assistant archivist, Mr. Roy. Last year I understood the Postmaster General to say that the best appointment would be made. When the question of appointing an archivist came before the last Cabinet, political qualification were not thought of. Dr. Doughty was appointed, he was a newcomer in the country but he was taken because of his special fitness for the office and his appointment has certainly been a credit to Canada. Then came the appointment of Mr. Edmond Roy, of Quebec, as assistant archivist. Certainly, as regards French archives, he was an authority, not only in Canada but in France. Mr. Roy was a well-known Conservative, but Mr. Fisher, who was then Minister of Agriculture, did not care about his politics; he appointed Mr. Roy on account of his special qualifications, and I am bound to say that that appointment was hailed with pleasure by all those who took especial interest in the archives. If an appointment has not been made to the position of assistant, I would urge upon my hon. friend that he should select the man who is best equipped for that very special post. I have no recommendations to make except, perhaps, the one I have made verbally to my hon. friend. I think I suggested the name of Mr. Massicotte, now in the court house in Montreal, who, I think, is one of the electors of the Secretary of State. The hon. member knows that he is well versed in all matters pertaining to archives and history in general.

Mr. CODERRE: I am obliged to say to the hon. member for Rouville that Mr. Fabien Vanasse has been appointed to fill that vacancy.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When ?

Mr. CODERRE: About a month or six weeks ago. Of course I believe that the

Government will have to appoint a King's Printer pretty soon. Several names have been mentioned in the press and elsewhere, and I believe that all these names will meet the same approval from my hon. friend, because they are names of persons who are capable of filling the position very well. I believe I should be thankful to the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy), who has had experience and who has given me to-night the benefit of that experience. I have read the reports made by the commissions who investigated the whole situation in the Printing Bureau. Both reports advise that a new building should be erected as soon as possible. The necessary money for the completion of plans will be found not in these Estimates but in the Supplementaries for this year. The question of finding a site has been considered but not completely settled yet. I really believe it should be settled as soon as possible, so that we may be able to bring under the same roof all the branches of the Printing Bureau. Lately we have been obliged to rent another building situated at the corner of Dalhousie and York streets. There were several reasons for that. One reason is that there is not sufficient space for the officers and employees of the Bureau, and another is that lately, according to a report made by the chief architect of the Public Works Department, that building was in a dangerous condition, being overloaded. The danger was imminent, and upon that report the Minister of Public Works has rented another building in which to-day the stationery branch is housed. There is no division. The King's Printer will still have charge over the whole work. This sum of $4,000 was placed in the Estimates during the illness of the late Mr. Parmelee to pay for an assistant, as the need was very great. We will have a King's Printer soon, but I do not want to be understood as stating that the Assistant King's Printer will be appointed immediately after the vote is passed; I believe it would be in the interests of the Printing Bureau to have this vote put through in case similar circumstances arise again, and for that reason I would ask my hon. friend to withdraw his opposition to this item.

Mr. MURPHY: Will my hon. friend tell us what the duties of the Assistant King's Printer will be, when the King's Printer himself is attending to his duties?

Mr. CODERRE: The Printing Bureau seems to be a place to which the working class in the city of Ottawa go to find employment. They have always gone there, and I suppose they always will. I have been to the Bureau several times, and on each occasion I have found several men waiting to see the King's Printer, with a view to getting work. It is not according to law that these people should bother the life out of the King's Printer to get employment, but he has to receive them and try to give them work, and when he is so employed, it is impossible for him to supervise the work of the whole Bureau.

Mr. GRAHAM: Even ministers have that trouble.

Mr. CODERRE: If the appointment of an assistant would relieve the King's Printer of these callers, I would suggest that the appointment be made to-day.

Mr. MURPHY: It is a labour bureau you want to establish.

Mr. CODERRE: We all know it is a labour bureau, and it cannot be otherwise. The King's Printer has to see these men and he cannot do that without neglecting more important duties. Somebody else should be there to help him.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps my hon. friend will not mind my giving him a bit of advice, not that I suppose it will be taken. You never can tell when you sow seed, what fruit it will bring forth. I have had some experience in the printing business, and so far as the qualifications are concerned, I believe I could help select a man for that job. The Act specifies that he must be a publisher or printer who has been actively engaged, as such, for ten years, but it is a mistake to think that even the most fluent writer in the world would necessarily be fitted for that position.

Mr. ROGERS: Would you qualify under the Act?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have had the experience, I do not say anything about the further qualifications.

Mr. MURPHY: If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Graham) does, will you appoint him?

Mr. GRAHAM: A man is not necessarily qualified for that position just because he is editor of a paper. The meaning of the statute is, a man who has had practical experience as a printer or as a practical publisher.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is what Mr. Taché is.

Mr. GRAHAM: To my mind, this large department which is the printing establishment for the Government ought to have a man with great executive ability. He should be able to organize the men under him; not that he should be labouring so earnestly himself in small matters, because the test of a good organizer is not that he works himself to death but that he gets the men under him to do the work. If this man has not good executive ability, he will make a mess of the Printing Bureau. A large number of men are employed there, and it takes considerable skill to run an establishment of that size with the minimum of friction and the maximum of good results. After executive ability, and outside the statutory qualifications, the King's Printer should be a man who is in touch with the printing business so that he could go to the Bureau, and on looking it over, see whether the work was being done properly. He should be able to look over the heads of his subordinates occasionally and discover any possible leaks. What I want to impress on my hon. friend is that it is a mistake to think that because a man is a good newspaperman he is well qualified for this position. He ought to be an organizer of men, of great executive ability, and one who can handle men, if you will allow me to put it roughly. That he should have some knowledge of printing and publishing is required by the statute. If my hon. friend would get a man with the qualifications I have outlined, it will not matter much whether he can write an article or not. While that would be an advantage it is not necessary, and a man might have that qualification and not be fit for this position at all.

Mr. PROULX: I would like to ask my hon. friend why so much printing is being done outside the Bureau. Is it because the staff of the bureau is insufficient, or simply to give some pap to the Conservative newspapers?

9 p.m.

Mr. CODERRE: The reason was given by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) a few minutes ago. It is because the building is too small. My hon. friend can rest assured that we could find sufficient employees, but we have not got room for them. The men are cramped as it is. I know that under the late regime, the hon. member for Russell intended to put a certain sum in the Estimates to buy a site.

Mr. MURPHY: It was in the Estimates.

Mr. CODERRE: The reasons why a new building should be erected then may be stronger to-day. With a new building sufficiently large it will be possible for the department to do all the necessary printing. This was the object of the Act.

Mr. PROULX: It is astonishing when we go through the Auditor Genreal's report, to see how much money is paid to outside printers. I will mention a few of the largest of these items. I commence with an item which I have no doubt will be interesting to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers). The Winnipeg Telegram received $15,365.16 for printing and $4,972.75 for advertising; Toronto World, $9,067.40 for advertising; Southam Press, $19,005.35; News, $10,165.89 for advertising; Mail and Empire, $12,641.71. Even the Orange Sentinel got over a thousand dollars—$1,554.

Mr. GRAHAM: How much did the Eye Opener get?

Mr. PROULX: The Eye Opener of Calgary got $261.70. The St. John Standard, which is known to be the organ of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), received $13,415.33 for printing, and $2,717.76 for advertising; the Quebec Chronicle, the English Conservative newspaper of Quebec, got $5,330.92 for printing and $5,645.60 for advertising; L'Evenement, the organ of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), got $18,728.73 for printing.

Mr. PELLETIER: I have no organ.

Mr. PROULX: But that is not all; besides that it received $4,644.78 for advertising; the Montreal Gazette got the lion's share—$24,903.55 for printing and $5,331.17 for advertising; and La Patrie got $18,110.37 for printing and $5,298 for advertising. I see here the Southam Press. It appears to be ubiquitous; we see it in Toronto, Montreal and Winnipeg. The Southam Press in Montreal got $12,788.39. The Ottawa Citizen got $6,678.53, and the Ottawa Journal, $3,835.70.

An hon. MEMBER: What did the Free Press get?

Mr. PROULX: The Free Press got only $155.16. The Kingston Standard, another good Conservative newspaper, got $3,849.16 for printing, and $3,544.95 for advertising. The Lachute Watchman got $176.19. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley), was more reasonable and more moderate than the others. The London Free Press received $7,799.30; the Dawson News, $315

for printing and $3,711 for advertising, and the Halifax Herald got $9,812.52 for printing and $3,500.42 for advertising. I am told that the editor of this newspaper is a senator appointed by this Government. The Hamilton Spectator, another good Conservative newspaper, got $4,785.04 for advertising and $180, for printing.

An hon. MEMBER: How much did the Hamilton Times get?

Mr. PROULX: It did not receive one cent.

An hon. MEMBER: That is all right.

Mr. PROULX: I suppose it was too Grit for this Government. Then the Fredericton Gleaner got $1,290.33 for advertising, and $932.02 for printing. The Charlottetown Examiner got $1,171.15 for advertising and $1,881.69 for printing. I am not going to mention them all because it would take too long. I must not forget the Brockville Times; it received $675.88, but I do not see the name of the newspaper of my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). The Belleville Intelligencer got $1,571.75.

Mr. ROGERS: How much did the papers in the county of Victoria, Nova Scotia, get?

Mr. GRAHAM: They got free delivery on a steamer within the last couple of weeks.

Mr. PROULX: It is astonishing to see how much money is paid to outside printers. Certainly a large amount of this printing could be done at the Printing Bureau.

As far as the advertising is concerned, they advertise small contracts for $100, $150 or $200 in about a dozen newspapers. It is a pure waste of money. There should be a retrenchment in this department, and I hope the Secretary of State will stop the leakage.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Three or four years ago, the then Minister of Public Works was taken to task because no tenders were asked for the advertisements published in the press. Where is my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain)? Does he remember one evening in this House when he declared war on the then Minister of Public Works because, forsooth, he had not called for tenders for advertisements? I would like to know what his opinion is about these advertisements being given now without any tenders. My hon. friend is consistent, and I am quite sure he does not like to admit to be good on the part of his friends what he declared to be bad on the part of his opponents. Here are hundreds of thousands of dollars spent for advertisements in the Tory press without any tenders being called for. What does my hon. friend think of that? I will expect an answer from him.

Mr. MURPHY: Did the Secretary of State say that plans were prepared for a new Printing Bureau?

Mr. CODERRE: No. The vote for the plans will be found in the supplementary Estimates for this year. As far as the buying of the site is concerned, the question has been brought up but no decision has been reached.

Mr. MURPHY: In conection with the site I would suggest that my hon. friend induce his colleagues to follow the course they have so often followed before, in respect to that feature of their policy which is always evident when we criticise any of their actions, and when they retort: That is what you did. If they will in this case follow the course of their predecessors, we on this side of the House will have no criticism to offer. The site it was proposed to purchase was one which I mentioned before to this committee, I think when the hon Mr. Roche was Secretary of State. The site I mentioned was the old St. Lawrence and Ottawa depot. which is bounded north and south by Sussex and Dalhousie streets respectively, and east and west by Botelier street and Bingham square. It is a large block of land having the advantage of a railway track. It would fill every requirement of a large manufactory with regard to light and air, and would permit of any expansion that might be required within the next fifty years.

I was rather amazed to hear my hon. friend say that the number of employees of the Printing Bureau was now over 1,200. That being the case, I am not so much surprised that it was found necessary to move part of the outfit to other premises. The last time a return was brought down, I think the number of employees was 750. I can scarcely conceive that the business done by the Printing Bureau has increased to such an extent within a couple of years as to justify the employment of 1,200 people now. That is a matter, however, in regard to which we can get fuller information when my hon. friend's main Estimates are under discussion. I would impress

upon him the necessity of a new building and the immediate purchase of a site. While my hon. friend is not under any obligation to take the advice tendered by my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) or by myself, still as a citizen who was born here and who has lived here all his life, I would like to impress upon my hon. friend that there is no better site in the city of Ottawa than the one I have mentioned. It fills the requirements in this particular, that it will be close to the residences of most of the employees of the Printing Bureau who have located in that part of the city known as Lower Town.

Mr. ROGERS: What about the site on Wellington street?

Mr. MURPHY: I would not approve of that at all. I understand that my hon. friend proposes to erect some very handsome structures on Wellington street. The office portion of the Printing Bureau might be architecturally fine, but there would be a portion of it which would be similar to that of a manufacturing establishment; there would be a place for the boilers and the chimney, and there would be smoke and grime which are always associated with a manufacturing establishment. For these reasons I would not like to see it on any part of Wellington street. As regards the site I mentioned, the office portion of the building and the stores portion of the building could both be located on the side nearest to Sussex street, as that is the portion which people would see as they passed back and forth to Rockliffe or the east end of the city, while the manufacturing part of the building could be in the rear, down towards Dalhousie street and close to the tracks of the Canadian Pacific railway. That was the idea in mind when the site was spoken of and practically decided upon. When the present Government came into power there was an item of $100,000 in the Estimates as a preliminary amount to be expended in the purchase of a site.

Mr. ROGERS: You would have to tear down the present building.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, the present building is an unsightly one and should be pulled down in view of the improvements to the park and Nepean Point. If this suggestion is carried out, both the Minister of Public Works and the Secretary of State will hear no objections from this side of the House.

Mr. NESBITT: Why the necessity of an Assistant King's Printer? What positions do the King's Printer and Assistant King's Printer occupy? I am perfectly willing to see every department properly manned. I am not afraid to spend money on necessary service, but I am opposed to unnecessary service in a Government department as much as in a private business. I see no necessity for having two King's Printers.

Mr. CODERRE: I gave these explanations to the House a few minutes ago, but I am willing to repeat them for the benefit of my hon. friend. This item of $4,000 is for the position of an Assistant King's Printer and was put in the Estimates a few weeks or a month before the death of the late King's Printer. Seeing that the King's Printer had been sick for about five or six months, I thought that in the interest of the Printing Bureau the appointment of an Assistant King's Printer was necessary, and I brought that proposition before the Governor in Council.

But there was no money to pay an Assistant Kings' Printer. As we were preparing these Estimates we put in this item of $4,000; and, though the King's Printer had died in the meantime, and though his successor will soon be appointed, I believe that this item should remain in case circumstances should arise making it necessary to fill this office of Assistant King's Printer. I have said that I believe the appointment of such an officer is absolutely necessary, because the King's Printer has more to do than ought to be put upon one man.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Did Mr. Parmelee apply for an assistant?

Mr. CODERRE: No, but the hon. gentleman will remember that when Mr. Parmelee was appointed an assistant was given him in the person of Mr. McMahon, who was Superintendent of Printing, and I believe the present Superintendent of Printing was appointed at the same time. Thus we had a King's Printer, an Assistant King's Printer and a Superintendent of Printing. But then in 1908 the Printing Bureau was not nearly so large as it is now. In view of all the conditions, we believe it would be wise to provide the money in case the appointment of an Assistant King's Printer may be found necessary.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the hon. minister please state the value of the work done in the Printing Bureau ?

Mr. CODERRE: About $1,500,000.

Mr. MARCIL: How much is done outside?

Mr. CODERRE: I am not sure, but I think about $400,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the Government considered the policy of decentralizing that Bureau by establishing branches in different parts of the country, and especially in the West? I am told that men who understand these matters consider it a waste of money to have the work centralized. Has any attention been given to this matter by the Government?

Mr. CODERRE: I have never heard it mentioned.

Mr. MARCIL: Are any changes proposed in regard to the printing of documents in French in the Bureau? In the past great difficulty has been experienced in relation to this matter, and even when the Estimates came up for consideration the other day they were not printed in French. I inquired into this matter some years ago, when I had the honour to be Speaker of this House. I was told that the rule of the Bureau was to do the English printing first and then go on with the French. Of course, the great majority of members of this House understand English, but the delay in printing documents in French is a great inconvenience to French-speaking members, newspapers and to the French-speaking public generally.

Mr. CODERRE: Acting according to the wishes of the right hon. the Prime Minister, and, of course, according to my own wishes, I have included in these Estimates, as hon. members will see, an amount which, if voted, will pay for the services of three French translators at the Bureau. The reports of the Department of Trade and Commerce, the Insurance Branch, and the Auditor General always appear too late in French. Under the advice of the Chief Translator of the House, Mr. Desaulniers, I have come to the conclusion that the reports can be translated at the Bureau. This, I believe, will help to solve the difficulty to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. MARCIL: Do I understand that in the various departments there are translators?

[Mr. Coderre.]

Mr. CODERRE: I know that there are two translators in the Mines Division, Mr. Sauvalle and Mr. Paradis, also that there are translators in the Department of Marine and Fisheries and one in the Post Office Department. As to the other departments, I am not informed.

Mr. MARCIL: The hon. minister will realize, of course, that to print documents late is to waste money. The printing in French should go on simultaneously with the printing in English. There has been an improvement in this matter within the last two or three years, but further improvement is possible. The documents should be sent to the King's Printer in both languages and the printing in the two languages should be simultaneous. I hope the minister will consider that, because it is important that all our people should have opportunity to inform themselves on public affairs. The French members of this House send out many blue books and other documents, but if these are late in being issued in French, they are of little or no value. I trust the minister will signalize his coming into office by making a sound rule in this respect. It need not involve any larger expenditure, and it will mean that the expenditure made will be really useful instead of mere waste.

Mr. LEMIEUX: (Translation.) I wish to say a few words in French, and I am addressing myself more particularly to you, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Blondin).

I am concerned with the translation of the Votes and Proceedings of this House. I do not know whose translation that is, but, really, it is very bad. I have before me No. 19 of the Votes and Proceedings, and I have checked off with the pencil at least one hundred and fifty barbarisms, anglicisms, I was going to say stupid blunders.

I shall stop at that. Instead of handing over that copy to the Speaker, it is preferable, I think, that I should let you have it, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am aware that you have taken a keen interest in the appointment of a new staff of translators, and we approved of that wise departure; but it is only fair to insist that such translators shall be competent.

I shall appeal to the hon. Postmaster General, to the Secretary of State and to the Deputy Speaker of the House. . . .

Mr. RAINVILLE: (Translation.) Is that translation made by the translators of 'Hansard?'

Mr. LEMIEUX: (Translation.) I cannot say, but I do not think it is. I believe it is done by the translators of the House of

Commons. 'Hansard,' that is the official report of the debates of the House, is translated by a special staff of translators, while the translation of the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Commons is made by translators appointed by the Speaker and by the Committee of Internal Economy of this House.

I shall now, Sir, hand over No. 19 of the Votes and Proceedings, and you will agree with me that, if we are to pay salaries to the translators appointed by you, we have the right to expect them to turn out a fairly good translation.

Mr. PAQUET: (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, is the translation of the Votes and Proceedings the work of men appointed by you?

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Translation.) The translation to which the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has referred just now, is not the work of the translators appointed during recess. From information just supplied to me, the translation referred to is the work of men who have been long in the service of this House, and concerning whose ability no doubt has heretofore been expressed. However, on looking over this copy of the Votes and Proceedings, as I have just done, I must admit that my hon. friend has certainly some grounds for complaint. It may be that the officer responsible for this work has not been in a position to supervise and control the work as he should have done. The hon. member may rest assured that I shall go into the matter to-morrow morning at the latest, and find out what are the facts.

However, I wish to point out that this translation is not the work of the translators recently appointed. They are entrusted with translation which formerly was being turned out much less speedily, as it was parcelled out to people living in various parts of the Dominion. To-day that translation is not given out to outsiders; it is all done in one and the same office. That has put a stop to one of the causes of delay of which the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) complained a moment ago. There is a great improvement, due to the fact that to-day we have those translators within our reach and on the spot.

As I stated a moment ago, the grievance voiced by the hon. member for Rouville appears to me at first sight to be well grounded, and he may be sure that not later than to-morrow morning I shall see to it that there is no recurrence of similar facts.

Mr. PROULX: Have the rates for advertising been increased since the Government came into power?

Mr. CODERRE: I cannot say positively, but I do not think so. So far as I am concerned, there has been no increase whatever.

Mr. MURPHY: There used to be one rate applicable to printing in all that portion of the country east of Port Arthur, and an increased rate for printing done west of Port Arthur. Have these rates been changed?

Mr. CODERRE: They have not.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has my hon. friend taken any action with regard to the appointment of Mr. Vanasse as assistant to the Dominion Archivist, Dr. Doughty?

Mr. CODERRE: Yes; he has been recommended by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As my hon. friend knows, this position requires very special qualifications. Has the appointment of Mr. Vanasse been approved by Dr. Doughty?

Mr. CODERRE: I have known Mr. Vanasse for a number of years; I know that he is a good writer and has always been fond of historical research, particularly in Canadian history. I must confess that his name was not mentioned to me by Dr. Doughty. I mentioned his name to Dr. Doughty, who happened to know him well; and he declared that he would be well satisfied if Mr. Vanasse got the position.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The moment Dr. Doughty is satisfied I am. I have no doubt Mr. Vanasse will make a good assistant, but I wanted to know whether he had been recommended by Dr. Doughty.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Are tenders called for printing done outside the Printing Bureau?

Mr. CODERRE: No, not generally. Tenders are asked in some cases, but as a rule the work is paid for according to what are called Bureau rates.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If there is advertising to be done, who decides what newspapers will get it?

Mr. CODERRE: I do.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Have you a list of newspapers to which you give advertising?

Mr. CODERRE: There was a list in the department when the Government came into power, but I must admit that it has been corrected.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What steps has one to take to get his name on that list?

Mr. CODERRE: Members of this House have written to me asking that this or that newspaper be added to the list, and I complied with the request in almost all cases.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would you give an advertisement to a Grit newspaper?

Mr. CODERRE: Certainly I would.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Thank you.

Mr. PROULX: Are the rates for printing the same for large as for small contracts?

Mr. CODERRE: Yes. Except in those cases where tenders have been called the work is paid for according to the Bureau rate, which is so much a page whether the work is large or small.

Mr. GRAHAM: In considering the construction of a new printing office, the greatest care should be taken to make proper provision for ventilation.

There are two or three things necessary in a printing office; first, perfect light, because the printing business is perhaps the hardest on the eye. Unless you have perfect light, not only is it impossible to do the work but the eyes of the employees will soon give out. Good light is a prime necessity, and if I were Secretary of State I would insist that plans should be designed only after a visit to one of the biggest printing establishments on this continent to ascertain just the necessities of the case. If a building is rushed up that might do for an ordinary manufacturing establishment, and the printers, proof-readers, type-setters, and pressmen are asked to work there, the work will not be well performed, and it will be very hard on the employees. The second point is that of perfect ventilation. The difficulty with most of our Government buildings is that they have not proper ventilation.

Mr. HAZEN: Including this building.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think there is no building excluded. In some of these offices when a deputation is heard the air gets so thick it is impossible to think, and everybody gets drowsy. Then you put up the window and wait until it clears out, but by that time the room is cold and some person may become seriously ill. In addition to that the fumes from the metal in the type-setting machines and the odours from the ink and several other things make it absolutely imperative, in a printing office more than in any other manufacturing institution, that you should have perfect ventilation. The plans for an ordinary building for rough manufacturing will not do for a printing establishment.

Mr. MURPHY: May I supplement the suggestion made by my hon. friend by telling the Secretary of State that the essentials which have been laid down by my hon. friend he will find carried out in the new Curtis Publishing Company's building in Philadelphia; in the Doubleday-Page Company's building, Garden City, Long Island, in a new building in Indiana, close to Chicago; and also in the more modern parts of the United States Printing Office at Washington. These several institutions I visited a few years ago when we were discussing the erection of a new Printing Bureau and the features to which the hon. member for South Renfrew has called attention were found to have been especially considered in the erection of these different buildings. Either an inspection should be made by my hon. friend of these buildings or he should send to inspect them the architect charged with the work, so that the result may be the duplication of some of these features in the new Printing Bureau in Ottawa, to the very great benefit of persons employed there and the more efficient production of the output of such an establishment.

Mr. CODERRE: I shall certainly take a note of the remarks made by the hon. gentlemen on these points and will suggest that the architect visit those large establishments before plans are made.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would my hon. friend inform this House whether all the typos and printers at the Bureau are union men and how many French-speaking typos are employed in the Printing Bureau, and how many English speaking ? Is the work done indiscriminately by English and French typos? Is not the lesser number of French typos the cause of the delay in the distribution of French blue-books?

Mr. CODERRE: I do not believe all of the men employed there belong to the labour union, but most of them do. They are paid according to the law applying to the Government Printing Bureau. Those rates are the rates obtaining in Montreal and Toronto. An agreement has been made between the employers in Toronto and Montreal, and the union, and we are obliged to follow that to a certain extent. On that point I believe the men are pretty well satisfied. I have been obliged lately

to give them a small increase in salary, but only on being satisfied that the salary paid here was lower than that paid the same class of workmen in Toronto and Montreal. I could not tell exactly the number of French and English typos.

Mr. MARCIL: The same amount of work has to be done in French and English ?

Mr. CODERRE: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: Therefore, every compositor should be able to set up type in either language ?

Mr. CODERRE: I believe that is what is done.

Mr. MARCIL: The only complaint I have is that all of the printing was done in English first before the French was taken up. Some arrangement could be made by which it would go out simultaneously in the two languages, and then there would be no dissatisfaction.

Mr. CODERRE: There was more than one reason for the delay, and one of the reasons was that the translation was too late. Now, as far as the reports of the debates of the House of Commons are concerned, I know the translation is made without delay. I was told by Mr. Desaulniers that they are translating from the English copy in manuscript; they do not have to wait until a version of the report is printed. Another reason, and this is the one mentioned by the hon. member for Bonaventure, is that they do not work at the Bureau on the two languages simultaneously. I do not know whether this can be done now in the space at our disposal. Soon, I hope, we shall have another building, and then we shall be able to do it.

Mr. MARCIL: Seeing that both languages are official, I think it is very important that there should be a French section in the establishment. These documents have to be printed in both languages and that can only be done by having a French section of the Bureau, which could be turning out the French copy simultaneously with the English.

Mr. M. MARTIN: (Translation). What are the working hours?

Mr. CODERRE: (Translation). Forty-eight hours per week.

Mr. MARTIN: (Translation). Is it the intention of the hon. minister to adopt the eight-hour day?

Mr. CODERRE: (Translation): It has been adopted already.

Mr. MURPHY: May I add another word to what has already been said with reference to the publication of 'Hansard' in French? The matter which has been brought up by my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) was under consideration four years ago, when the present Judge Gervais, then member for Montreal, was Chairman of the Debates Committee. Through him and his committee, a new arrangement was made in conjunction with the Printing Bureau by which 'Hansard' was brought out in French much more quickly than it had previously been. Certain rules were drawn up and printed, and the Secretary of State will find a copy of those rules, possibly in his own department, certainly down at the Printing Bureau. At that time certain changes were made in the matter of translating, producing copy, having it sent to the Bureau and having the proofs read, to the end that the publications in French and English might be produced simultaneously, and, if that was not possible, then to have the French copies issued as speedily as they could be produced. A very marked improvement was made at that time, and I have no doubt the process is carried out under the regime of my hon. friend. There are a great many reasons why this occasional delay occurs, but with co-operation between the branches of Parliament, and the departments, and the Printing Bureau, there is no good reason why there should be any substantial delay in connection with any of these publications. It simply entails constant attention to the details of the work and good will on the part of those charged with producing it. My hon. friend will find that, if these conditions exist, the French publications will come out almost at the same time as the English publications, as undoubtedly they should.

10 p.m.

Mr. MARCIL: The change brought about by Mr. Gervais consisted chiefly in having the 'Hansard' office send a duplicate copy to the Printing Bureau and the translators' office. The translation went on while the English version was being printed. The French copy was afterwards sent to the Bureau, where there were two proof-readers, and the result was that the French 'Hansard' was delivered here 24 hours after the English 'Hansard.' The result was very satisfactory in every respect. I do not know whether the same arrangement still continues, but we are not complaining

about the French 'Hansard' so much as the other reports.

Mr. PELLETIER: Perhaps the committee would be interested in knowing what improvements the translators have brought about. I have before me a statement showing the translation done from July 1, 1912, to January 27, 1913, practically six months. The total number of pages translated was 6,904. I have also a statement showing the work done by the new organization from September 16, 1913, to January 28, 1914. That is only four months as compared with the other six months, and in those four months the number of pages translated was 9,206.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does that statement show what reports and blue book have been translated?

Mr. PELLETIER: Yes, it gives everything in detail. There is the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, the Veterinary Director General's Report; reports of the Railway Commission, Technical Education Commission, Naval Department, Postmaster General's Report, and so on. So that under the new regime 9,206 pages were translated in four months, whilst under the old regime only 6,904 pages were translated in six months. That is a great improvement.

Mr. MARCIL: Do the translators still complain about the Printing Bureau? The old complaint used to be that the copy was sent down there, and allowed to remain for weeks and sometimes months before being attended to. They placed the fault on the Printing Bureau. Has that been altered? Does the Printing Bureau proceed with the copy as soon as it gets it?

Mr. PELLETIER: We will make inquiries about that.

Mr. MARCIL: If the Printing Bureau proceeded with the work as soon as they received the French copy, I do not think there would be any trouble.

Mr. CODERRE: If the reports are wanted in both languages, I believe part of that work will have to be done outside.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As the Government has appointed additional translators and materially increased the translating staff, there is no reason why we should not aim at getting the reports in French and English simultaneously. It is a matter of right, and we have been bringing it up for years and years at every session but without results. I am quite ready to admit that the Government took the right step when last year it increased the staff of translators, and now that a start has been made in this matter, why should we not complete it? The country expects that the blue books shall be distributed to the French section as well as to the English section of the community. They ought to be published simultaneously, and my hon. friend should see that they are, now that the copy gets in in due time. My hon. friend has been in journalism for a number of years, so have I, and so has my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and we all know that a French blue book from Ottawa was a standing joke in the French editorial staffs. If a French-Canadian journalist wanted to quote from a blue book, from the Auditor General's Report or from the report of the Postmaster General, or from any other report he had to wait at least twelve months before he could get it. That is not fair. As a result the people of our province were deprived of the benefit of the information contained in the blue books. The members could send a certain number to their constituents. The journalists had to translate from the blue books printed in English and, as a matter of fact, the press of the province of Quebec, and part of the press of the Maritime provinces, was deprived of the benefit of the information contained in the blue books. Now we have reorganized the translation office. I think we have appointed good men with the exception of those who translated this Journal of the House. Let us now complete that work and see that the blue books are published and distributed in French and English simultaneously. If the Secretary of State can accomplish that feat he will deserve well of his province.

Mr. CODERRE: I have already been trying to do something in that line.

Mr. PELLETIER: My experience in my own department has been very much the same. I would like to put on the table of the House, as the law requires, the two versions of the report of my department at the same time. We have been hammering at the Printing Bureau and trying to get the French version at the same time as the English version, but they say that they cannot do it; it is a matter of utter impossibility. They say: We have neither the space nor the men; if we had a Printing Bureau, such as that which has been very properly suggested by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy), we would be able to do the work, but it is out of the question

now; we cannot do it. I have been urging upon my colleague the Secretary of State that the report should be sent outside, but they have begun upon the work and it is too late to send it outside. There is not enough space and not enough men to get out the two versions at the same time. The suggestion made by my hon. friend from Rouville is a very proper one. If the Printing Bureau cannot do the work they should not undertake it. Let it be done outside and let us have it as we should have it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I might refer to a report which was handled last year by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche) on the question of immigration. The report was prepared by Mr. Asselin, a very interesting report, and, as my hon. friend knows, one that was well prepared. I have been asking for that report since last year but I have not been able to get it.

Mr. CODERRE: In French?

Mr. LEMIEUX: In French. It was prepared in French. It is a very important report and I would like to get it. I have always taken a deep interest in this question of immigration from France and Belgium, but up to the present time I have been unable to get the report. This report was sent in nearly two years ago, and yet we have only been able to get a typewritten copy. It is not fair to the members speaking the French language that we should have to wait so long for a report which is of special interest to our province.

Mr. MARCIL: I would like to remind the committee that the French version is as official as the English version. We always refer to the French translation of these documents, but we must not forget that the publication of a document in the French language is as official as it is in the English language. I might mention the unfortunate position in which I was placed two years ago upon my return from France. I had met certain public men there who were anxious to become familiar with the governmental affairs of Canada, and they asked me to send information upon the subject. I consulted the library and I was in many instances obliged to send over blue books printed in the English language because of the delay in the printing of the blue books in the French language. The French translators say: We have done our share, but the fault lies at the Printing Bureau. I hope that this difficulty will be overcome if we get a new Printing Bureau. Canada is going ahead by leaps and bounds, our trade with France has increased to $15,000,000, our trade with European countries is rapidly increasing and I hope the Government will see to it that the French language is given its proper share of attention in the preparation of official publications.

Mr. LEMIEUX (Translation): I must say to the hon. Secretary of State that I believe it is necessary to appoint a King's printer who knows thoroughly both languages and can give fair play to both nationalities.

It is one of my reasons for insisting upon the appointment of M. Taché, who is thoroughly able, and being well acquainted with the needs of the two official languages of this country, he would see to it that justice be done to both nationalities.

Mr. MURPHY: While my hon. friend the Secretary of State may have some sins to answer for, a good deal of the criticism that has been directed towards the delay in getting out the publications in French is really a matter that does not appertain to the Department of the Secretary of State. The Printing Bureau should be what its name indicates: it should not be any part of the business of the Printing Bureau to do translation. There should not be any translators there. The Printing Bureau should be supplied with copy ready for the printer without the intervention of any other class of people, just as copy is supplied to any other printing establishment. It is a mistake to mix the printing and the translation. The translation should be something apart from the Printing Bureau altogether. I only mention this because a good deal of discussion has centred upon the delay which I believe undoubtedly takes place in connection with the translation. This delay, I am bound to say in all fairness, is not the fault of my hon. friend or of the officials who are employed under him at the Printing Bureau and who should be called upon to do the printing and printing only and not translation. In connection with the important question that was asked by my hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) in regard to this new position of Assistant King's Printer, the Secretary of State very courteously replied to the question, but he did not give my hon. friend very much information with the result that the curiosity of my hon. friend has not been entirely satisfied. Is it the intention to fill this position by promotion in the department?

Mr. CODERRE: The matter has only recently been considered in consequence

of the illness and death of Mr. Parmelee. As my hon. friend knows, the names which have been mentioned are names of men not at present employed in the Printing Bureau.

Mr. MURPHY: I am asking the hon. gentleman if, when he comes to fill the position, he will fill it by the promotion of some person employed in the Printing Bureau?

Mr. CODERRE: I am not sure. Personally I would like to fill that position, but I do not know yet whether there will be a promotion or not. This part of the question has not been considered yet. I will, of course, try to do what I think best in the interest of the Bureau. There are employees at the head of branches who are doing pretty well as heads of these branches. I do not know that they will be competent to fill the position of King's Printer. The position would require something more than that a man be simply an accountant, he would have to be a man of administrative ability. The question should remain in abeyance for a few days.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Until after the session.

Mr. CODERRE: No, but the matter will have to remain in abeyance for a short time.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the appointment be made by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. CODERRE: It will have to be made according to law by the Civil Service Commissioners.

Mr. NESBITT: That is, the candidates will have to pass an examination?

Mr. CODERRE: I do not know. Whatever the law requires will be done.

Mr. NESBITT: The law requires that every person has to pass an examination before being recommended by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CODERRE: I believe in this case, being a technical position, no examination would be required. The Civil Service Commission could issue a certificate according to Clause 21 of the Act, and in that case I do not think they would be obliged to hold a competitive examination.

Mr. NESBITT: I was pleased to hear my hon. friend the minister, in answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Murphy), say that the appointment would be made only in regard to the ability of the man to fill the position. Will my hon. friend follow that course?

[Mr. Coderre.]

Mr. CODERRE: Yes, I am in earnest.

Mr. NESBITT: I hope my hon. friend will carry out what he says, because that is the spirit I would like to see engendered in the public service. If he found that he had not a man in his department able to fill the position from an administrative standpoint, if he took in some one from the outside and made the appointment purely and simply in the interest of the department, to further the organization of his department and to better his department, I think I would be perfectly satisfied, because that is the spirit that should predominate. When I first asked my hon. friend the question, he told me that it was necessary to have an assistant because the work was so great. If it is necessary to have an assistant in a great department of that kind, the appointee of course would have to have some knowledge of printing, but the principle recommendation should be his powers of organization and administration. From such a large department my hon. friend surely could get some poor fellow who had earned his advance and could give him a step up in the world.

Mr. BUREAU: Is it the policy of the minister to promote employees who are qualified, provided the interests of his department are properly safeguarded?

Mr. CODERRE: Yes, it is the policy of the department and numerous proofs of this have already been given, in the Estimates of last year and in the Estimates of this year. From a perusal of these Estimates my hon. friend will see many promotions.

Mr. BUREAU: Many increases.

Mr. CODERRE: Yes, the statutory increases. I cannot do more than that.

Mr. BUREAU: Is there in the Printing Bureau a separate staff for the printing of French? Have you a certain number of men employed to print the French versions of the various documents, such as the Debates of the House or the Votes and Proceedings; or have you got a common staff with a number of men who can do the work in French and English and who, when they are not required to print French, are shifted into the English department?

Mr. CODERRE: All the men employed there can do both.

Mr. BUREAU: All the men employed in the Printing Bureau understand both French and English and are able to do the work in either French or English?

Mr. CODERRE: Yes, they are able to do the work in either French or English.

Mr. BUREAU: Is that one of the qualifications of employment in the Printing Bureau?

Mr. CODERRE: The work done there is done by the men, whether it is French or English.

Mr. BUREAU: Is the French work done by English printers who do not know French? Take the French version of 'Hansard.' Does the minister mean to say that an English printer who knows no French at all is asked to print the French version of 'Hansard?'

Mr. CODERRE: No, I do not want to say that. There are employees there who can speak French and English. I believe the Superintendent of Printing is a man wise enough to give the French 'Hansard' to an employee who understands French. As a matter of fact, there is no such division as the one mentioned by my hon. friend; there is no special French or English staff. The Superintendent of Printing divides the work among the men according to what they know. If the work to be printed is French, the Superintendent of Printing gives that work to a man who understands French, and vice versa.

Mr. BUREAU: Have you any men in the Printing Bureau who can print both French and English; that is, who know both the French and English languages? You say the Superintendent of Printing is a wise man. I do not believe that any wise man would give English copy to a Frenchman who did not know a word of English, or give French copy to an Englishman who did not know a word of French. Have you any men who can print in French, but cannot print in English, because they do not know the English language and have you any men who can print in English but cannot print in French because they do not know the French language?

Mr. CODERRE: Do you want to know if all the employees can speak both languages and can therefore print in both languages?

Mr. BUREAU: Yes.

Mr. CODERRE: I could not answer that now. If my hon. friend will give me time, I will make the necessary investigation.

Mr. BUREAU: If you have any French printers who can print both languages, when work is not sufficient to keep them busy, do you switch them on to English printing in preference to employees who know only one language and can only print in one language, or do you dispense with their services for the time being and keep men on who know only one language in preference to those who know two?

Mr. CODERRE: Personally, I do not know what the Superintendent of Printing does in such cases. I know that he has been following the rules which have been in existence for many years.

Mr. BUREAU: What are the rules? I want to know if a man who knows both languages has the preference, when work diminishes and somebody has to be laid off, over a man who knows only one language.

Mr. CODERRE: I do not believe that such a preference has been given, or that occasion for it has arisen, for the number of employees there, instead of decreasing, is always increasing. There is always work for the employees there.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand the minister to say that men employed during the session remain the year round?

Mr. CODERRE: Yes, I do not know of any dismissals, nor any decrease in the work.

Mr. BUREAU: Does not the printing of 'Hansard' and other sessional documents mean more work during the session?

Mr. CODERRE: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: And are no extra men employed?

Mr. CODERRE: I do not know of any temporary employees.

Mr. MURPHY: During the session they run the Bureau at night as well as by day.

Mr. BUREAU: But the men do not work twenty-four hours a day. Among the temporary employees for the session, do you make a discrimination, giving the preference to the men who know both languages?

Mr. CODERRE: The occasion for such preference has never presented itself. There is plenty of work.

Mr. BUREAU: Not for the temporary men?

Mr. CODERRE: There are none.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. gentleman said there were.

Mr. CODERRE: No, I said there were not any. The employees who work at night during the session work during the day out of session.

Mr. BUREAU: Does the minister employ the same number of men the year round?

Mr. CODERRE: Of course during the session they do the work that is urgent, and other work is set aside. At the end of the session there is an accumulation of work to keep all hands busy.

Mr. BUREAU: That is a very ambiguous answer to a plain question. Does the minister employ the same number of men the year round?

Mr. CODERRE: No, because the number is always increasing.

Mr. BUREAU: But does the minister keep them the year round?

Mr. CODERRE: I have not found any men who wish to leave, and personally I have no desire to send them away.

Mr. BUREAU: It is not a question of what the men wish or what the minister desires. It is clear that during the session there is an extra amount of work. I ask if the same number of men are employed the year round, and the minister tells me that the number goes on increasing. What is the proportion of that increase?—five, six, seven a month?

Mr. CODERRE: I cannot say offhand.

Mr. BUREAU: Could not the minister give it in general terms?

Mr. CODERRE: I could bring all these details at a later date.

Mr. BUREAU: If there are more Estimates for this department I would like to have these details.

Mr. CODERRE: Yes, there will be more.

Civil Government—The Department of the Public Archives—Salaries, $53,800; contingencies, $7,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many officers are there in the Archives and what do they do?

Mr. CODERRE: There are twenty-seven, and they copy public documents and care for the collection already made.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have you any employed outside?

[Mr. Coderre.]

Mr. CODERRE: Yes, two in England and three in Paris.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who are in Paris?

Mr. CODERRE: Mr. Beauchene, Mr. Buron and Mr. Dugas. I believe that a young man named Morin has received an appointment recently, but I do not know that he is there yet.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What do you pay copyists?

Mr. CODERRE: Some of them $50 a month.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who are the copyists in England?

Mr. CODERRE: Mr. Biggar and Mr. French. Mr. Biggar has been there for years, but Mr. French is a young Montrealer who was sent there a few months ago.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are any employed in the United States?

Mr. CODERRE: I believe that a few months ago a young man named Lanctot was sent to California for special work.

Mr. MURPHY: A commission was appointed some time ago to make an inspection of the departments with a view to collecting documents which could properly be added to the Archives. Has that commission reported?

Mr. CODERRE: Not yet.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I see the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) in his place, and I desire to call his attention to the Archives. Would it not be well for him to consider the advisability of erecting a new building for the Archives, or at least enlarging the present one? I understand that a delegation waited upon him some time to urge the necessity of enlarging that building.

As a matter of fact, having occasion to frequent the building quite often, I know that it is impossible to accommodate all the documents within the four walls of the present building. The building is very unsuitable, and in view of the importance of the Archives Department, I think it should be enlarged, and be of a more imposing nature. Has the Minister of Public Works considered this matter, and if so, what does he intend to do about it?

Mr. ROGERS: When I had the pleasure of meeting the deputation to which my hon. friend refers, this matter was discussed, and the idea put forward by the deputation was that in the event of the

construction of a new building for the archives, which was deemed to be necessary, it should be constructed on the lower end of the property recently purchased on Wellington street. Nothing further than that has taken place.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to call the attention of the minister to the fact that the copyists in London and Paris are paid only $50 a month. Generally the young men employed in that work are students. This employment does not last for many years, but during the time they are employed by the Dominion Government they should at least be paid a reasonable salary. $50 a month in Paris or London is certainly not a living allowance, and it should be doubled.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.42 p.m.

Friday, February 13, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

UNITED STATES POTATO EMBARGO.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. MICHAUD: Will the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) please say if he has received information with regard to the embargo placed upon the importation of potatoes to the United States from Canada?

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture): I cannot give my hon. friend much information on that subject. The embargo—it is practically an embargo, as the regulations under it amount to almost total exclusion—has not been modified in any important respect so far as it affects Canada. We have been in correspondence, and as soon as there is anything definite, I shall be glad to let my hon. friend know.

COMMUTATION OF THE DEATH SENTENCE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): If in order at this time, I desire to make a statement with reference to some observations made yesterday by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with regard to commutation in certain cases in which persons in the western provinces have been sentenced to death. These observations of my right hon. friend were based upon statements in the report of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. As I had occasion to point out last year when a motion was made for the production of papers in a case of application for clemency, the rule, in England, as I understand it, is, not to give the reasons which influenced the advice as to clemency. I am not unaware that there have been cases in this country, I understand, which have been treated as exceptions, and in which papers have been brought down. I have no desire, in making any statement at the present moment, to so make it as to preclude, if it should be desired, debate upon the question whether this is a proper matter for discussion upon the circumstances of the cases themselves. If such debate is not desired, and if the rules of the House will permit, I should like to make my statement at the present moment.

Mr. SPEAKER: According to the rules of the House, a debate could hardly take place with no question before the Chair. If the minister wishes to make an explanation and the House is willing to grant leave, I have no objection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I fear that such a statement of fact as the minister indicates is likely to be controversial. It would be better to make it on motion to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand that it could not be taken up now, except by consent, and for that reason I suggested I would be ready to bring the matter forward at some other stage when my statement, which might be the subject of debate, could be considered.

PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS AND DOMINION OFFICIALS.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. OLIVER: I desire to repeat an inquiry I made yesterday when the Minister of Public Works was not present. I would like to be furnished with the authority for an alleged interview with myself which he read to the House the other day.

Mr. ROGERS: The hon. member for Edmonton seems determined, if he possibly can, to stir up a certain amount of trouble, and of course, if my hon. friend stirs up that trouble, then he will have only himself to blame.

Mr. OLIVER: I rise to a point of order. I protest against the hon. gentleman suggesting that I want to stir up trouble. I

asked a civil question, and I am entitled to a civil answer.

Mr. ROGERS: I shall certainly be pleased to give my hon. friend a very civil answer indeed, and it is this: I certainly would not at any time, in this House or elsewhere, undertake to make any assertion were I not conscious that it was absolutely correct and in accordance with the facts. When asked the other day, when I was making this statement, for the authority upon which I based it, I did not then have in mind its exact source, and I was unable to give it to my hon. friend. But on looking the matter up I find that I was simply repeating words which have already been placed upon 'Hansard.' As far back as the year 1906, when this matter was discussed in the House by the right hon. the Prime Minister of to-day, then leader of the Opposition, the question arose, of the interference of the staff under the Administration of my hon. friend, then Minister of the Interior, in elections in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. The Prime Minister of to-day, in dealing with that matter, first of all, quoted the unanimous resolution that was agreed to by the House in respect of the action of officials in connection with elections. After quoting this resolution he went on to say:

That resolution, accepted by both political parties, accepted by the Prime Minister, was passed by this House—much to the regret as I observed at the time, of the Minister of the Interior. This is what the Minister of the Interior said: 'They have the power of speech, and therefore they are entitled to express their political opinions. They are entitled to express them to homesteaders; they are entitled to express them to men under their control; they are entitled to go upon public platforms and express them; they are entitled to express them as presidents and officers of Liberal organizations.'

That is the idea of the Minister of the Interior as to the way in which a solemn resolution of this House, unanimously passed, should be observed by himself and by his officers in the West, and these officers felt very much encouraged. We do not know how many feats of daring they performed; we do not know to what extent their efforts along certain lines have prevailed in the West. But we know that the curtain has been lifted just a little in one or two places, and we have a slight idea of the wonderful things which the officers of the Interior have accomplished in bringing about that endorsement.

Mr. OLIVER: Who was the speaker on that occasion?

Mr. ROGERS: The Prime Minister of to-day. A little further on he said:

I do not know whether these men have been dismissed. Can the Minister of the Interior tell me whether they have been?

[Mr. Oliver.]

The hon. member for Edmonton answered that question. Then, turning over a few pages, I find that the hon. member for Edmonton, undertaking to make reply to the then leader of the Opposition, used the following language:

The hon. gentlemen opposite have rather peculiar ideas of elections, it seems to me.

I am quoting now from the remarks of the hon. member for Edmonton appearing on page 114 of 'Hansard,' volume 1, 1906:

Their idea of a proper election is one in which the other party shall be eliminated and they shall have the privilege of casting all the votes. It would appear from what they say that it is an offence for a citizen of the Northwest to exercice the franchise to express an opinion, or even to hold an opinion; and it is still more a crime on the part of an elector of the Northwest in the person of my humble self to go there and take part in an election. I do not agree with these gentlemen. And I wish to say further that I think it is a very serious question just how far a government has a right, by virtue of its authority, to trespass upon the rights of the citizen in the exercise of his franchise. I had occasion to express my views on that point, and I did express them, in the Northwest. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) did me the honour to partially quote my expressions.

I have already read the quotation, and it is unnecesary to repeat it. Then the hon. member for Edmonton proceeded to say:

I will take the liberty of stating to the House what I said. I said that officials of the Government were citizens, therefore they had the right to vote. I said that, having intelligence—supposedly having intelligence—they had the right to choose on which side they should vote. And I said that, having the power of speech they had the right to express their opinions. But the question of improper interference is not to be settled in a general way; each case must rest upon its own basis. To say that a man may be driven from the public service because he has a vote, because he has an opinion and expresses that opinion—it seems to me that is a most unwarrantable and most unjustifiable trespass upon the rights of citizenship. Especially is that the case when the political question at issue is not one in which the government having control of these officials is directly concerned. There may be a reason—there might be a reason—for the Government exercising an arbitrary and otherwise unjustifiable authority over its officials in the case of an election in which it was concerned. But to say that they must practically disfranchise or decitizenize their employees in regard to all questions coming before the public, provincial, municipal or otherwise is, it seems to me, unreasonable, improper and absurd; and, if hon. gentlemen opposite wish to take that position, I can only say that they are welcome to it and that I take issue with them upon it.

The hon. member for Edmonton now has my authority for the quotation which I read to the House the other day. Nine years

ago, when he was dealing with the matter himself, he deemed that, the then leader of the Opposition, the present Prime Minister, did him an honour in quoting that language upon the floor of this House. His answer the other day was very different.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to interrupt my hon. friend to say that he has incorrectly stated the position.

Mr. ROGERS: I would like to know in what respect I am incorrect?

Mr. OLIVER: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and the permission of the House, I shall be glad to tell my hon. friend.

Mr. SPEAKER: This question has been propounded more than once by the hon. member for Edmonton; the answer has now been given, and the matter brought to end there. A debate upon it should not be allowed.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend, standing in his place, himself misstated the position as he read it. I merely call the attention of the House to that fact.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the second reading of Bill No. 21, to amend the law relating to merchant shipping, with a view to enabling certain conventions to be carried into effect. He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I think it would be well that I should fully state to the House its purpose and object, and the events which have led to its being introduced at the present time.

Mr. SPEAKER: My attention has been drawn to this Bill. I thought that as it is a Bill relating to trade and commerce it should properly be introduced by a resolution. However, I took the trouble to have that gone into, and I hold in my hand a list of Bills regarding shipping which have been introduced in this House, and the great bulk of them have been introduced simply on motion. Therefore, while my opinion was that a Bill in relation to shipping ought to be introduced by resolution, in view of this practice having been carried on to the extent it has, I did not feel that it was desirable for me to object to this Bill being introduced without a resolution.

Mr. HAZEN: The purpose of the present Bill is to amend the law in respect to collisions and salvage at sea so as to enable the Government of Canada to give effect to their adherence to the International Maritime Conventions on these subjects, which were signed at Brussels on the 23rd September, 1910. Before giving an explanation of the Bill, it would, perhaps, be well to give a brief statement concerning these conventions.

The first great step taken in the way of a universal maritime code was in 1864, when, as the result of an international conference, the regulations for preventing collisions at sea, commonly known as the Rules of the Road, came into force. They were amended in 1884, and modified and revised in 1897.

There has been for a number of years an international maritime committee for the consideration of all such matters. It includes amongst its members prominent men engaged in shipping, or interested in it, as well as eminent jurists of every civilized nation. The efforts of this voluntary body have been strongly supported by the Belgian Government, and the international conferences which have been held from time to time have convened in that country. The method of inquiry adopted by the International Committee is to issue to the different national associations a series of questions relating to the subjects to be dealt with at the next conference. The replies are subsequently considered. and the principles agreed upon are then embodied in a series of resolutions. These resolutions form, in turn, the basis of the labours of a subcommittee nominated by the Central Bureau and containing, as far as may be, representatives of all the different systems of law. This subcommittee prepares a draft code for discussion at the diplomatic conference where it is critically examined by the accredited representatives of the powers before being reported to the different Governments. It will thus be seen that the proposals are not hurriedly submitted for consideration, but represent patient thought, discussion and revision by persons in the several maritime countries who are best able to deal with the matters in question.

There is a British Maritime Committee for studying such questions as the one now under discussion. It has amongst its members some of the most influential shipowners and Admiralty judges in the United Kingdom.

With a view to the unification of certain rules of law respecting collisions and as-

sistance and salvage at sea, the International Maritime Conference convened at Brussels in October, 1905, at which all the principal maritime countries of the world were represented. Great Britain was represented by Sir Arthur Hardinge, Sir Wm. Pickford, judge of the High Court of London, Mr. Leslie Scott, K.C., of London, and the Hon. Hugh Godley, barrister, of London, England. Canada was not represented and apparently no invitation to send a representative was received. It is possible that provision could not be made for representatives from all the overseas dominions, and therefore no invitations were extended to any of them. The Shipping Federation of Montreal have suggested to the department the propriety of Canada being represented at such conferences, and a note has been made of the same for future consideration.

Copies of the conferences dealing with collisions and salvage were transmitted to the Canadian Government for consideration in Colonial Office despatch, dated 28th September, 1906.

Following the practice of the Imperial Board of Trade in dealing with such matters in the United Kingdom, the Department of Marine and Fisheries invited the views of the Shipping Federation of Canada and the Boards of Trade of Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, St. John, Charlottetown, Victoria and Vancouver on the proposed conventions. Mr. Fred. Meredith, K.C., solicitor of the Shipping Federation of Canada, submitted a very valuable opinion dealing fully with the question from a legal standpoint. The Boards of Trade of Montreal and Victoria also submitted their views in regard to the conventions. The papers were subsequently referred to the Department of Justice for consideration, and the Hon. Mr. Aylesworth, Minister of Justice, wrote to the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, under date of the 23rd January, 1907, as follows:

I would suggest that in your report to Council you should set out the steps taken by you to ascertain the views of the commercial and shipping interests of Canada, and attach copies of the replies of the Montreal Board of Trade and the Shipping Federation of Canada, including Mr. Meredith's report, as well as a copy of the report of the Victoria Board of Trade. I would also suggest that the Imperial authorties be informed that while Canada is willing to concur in any action for the putting into force these two conventions that Great Britain may think proper to adopt, Canada would urge in view of her very extensive inland navigation in which Canadian vessels are in constant intercourse with vessels belonging to the United States, that if the conventions are put in force their provisions should extend to the inland waters of Canada, and to vessels for inland navigation of any of the waters of Canada, or the inland waters of Canada or the United States contiguous to Canada.

An Order in Council was passed on the 6th May, 1907, embodying Mr. Aylesworth's suggestions, except that no copies of replies received by the department were forwarded. It was also suggested that His Majesty's Government should ascertain the views of the United States Government on the question of extending the conventions to cover inland waters. But it was expressly stated that the Canadian Government did not desire to delay action on account of this inquiry.

A short statement of the general principles of the Bill would perhaps be useful. They may be dealt with under two heads, namely, Collisions and Salvage.

The convention on the subject of collisions introduces three important modifications in British law, viz.:

1. The apportionment of damages according to the degree of blame in cases where both ships are found in default (Article IV).

2. The abolition of the defence of compulsory pilotage (Article V).

3. The repeal of subsection 2 of section 422 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894 (Article VIII), which reads as follows:

If the master or person in charge of a vessel fails to comply with this section (i.e., to assist the other vessel in case of collision) and no reasonable cause for such failure is shown, the collision shall in the absence of proof to the contrary, be deemed to have been caused by his wrongful act, neglect or default.

Under subsection 4 of section 419 of the Imperial Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, which reads as follows:

Where in a case of collision it is proved to the court before whom the case is tried that any of the collision regulations have been infringed the ship by which the regulation has been infringed shall be deemed to be in fault, unless it is shown to the satisfaction of the court that the circumstances of the case made departure from the regulation necessary.

This subsection embodied what is known as the statutory presumption of fault. The expression 'any of the collision regulations' means any which is in the circumstances applicable, and includes local rules having the force of the general rules, known as the Rules of the Road. The person making the charge has to prove that the rule is applicable and that a competent seaman exercising reasonable care would have discovered it to be so. The convention deals with the cases of collision, owing

to the fault of one ship, to inscrutable fault and to inevitable accident, and substantially reproduces the British law.

The first great change in the law is in the apportionment of damages. The new rule does away with the British Admiralty rule with regard to the division of loss where two ships are to blame. Heretofore where both ships were to blame the amount of the damage to both ships was added together and each ship paid half. This rough and ready method of apportioning the damages was probably practical justice in a general way. But it would not always be so. For instance one of the ships in collision has committed some merely technical violation of the Rules of the Road which may have contributed to the accident; the other ship has been navigated utterly wrong from first to last. The vessel which is technically to blame is slightly damaged; the vessel really to blame has been sunk.

The add and divide principle in such a case would be a travesty on justice. The British rule rests on no recognized principle of law; it is not even an old established rule and it is not in conformity with the ordinary rule of the common law as to contributary negligence, under which neither party would be entitled to recover anything. It is better therefore to abolish it, and to place the court in a position to do substantial justice to both parties. Foreign nations will not assent to the introduction of the British common law rule. The proportional rule exists as part of the law of nearly all the maritime nations except Great Britain. The rule that neither can recover if both are to blame appears in the laws of Holland, Italy and Spain. Germany abandoned it in 1900, and adopted the proportional rule.

In regard to cargo claims, the matter is very clearly put in one of the special articles on the unification of the Maritime Law which appeared in the London Times, in January, 1909, and I have obtained much of the information now given. These very interesting articles were evidently written by one who is deeply versed in the whole question. He says:

> It will be observed that it is proposed that the same rule should apply in cases where the plaintiff is the cargo owner, and that the damage should be divided between the ships in proportion to the gravity of their faults, and without the plaintiff having an action jointly against the owners of both ships for the whole of his loss.

By English law where both ships are to blame the cargo owner can recover half his damages, no more and no less, against each ship unless he has by contract relieved the owners of the carrying ship from liability for negligence, in which case he can only proceed against the other ship, and no matter how great may be his fault, he, who is entirely blameless, can only recover one-half of the loss. Before the passage of this convention under the French law, a British ship, although only technically at fault, would be liable in a French port to a suit for full damages to cargo if the other ship in default could not be proceeded against by reason of the terms of her bill of lading.

As to error of pilotage, under the provisions of the Imperial Merchant Shipping Act, the owner or master of a ship is not answerable to any person whatever for any loss or damage occasioned by the fault or incapacity of any qualified pilot acting in charge of that ship within any district where the employment of a qualified pilot is compulsory by law. The only other countries having such a law are Italy and Germany. Both have agreed to the present convention. In Canada no owner of a vessel is free by reason of his employing a licensed pilot. It must be borne in mind that in Canada the employment of a pilot is not compulsory. The payment of the pilotage fee or half fee, as the case may be, is compulsory. But no vessel is obliged to take a licensed pilot on board. The provisions of the convention do not affect the law as it is in Canada to-day.

As to rendering assistance, the convention abolishes presumption of fault for a collision in cases where a vessel fails to stand by after collision. She is bound to stand by, but it is not prima facie evidence of fault for the casualty if she does not do so. The provisions of the Canadian Shipping Act in this respect are amended by repealing such part of section 920 as is necessary to give effect to the requirements of the convention.

As to salvage, there is the duty of every ship to render assistance to another ship in distress, even an enemy. Then the time within which an action to recover salvage is limited to two years. This latter provision was necessary owing to the various and complicated laws as regards the time limit in force in other countries. There were also differences in the laws of the other maritime powers as to the rate of remuneration of the salvors which led to endless trouble. All these differences have been abolished. The remuneration is fixed according to the success obtained, the meritoriousness of the services, the danger incurred by the vessel salved and her cargo, and by the salving

vessel and the salvors, the expenses and damage incurred and the value of the salved property and the assisting vessel, thus substantially reproducing British law.

Having given as briefly as possible the principal points of the two conventions. there remains only to be made a statement of the position of affairs at present. A copy of the two conventions, printed in English and French, has been furnished to each member of the House, so that the provisions of the conventions may be familiar to them when this Bill is under consideration. The conventions were, it may be stated, signed in the French language only.

The Government deemed it advisable to give their adherence to these conventions and so notified His Majesty's Government at the same time, giving an assurance that legislation would be introduced at the last session of Parliament to amend the law in Canada so as to conform to the provisions of the conventions.

His Majesty's Government deposited the King's ratifications for the United Kingdom on the 1st September, 1912, and similar ratifications for India and certain colonies and possessions—the self-governing Dominions were not included—on the 5th December, 1912.

The United States Senate ratified the conventions on January 18, 1912, and an Act to give it effect was approved on August 1.

There is just one point that might be again referred to, and that is the advisability of applying the provisions of the conventions to the inland boundary waters between Canada and the United States. It would certainly be an advantage to have a uniform law, but until that question has been considered by the Governments of the two countries nothing can be done to extend the application of the conventions. That is why the Bill now before the House is drafted so as not to apply to the inland waters of Canada, above Montreal.

It will be noticed that there is a suspending clause at the end of the Bill. This is inserted so that the Act when passed may be submitted to His Majesty's Government for His Majesty's approval, under the provisions of the Imperial Merchant Shipping Act, 1894. By adopting that course no question can subsequently arise as to the validity of this piece of legislation. Copies of the two conventions are on the table of the House.

It will be seen, therefore, that the object of this Bill is to give legislative effect to the convention entered into at Belgium, for the uniformity of laws regarding salvage, collisions and matters of that sort, so that there may be uniform regulations among the different maritime countries of the world, thereby saving a great deal of the trouble and inconvenience that results at the present time. The convention has already been ratified by the United Kingdom and the United States. The Government of Canada undertook to approve of this convention before the present Administration came into power, and the present Administration approved of their action in so doing. It was my intention to have introduced the Bill at the last session of Parliament, but for reasons that perhaps it is not necessary to enter into now, the matter was deferred until the present session.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will my hon. friend explain why the Bill has not been made applicable to the Great Lakes and inland waters generally ?

Mr. HAZEN: At these conventions, the question of inland waters was not dealt with. As the only nations, practically, that trade upon the inland waters of Canada and the United States, are these two countries themselves, and as the trade of the two countries on these waters is very closely interwoven, it was thought that it would be better for a conference to be held between Canada and the United States before the adoption of these rules. It might be that rules which are applicable to deep sea navigation would not be applicable to inland navigation; and I might say to my hon. friend from Guysborough that at the conference recently held in London with regard to The Safety of Ships at Sea—that was the title of the conference—the convention entered into, applies to the sea only and not to the lakes. On Monday next, I hope to lay that convention on the table of the House, with a summary which I am now preparing of the results of the convention. While that convention does not apply to the Great Lakes, it was thought by those who were at London representing the United States and Canada, that the recommendations and agreements come to at that convention might serve as a basis for future legislation introduced in the United States and Canada, with regard to the safety of ships on the Great Lakes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I understand the law in regard to collisions on inland and coastal waters to be the same now in Canada and the United States, and that this Bill will vary it and introduce new provisions as far as the coastal waters are concerned be-

low the port of Montreal but will not change the law in regard to collisions on the Great Lakes?

Mr. HAZEN: That is absolutely correct.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is the United States a party to this convention?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, the United States was not only a party to it but the United States has passed the necessary legislation in order to make the convention effective in so far as that country is concerned. It did that in 1912.

Mr. MACLEAN: It would be well to have a uniform law.

Mr. HAZEN: I think that probably it would be, but my hon. friend will see this distinction, that practically the only shipping there is on the Great Lakes is the shipping of Canada and the United States.

Mr. MACLEAN: And you intend to take that up later?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes. This convention applies practically to all the maritime nations of the world which were represented at that conference, and one can readily see how much more necessary it is to have uniform regulations regarding all these different nations whose vessels sail upon the high seas than it would be between two countries like Canada and the United States situated so close to each other and whose laws at the present time closely approximate one to another. The basis of the Admiralty laws in the United States is practicaly the same as the basis of the Admiralty laws in Canada. The United States and Canada practically derive their laws from a common source, and it will be found in regard to this question of collision and salvage upon the lakes that there will be very little difference between the United States and Canada. This question will be made a matter of further consideration between these two countries alone.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Was this Bill drawn by the Justice Department?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, this Bill has been drawn after full consultation with the Justice Department and it is one giving effect to the convention. Before being submitted to the House the Bill was considered by shipping authorities in Great Britain. There is a suspending clause added to the Bill and it is proposed to insert in the Bill that when the Act is passed it shall be submitted to His Majesty's Government for approval under a provision of the Maritime Shipping Act, 1894. By adopting this course, and having the approval of His Majesty's Government, no question will arise in future in regard to its validity.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I would not venture any criticism at all of the Bill and I have no objection to it. I think this Bill is a good one, but there are one or two questions in regard to it and I think this would be a proper time to bring them to the minister's attention. For example, take clause 8 of the Bill. In this clause provision is made that the appointment of salvage will be made by the law of the country to which the vessel belongs. The clause is as follows:

Where any dispute arises as to the apportionment—

In the Bill it is 'appointment' but I understand that it is intended to be 'apportionment' and that this is a clerical error.

Where any dispute arises as to the apportionment of any amount of salvage, among the owners, master, pilot, crew, and other persons in the service of any foreign vessel, the amount shall be apportioned by the court or person making the apportionment in accordance with the law of the country to which the vessel belongs.

We have a regulation in regard to that question in section 919 of the Canadian Shipping Act, which I think conflicts with that clause. Section 919 reads as follows:

Whenever foreign ships are within Canadian waters the regulations for preventing collisions in force for the time being under the provisions of this Part, and all provisions of this Part relating to such rules, or otherwise relating to collisions, shall apply to such foreign ships; and, in any case arising in any court of justice in Canada concerning matters happening within Canadian waters foreign ships **shall, so far as regards such regulations and provisions, be treated as if they were British or Canadian ships.**

I would like the minister to look into these two clauses and see if they do not conflict one with the other. We provide in that clause that the apportionment of the salvage shall be made by the court of the country to which the vessel belongs. I understand that the vessel is paying salvage—

Mr. HAZEN: No, the vessel is receiving salvage.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Well, say that the vessel receiving salvage is a Norwegian vessel and it comes into collision with a Can-

adian vessel at Montreal; under section 919 it strikes me that the proper court in which that adjustment ought to be made would be the Canadian court, but under the section we are enacting, the law provides that the court must be the court of the country to which the vessel belongs. That is one question that I wish to direct to the attention of the minister. Then, in regard to the fact that the Act shall not apply to the Great Lakes, I would like the minister to look at section 916.

Mr. HAZEN: Of the Canadian Shipping Act or the Maritime Shipping Act?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Section 916 of the Canadian Shipping Act is repealed, I understand, in regard to collisions on the Great Lakes. But there is a section which provides for all collisions in Canadian waters. —Section 913—which is not repealed. This section 913 is a section of very great importance because it provides that the regulations respecting lights, fog signals, steering and sailing shall apply to all the rivers, lakes and other navigable waters within Canada or within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada, until annulled or qualified by Imperial regulation. That is to say that a captain, when sailing his vessel, must observe the rules of the road in order to avoid collision, and if he fails to do so he is liable. That section remains in force as far as I can see in the coasting waters and in the waters below Montreal, but section 913 that is at present in the Canadian Shipping Act continues to be in force. Other provisions are made in the Bill which we are enacting which do not make any reference to the fact that the captain of the ship must observe the rules of the road. I think these two sections will have to be very carefully examined to see that they do not conflict one with the other. I have no further observations to make, but the question will, of course, be dealt with in Committee of the Whole later on and I would like the minister to have his law officer look carefully into these matters.

Mr. HAZEN: I want to understand my hon. friend's criticism. Section 8 is very clear indeed:

> Where any dispute arises as to the appointment of any amount of salvage, among the owners, master, pilot, crew, and other persons in the service of any foreign vessel, the amount shall be apportioned by the court or person making the apportionment in accordance with the law of the country to which the vessel belongs.

That of course is self-explanatory and is only right. I should think it was only reasonable that, where a vessel is awarded salvage, the apportionment of that salvage among the owners, masters, pilot, crew, and other persons interested should be according to the law of the country to which the vessel belongs. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that that may conflict with section 919 of the Canada Shipping Act?

Mr. SINCLAIR: It brings the apportionment under Canadian jurisdiction. I gave an example of a Norwegian vessel coming into collision in the St. Lawrence river, in which case it was claimed that the apportionment should be made in Norway, where the vessel was registered.

Mr. HAZEN: Not made in Norway, but according to the laws of Norway.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Yes.

Mr. HAZEN: The Judge of the Admiralty Court would make the apportionment according to the law of the country to which the vessel belonged. The vessel or the people would not have to be sent to Norway in order to have the apportionment made, but the judge would look up the Norwegian law and apply it to that case.

There seems to be a conflict between sections 916 and 913. I will see my hon. friend's remarks in 'Hansard.' I would be very glad if this Bill were advanced to another stage. I would be much obliged to my hon. friend if he would study the Act very carefully, because in drafting legislation of this nature something of importance may be overlooked.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not understand why section 916 is repealed. Of course there may be something in connection with the convention that I have not yet seen or studied. The confusion in my mind arises out of the repeal of section 916.

Mr. HAZEN: Can my hon. friend tell me the section of the Act which repeals section 916?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Section 5.

Mr. HAZEN: Section 916 of The Canada Shipping Act reads as follows:

> If, in any case of collision, it appears to the court before which the case is tried, that such collision was occasioned by the non-observance of any of such regulations, the vessel or raft by which such regulations have been violated shall be deemed to be in fault, unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the court that the circumstances of the case rendered a departure from the said regulations necessary.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is not that a good section?

Mr. HAZEN: The convention repeals that. I will give the reasons.

Mr. SINCLAIR: This is not a good section for the Great Lakes.

Mr. HAZEN: Here are the reasons:

If it is proved that damage has resulted by reason of the non-observance of the rules, then the provisions of article 13 of the convention apply.

For instance, a vessel runs aground by being forced out of her course by the improper navigation of another vessel. The article reads as follows:

This convention extends to the making good of damages which a vessel has caused to another vessel, of the goods or persons on board either vessel, either by the execution or non-execution of the manœuvres or by the non-observance of the regulations, even if no collision has actually taken place.

Therefore my hon. friend will see that that article covers section 916 of the Canada Shipping Act, and is somewhat more explicit. If section 916 is repealed, is it my hon. friend's contention that there is no law so far as the Great Lakes are concerned?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Yes, there is no law so far as the Great Lakes are concerned, and no provision has been made for them. My hon. friend has repealed the law which requires captains on the Great Lakes to observe the rules of the road, and he makes no provision in its place, so that in future a captain who has a collision on the Great Lakes is not bound by the law which has always existed in this country requiring captains to observe the rules of the road.

Mr. HAZEN: I understand my hon. friend's contention, and will look into the matter.

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

Mr. HAZEN: Considering the importance of this Bill, it might be better not to proceed further at present. I think we should report progress, so that hon. members may have further time to study the Bill.

Progress reported.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

4 p.m. On motion of Mr. Cochrane, Bill No. 30, respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, was read the second time, and the House Went into Committee thereon, Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

On section 1—prairie section:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This is a repetition of the Bill of last year.

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes, extending the time on the prairie section.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Bill No. 31, respecting the National Transcontinental Railway—Mr. Cochrane—was read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply.

Ocean and River Service—Schools of navigation, $8,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We have the Naval College. What, then, is this vote?

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): This is for schools of navigation such as have been carried on for many years. These schools are for the instruction of men who wish to pursue navigation, to get certificates as mates and captains. The schools give instruction in the use of nautical instruments, and so on. These schools are established at ports throughout the country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is nothing new in this vote?

Mr. HAZEN: No; such schools have been carried on for many years.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does the Government pay anything to the Technical College in Nova Scotia for carrying on classes in navigation?

Mr. HAZEN: The Government is arranging to establish a school of navigation at Halifax in connection with the Technical College.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will a sum be voted this year for that purpose?

Mr. HAZEN: It will be paid for out of this vote. Correspondence is going on now between the authorities of the college and the department on the subject.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would strongly commend the idea of the Government assisting the Technical College at Halifax to

establish a school of navigation. I think that this work of education could be carried on by the college more effectively than by any other means. At present, it is the practice of the Government to make small allowances to persons at various ports who will conduct navigation schools for limited periods during each year for the instruction of persons desiring to go up for examination. I think experience has shown that this is not very satisfactory. In a comparatively small province, such as Nova Scotia, suitable educational facilities in navigation at Halifax, I should think, would meet all the requirements of the province generally. A well-equipped school at Halifax would probably attract a greater attendance than schools distributed throughout the province. I trust arrangements will be definitely concluded between the department and the college.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I have drawn the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, on more than one occasion, to the necessity of a branch school at Canso. Five or six years ago a school was started at that point in the winter season, and the attendance was quite large, running as high as forty, I believe. But recently the grant to this school has been withdrawn. I am not accusing my hon. friend of doing that for any improper purpose.

Mr. HAZEN: That grant was withdrawn before I became minister.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is not the point I am making. The proposition to establish a school of navigation at Halifax in connection with the Technical College should embrace also branches at places along the coast such as Canso. A sailor cannot afford to go to Halifax and spend two or three months in getting his education, and we ought to bring education to him. Along the coast we have a large number of young men, hundreds of them, engaged in the fishing industry. These men are partly idle during February and March, and this would be a suitable time for them to get instruction. I cannot help thinking that the proper system would be not only to have a central school at Halifax, but to have branches along the coast in various places where sailors could have an opportunity of getting this instruction; they could go up for examination at Halifax. We have two or three of these schools already, but they have never been supported by the Government to any considerable extent. The small pittance that the teacher gets does not make it worth his while bothering with it at all, and the institution hardly deserves the name of a school. A small amount given to some retired sea captain who chooses to gather around him a few sailors, is about all that is done. If we are going to give education of this kind, we ought to follow out some definite system that would be worthy of the people of Canada. I am not specially accusing the present Administration; we have never had an Administration in this country that has taken an interest in this matter. We have been pretending to be doing something for the education of our seamen ever since Confederation, and all we have done is to appoint gentlemen in various places along the coast to instruct, in the great art of navigation, such sailors as choose to come to them. I would like to see the department doing something bigger than that. If the technical school is the right place—and I think it is—let the head school be placed there, but let us have, not only Nova Scotia but in the other Maritime provinces, branches at various points along the coast where the young men can get an education to fit them to pass the examinations and obtain licenses. It would not involve a very great expenditure, and I submit it would be a good departure for my hon. friend the minister to make.

Mr. MARCIL: I concur very heartily in the suggestions made by the hon. member for Guysborough, and would suggest that the minister apply them to the Baie des Chaleurs, around which there are five constituencies, Northumberland, Gloucester, Restigouche, Bonaventure, and Gaspé. In these constituencies no facilities are afforded to the young people to enable them to receive an education of this kind. In Gaspé and Bonaventure we are hundreds of miles from Quebec, St. John and Halifax. There are no facilities of any kind so far as instruction in agriculture is concerned, and perhaps the Department of Marine and Fisheries might set a good example by making a start in navigation instruction. We have a population consisting largely of seafaring men, and some educational facilities should be afforded them. During the long winter months in the Gaspé peninsula, aside from the lumbering operations, there is very little for the young people to do, and I am sorry to say that at present hundreds of them wander into the state of New York, the Ottawa River district, and elsewhere, to

engage in lumbering. Those who do not go to the Ottawa River district go to the United States, and, in many cases, are lost to Canada. I submit that an opportunity is here afforded for the taking of steps by which these young persons may be kept at home and their time properly occupied during the winter months. A start might be made in one of the constituencies—say at Bonaventure River, in the constituency of Bonaventure, where we have a population of 2,500—by giving a course lasting, say a month. The same might apply to Grand River, in the county of Gaspé, to Bathurst and to other points on the south shore of Baie des Chaleurs. These points on the south shore are within easy access of St. John and Halifax, but such is not the case with points on the north shore. In winter the county of Gaspé is sometimes deprived of railway communication, and only very difficult communication is afforded even with the county of Bonaventure. If the minister came forward with a new departure in this respect it should meet with support from both sides of the House. I concur in what the hon. member for Guysborough has said, and I hope the minister will apply his good intentions to the Baie des Chaleurs, and especially the north shore.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: So far as I am concerned, I have no objection whatever to the most generous financial assistance on the part of the department so far as the starting of navigation schools is concerned. Of course, as there would be a limit to the number of schools, there would be a limit to the amount required, but I doubt very much if the idea which my hon. friend the hon. member for Bonaventure has in mind will meet the situation, or that the establishment of schools by constituencies is a feasible or practical idea. The difficulty in establishing successful navigation schools lies in obtaining pupils. The hon. member for Guysborough and the hon. member for Bonaventure will agree that if you cannot get pupils to attend the school, the same is a failure.

Mr. MARCIL: The thing has never been tried in the peninsula. Because it is so remote and difficult of access, the conditions in the peninsula of Gaspé are quite different from those of the northern constituencies of Nova Scotia.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I doubt if the inference my hon. friend desires can be drawn from the conditions existing there. Schools have been established at many points in Nova Scotia, and difficulty has been found in securing pupils to attend them. The hon. member for Guysborough says that they have no difficulty in that regard in his constituency—this I am glad to hear—and that the attendance is very good. But that was not the experience in other places in Nova Scotia. However, I think it would be wise indeed to assist navigation schools in almost any district in any province where there is a demand for such a school, but I think the idea of a strong central school is advantageous. I know that in Nova Scotia more masters and mates obtained certificates when there was a very good marine school in Halifax conducted by a private individual, whether aided by the Government or not I do not know. This was some twenty or twenty-five years ago. The advantage of association of students or applicants for certificates was very beneficial; it caused the students to take a greater interest in their work, and this advantage is absent in a small place where there is an attendance of only half a dozen or a dozen. I think, too, that there would be a very considerable advantage in having a strong navigation school in some central part of each province, with such a provision for schools in the other outside districts as has been suggested by the hon. member for Guysborough.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How many men qualified last year?

Mr. HAZEN: This year there are schools at Vancouver, Collingwood, Quebec city, North Sydney, Halifax, Yarmouth, and St. John. Of these seven schools three are in Nova Scotia, one in the eastern part of Nova Scotia, at North Sydney, one at Yarmouth, and the other at Halifax, in connection with the technical college. The appliances and instruments required have been purchased and are now at Halifax, and as soon as a suitable building is obtained the school will start. I am in sympathy with the idea advanced by the hon. member for Bonaventure that perhaps we would reach those who want an education in this respect better by a number of small schools than by a central school, because if you have these schools in cities, as a rule the young men who may want to take up navigation as a profession are not men of large means, and it would be easier for them to attend a school in a smaller center than in a large city. They could not afford to go to the large cities.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: On the contrary, they are usually well off; that is, they are young seamen with ambition enough to want to secure certificates.

Mr. HAZEN: But these are usually young men who have only been before the mast and most of them are men of rather limited means. Last year we had no school at either Halifax or St. John, although those are the two largest shipping ports in the Maritime provinces. There was no school at Halifax owing to the illness and subsequent death of Captain Lugar. At page 29 of the report of the deputy minister the following information about the schools will be found:

The following tabulated statement shows where the schools were held, the total number of lectures delivered and the total attendance at each:

	Total Lectures.	Total Attendance.
Collingwood, Ont..	32	361
Halifax, N.S.	5	
Quebec, P.Q..	43	753
North Sydney, N.S.	30	242
Vancouver, B.C. ..	15	178
Yarmouth, N.S. ..	30	161
	155	1,695

There was one lecture and thirty-eight in total attendance less than during the previous year which is accounted for by the illness of Captain Lugar, of Halifax, which disorganized that school. A noticeable increase in attendance occurred in the eastern schools, while the total daily attendance at Vancouver fell from 707 last year to 161 in 1912.

The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) asked the number who obtained certificates. The numbers are as follows: in the eastern division, 70 masters and 38 mates; in the inland division, 85 masters and 37 mates; and in the western division, 43 masters and 48 mates.

Mr. LAW: How many passed as masters and mates at Yarmouth?

Mr. HAZEN: I shall ask the deputy minister to obtain that information for the hon. gentleman and send it to him.

Mr. LAW: I was surprised at the large number who passed at Yarmouth, and I think it would be a great pity if it was intended to have a large central school at Halifax and to do away with the smaller schools.

Mr. HAZEN: We have no intention of doing away with the schools at Yarmouth and North Sydney .

[Mr. Hazen.]

Mr. KYTE: What proportion of the grant is to be paid to each of the navigation schools?

Mr. HAZEN: We did not use the full amount of our grant last year. I think the sums run from about $300 to $600.

Mr. PARDEE: I understand that Collingwood is the only school in Ontario. Is it necessary for a candidate to go to Collingwood to pass his examinations or secure a certificate?

Mr. HAZEN: Collingwood is the only school in Ontario, but no change has been made in reference to passing examinations or securing certificates. This may be done at a number of places as heretofore.

Mr. TURGEON: I would endorse what has been said by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) in reference to having schools in each of the constituencies of the north shore of New Brunswick and the Bay de Chaleurs. On the north shore there are many young men who wish to pass the examinations but cannot afford to go to St. John, Halifax or Charlottetown. Many times young men come out of superior schools with an aptitude for navigation but they are not able to attend these navigation schools. Only two years ago two young men coming from the school of Mr. Boudreau, from which many good seamen have come, wished to pass their examinations but they were not able to afford to go to one of the cities referred to for that purpose and they went into some other occupation. Until the minister can establish more schools he should have his examiners visit many more localities in order that young men desiring to pass their examinations may do so.

Mr. HAZEN: I may say to my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) that our policy now is to send the examiners to definite points when any young men wish to be examined. I know what my hon. friend refers to: there was no examination of masters and mates last year in the province of New Brunswick, but we sent an examiner from Charlottetown to Chatham.

Mr. TURGEON: The young men had to go to Charlottetown to pass the examinations.

Mr. HAZEN: No, I was just explaining to my hon. friend that our policy now is to send the examiner to the point that would be most convenient, and that last year in

order to enable a number of young men on the Miramichi to take their examination, we sent the examiner of masters and mates to Chatham where the examination was conducted. We intend to follow that policy in future. I agree with my hon. friend that it would be very unfair if young men from places like Bathurst and Dalhousie had to go to Prince Edward Island or to St. John to pass the examinations.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to emphasize what has been so well said by my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and by my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon). I formerly represented one of the counties on the Baie des Chaleurs. The idea of my hon. friend to decentralize as much as possible the schools of navigation, is an excellent one. I remember, when I was member for the county of Gaspé, I used to receive every year a number of requests for passes over the Intercolonial railway or on steamship companies running down to Quebec and some points on the coast of Gaspé, from sailors. These young men have to earn their daily bread and are not generally well off and when they have to travel quite a distance in order to try their examinations, they quit. And what is the result? From letters I have received this year from different priests in the county of Gaspé, I learn that this winter the parishes have been completely depleted of the young men. Their trail can be followed to the United States navy, or to the shanties in the state of Michigan, or the Upper Ottawa district, and many young men who go as sailors in the United States or to the lumbering camps, do not return. I have noticed that there is quite a colony of my old Gaspé electors in the city of Ottawa. I daresay there are almost 500 or 600 people here from the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure. They have been lured by the city and they will not return to the deep sea fisheries.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Are they all in the public service?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The same thing might be said with regard to the city of Montreal and possibly the city of Quebec. In Montreal, in Gaspé street, Hochelga ward, there are at least from 1,000 to 1,200 natives of Gaspé, and we can trace the preponderance of Gaspé electors in that ward to the fact that no facilities were provided at home to enable them to learn seafaring. They have been lured by the cities and have stayed in the cities. In the counties of Gaspé, Gloucester and Bonaventure, there is a large population of French-Canadians, Acadians and Jersey fishermen. The old fishing establishments of Robin and Colas, and Le Bouthillier and Cie, have for over a century sent their ships to Italy and Spain, where the Canadian fish trade used to flourish. Some thirty years ago the trade began to go in another direction, and they sent their fish to the West Indies and to South America. At that time we had on the Labrador coast, and in Gloucester county and in Gaspé, deep-sea captains who had travelled all over the world, but to-day it is only by accident we meet one. The reason for this is that the young men who are born sailors have not been encouraged, and no facilities have been provided for them to learn their trade. I would urge upon my hon. friend the necessity for decentralizing the schools of navigation, so that our young men in the Maritime districts should be given a chance to become deep-sea captains as their forefathers were.

Mr. HAZEN: I will be very happy to give instructions next year for one of the examiners to proceed along the coast of Gaspé or Bonaventure, as may be most convenient, for the purpose of conducting examinations.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would suggest that my hon. friend confer with that very excellent officer of his, Commander Wakeham, who knows the coast by heart and practically every family there. I am sure he would give him excellent advice as to the places where the examinations should be held. I think myself that they could very well be held at Pointe aux Esquimaux, on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, at Gaspé basin, Mount Louis, Percé and Grand river on the south shore. I am sure that the department would find that the young men on the coast, having such facilities to pass their examinations, would become what they were born to be, excellent sailors.

Mr. MARCIL: Do I understand that the minister is merely going to send down an examiner? I suppose some course of instruction would have to be given. There are hundreds of young men down there who, when they arrive at a certain age, do not know what calling to enter. They are born seamen, they have breathed the salt air from the day of their birth, and if some course of instruction is not provided for them they may go to the United States and

disappear from the Baie des Chaleurs district altogether. My idea is that some preliminary school of instruction should be established and a course of lectures extending over two or three months in the winter time, given. I think in that way you would have excellent subjects for the examination next season. I do not suppose it is the intention of the minister to send an examiner down there, and no one to instruct the young men.

Mr. HAZEN: A great many of those who come up for examination have never attended the schools provided by the Government. In many parts of Canada there are private schools, kept by gentlemen who have been sailors or navigators and, where these private schools are in existence, it is not the policy of the Government to interfere with them by establishing a school. But from the remarks of my hon. friend the conditions along the Gaspé coast must be different. My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) has convinced me that it would be only proper and right that we should during next season establish some school along that coast for young men who desire to study navigation. I will see that that is done.

Mr. MARCIL: I can assure the minister that the attendance at Bonaventure will be satisfactory from the start.

Ocean and River Service—Registration of shipping. $3,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In connection with the item relating to the registry of ships, it would be interesting to know how many ships have been withdrawn from Canadian registry during the year and what tonnage has been added. It is commonly supposed that the laws relating to shipping are a little too stringent in Canada, and the result is that a good many ships owned by Canadians are taken off the Canadian registry and registered in other colonies like Newfoundland.

Mr. HAZEN: And Barbados.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Barbados. It has been a common occurrence in my province for some years past. One of the chief reasons for this is that coasting captains are restricted in the latitude in which they may sail. There is no reason for this restriction, which did not exist until some years ago, and which was made more stringent than was necessary. At the present time a coasting captain has a right to clear from a Canadian port and to sail to any point north of Central America. There are a number of points farther south of that latitude to which coasting captains would often like to sail. My hon. friend can take the newspapers in the city of St. John, or city of Halifax, any day, and I will venture to say that he will find clearances for ports on the coast of South America, ports like Rio and Bahia, and other points on the River Plate. A coasting captain cannot legally clear for these ports under the present law. He must be a deep sea captain to do that. The coasting captain goes to the custom house and, when he says that he is clearing for a port south of the latitude allowed by law, the customs house officer refuses him a clearance. In certain ports in the province of Nova Scotia I have known it to happen that some old man who had obtained a license a good many years ago, would be sent to the customs house to get the clearance, and when the vessel got down to a point some distance from the port of sailing the old man would be sent home and a young man who had a coasting license only would get on board and take the vessel to a point beyond the latitude stated in the law and no question would be asked. That is a device that used to be resorted to—I do not know if it is still resorted to—in order to get rid of this difficulty. There is no reason why a coasting captain should not be allowed to go down the coast of South America. Let him go to South America and let him go around the Horn if he wants to. I would like the minister to facilitate a Bill which I have introduced in order to give coasting captains their right to go farther south than they can go at the present time. I do not know anything about the circumstances or conditions on the Pacific coast, but I looked up the law and I found that a coasting captain on the Pacific coast can only go as far as the harbour of Portland. That is not very far from Canadian territory. I see no reason why that limit should not be extended.

Mr. HAZEN: I think a coasting certificate in British Columbia enables a man now to go as far as San Francisco.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I did not know that.

Mr. HAZEN: I think there was some amendment a few years ago.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In the Bill I have introduced, and which is now up for its second reading, I suggested that 40° south latitude would be a good point on both coasts. That enables a captain on the Pacific coast to go down to the seaports in Chili and it enables a captain on the

Atlantic coast to go as far south as the River Plate. I am referring to this matter at the present moment to press this question on the minister, as I know I will not be able to get my Bill through without his help, and if he will take into consideration the importance of this Bill and its passage it will be a great boon to the people engaged in shipping on the coast of the Maritime provinces.

Mr. HAZEN: The matter to which my hon. friend refers is one of great interest to shipping men in the Maritime provinces and also to those on the Pacific coast who are engaged in the shipping trade. On the Pacific coast I understand that captains can go as far south as San Francisco, and I think their desire is that a coasting certificate shall enable them to go even farther south. There is no doubt that what my hon. friend says is correct, that a great many coasting vessels are being registered in Newfoundland, Barbados and at other points where no certificated captain is needed at all. In addition to that there are vessels owned by St. John companies which are registered in the state of Maine, notwithstanding the fact that they are managed by St. John people. I have had representations made to me by the owners of coasting vessels both in Halifax and St. John, and I have had conferences with some of these gentlemen in St. John. One gentleman came to see me just before New Year's. It was in connection with the new Canada Shipping Act which I propose to introduce to Parliament this year. The introduction of that Bill will afford an opportunity for a full discussion of this entire question. The owners of coasting vessels want to have the right to receive a coasting certificate which will enable them to proceed right down to South America all along the coast, and they argue, and argue with a good deal of force, that a man who is able to take a vessel from a Maritime province port down along the coast of North America as far as Cape Hatteras is quite capable of taking a vessel down the coast of South America. They say that it is difficult to get certificated captains and almost impossible to get certificated mates. They ask, first, that the certificate shall entitle a captain to take his vessel farther along the coast than he is now permitted to do, and that the certificate, in so far as the mate is concerned shall be abolished altogether. Some also have told me that there are cases where they get men who have a certificate, but whose age precludes them from being of any use, to simply take the vessel from port and the voyage is continued under that certificate. There is a diversity of opinion about the matter, but I think it is a question well worthy of consideration, and I intend in the next week, or the week after that, to introduce a Bill which will be a consolidation and revision of the Canada Shipping Act. I doubt very much if an Act of this importance, and containing so many sections, can be passed through the House this year, but I shall suggest, on the second reading of the Bill, that it be referred to the Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, before which there will be every opportunity of discussing all these questions which are so important to the shipping interests of Canada. I am only offering my personal opinion now, but I think it would be in the interests of Canadian shipping if some modifications were made, and, while it would be in the interests of Canadian shipping, I do not think it would in any way imperil the lives of those who go to sea or the property which is entrusted to the men who handle these vessels.

Mr. MARCIL: I might inform the hon. minister that circulars have been received by members of the House lately protesting against the coastwise business being done by Norwegian vessels. Is there any new feature of the question, or does the same arrangement continue to subsist as that which has been in existence for some time by which Norwegian vessels are allowed to engage in the coasting business?

Mr. HAZEN: There is nothing new in that matter; it is exactly the same arrangement as that which has existed for many years.

Mr. MARCIL: To be continued until 1913 under a treaty?

Mr. HAZEN: No, I do not think there is any treaty about it.

Mr. MARCIL: I thought it was in view of a treaty between Norway and England which allowed Norwegian vessels to come into British colonies.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think so.

Mr. MARCIL: The people of Nova Scotia protest very strongly against this.

Mr. HAZEN: The vessels bring coal from Nova Scotia up the St. Lawrence. That privilege was given some years ago; I believe there was very little objection to it,

and it was extended for a period of one year when it expired a couple of months ago.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is not there a general protest by the shipping interests of the Maritime provinces against that privilege? I see that the gentleman who signed the circular is very severe.

Mr. HAZEN: I have not seen the circular.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will send my hon. friend a copy of it.

Ocean and River Service—Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, $20,000.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: How is this $20,000 to be expended?

Mr. HAZEN: In 1912-13 we spent only $1,533 of the vote.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There were no obstructions last year.

Mr. HAZEN: No. In 1913-14, we spent $1,179. The officers of the department are of the opinion that it is impossible to estimate with any accuracy the amount that will be required. If hon. gentlemen will look at page 5 of the departmental report of this year, they will see that the following obstructions were removed during the year:

Florida, sunk in Montreal harbour. Scow Newel Hubbard, sunk at Hocket Beach. An old barge sunk, entrance of Chateauguay river, P.Q. A derelict in Vancouver harbour, B.C., S.S. Joliet, sunk in St. Clair, Ont.; and logs from Victoria harbour, B.C.

There have been years when the whole amount is required. In other years only a small portion is required.

Mr. LAW: This item is only for the removal of wrecks and obstructions in navigable waters, and not for the removal of obstructions in rivers?

Mr. HAZEN: This item is not for the removal of snags and other obstructions from rivers. That work is attended to by the Department of Public Works. In some of the rivers where lumbering operations are carried on, and there is a good deal of navigation, the practice of the Department of Public Works is to give a charter to some tug-boat owner to go to those waters and to remove obstructions. Sometimes a log will be found standing straight up in the water, and a steamer running into it might suffer great injury. This item is for the removal of derelicts in navigable waters.

[Mr. Hazen.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does not the department make a claim when the obstruction is taken away?

Mr. HAZEN: We do. The owner of the vessel is responsible for removing it, and we at once notify him. If he does not remove it, we do so and proceed against the vessel owner and make him pay.

Mr. LAW: What is the necessity of the vote if the money is collected from the owner of the vessel?

Mr. HAZEN: The vote is necessary because we need some fund from which we can pay for the work before we collect from the owners of the vessels. There are always cases in which the vessel owners cannot be collected from.

5 p.m.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In the cases mentioned by my hon. friend, has the Government been recouped?

Mr. HAZEN: In the case of the Joliet which was sunk in St. Clair, we were recouped. The owner refused to pay; we proceeded against him and forced him to pay.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In the case of the barge sunk in the Chateauguay river, were you recouped?

Mr. HAZEN: No, it was an old barge, and we apparently could not find anybody whom we could compel to pay.

Mr. MARCIL: I have been able to find the circular to which I referred, and I shall read some extracts for the benefit of the minister:

Are Norwegians still to monopolize Canadian coastwise trade? Or is it to be Canada for Canadians in our coastwise trade, which means the transport of our products from one Canadian port to another Canadian port? Build up Canadian coastwise shipping. Trade follows the flag.

A few years ago Nova Scotia's tonnage was 558,000. In 1910 it had declined to about 160,000 tons, mostly fishing schooners. The province of Nova Scotia at one time owned more shipping tonnage per head of population than any other country in the world. Canada has been reduced from the fourth shipping maritime power in the world to eleventh place.

Then there is a letter which appeared in the New York Tribune under date of September 28, 1913, from Alexander T. Baillie, a resident of Port Hastings, Cape Breton, Canada. Then there are Orders in Council and memoranda from the Department of Customs regarding the coast trade of Canada. One of these, dated December 8, 1911, reads as follows:

Steamships of not less than two thousand tons gross tonnage each, of the following countries, namely: Norway Sweden, Austro-Hungary and Japan shall be admitted to the coasting trade of Canada in the carrying of goods and passengers coastwise between any port in the province of Nova Scotia and any port in the province of Quebec, and vice versa, on the same terms and conditions as are applicable to Canadian vessels, until the 31st day of December, 1915.

John McDougald,
Commissioner.

It concludes by a pathetic appeal headed:

Heroic Nova Scotia seamen who risked their lives to rescue those on board the ill-fated Cobequid.

Then other criticisms follow. The conclusions are these:

A few years ago Nova Scotia tonnage was 558,000 tons; If her coastwise trade and seamen had been protected as some other important industries in our province, such as coal, she would have to day over one million tons of shipping instead of about 160,000 tons mostly fishing schooners.

Mr. HAZEN: Of course my hon. friend will understand that that matter does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Department of Marine and Fisheries; it is a matter of the Department of Customs. I understand that Mr. Baillie has been protesting for some fifteen years against it, but the governments during that time, after considering the matter, have seen fit to extend it. Without this extension it would be very difficult for coal men to get their coal to Montreal. They could not get it there on terms that would enable them to sell it at a profit to the consumer if they could not take advantage of these Norwegian bottoms.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is it the policy of this Government to stop the granting of these licenses at the end of the year?

Mr. HAZEN: I cannot tell my hon. friend what the policy will be. There is no decision on the matter.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: From 1907 or 1908 to 1911, it was just as much the policy of the party which is now in power to prevent the matter to which the hon. member from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has been referring as it was to give this country adequate protection, purity in elections, the Highways Bill and other things. I think the minister should give us some reason for not carrying out this programme. In some constituencies in Nova Scotia, particularly a county like Lunenburg, the electors there were promised by Conservative candidates that if they came into power, Norwegian vessels would not be permitted to engage in Nova Scotia trade. In fact, pretty nearly every Conservative candidate in the election of 1908 was unequivocally pledged to prevent the continuance of this. Does the minister ever receive communications from his political friends in Nova Scotia asking that Norwegian vessels be prevented from engaging in this coasting trade?

Mr. HAZEN: This matter falls within the control, not of my department but of the Department of Customs. I have never received any such letters as the hon. gentleman refers to; but such letters, if written would, in the ordinary course, be addressed to the Minister of Customs.

Ocean and River Service—Winter mail service, $11,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister please explain this item?

Mr. HAZEN: This vote is given every year to provide for the ice-boat service between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse, when the regular steamer service is cut off. In some years this whole vote is used and in others very little of it. In the season of 1912-13, the amount spent was $7,129.30, and for the present season up to January 1, only $91.23. Of course, the great expenditure may come in February and March.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will ask my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) to do this year what he was kind enough to do last year—and that is, when the season is favourable, to allow one of the Government steamers to go from Prince Edward Island or Pictou to the Magdalen Islands. As the hon. minister knows the Magdalen Islanders are deprived of all communication for several months in the year. The last letter I received was from the Rev. Mr. Turbide, of House Harbour. He says: 'I am writing you, because fortunately, a steamer has come this morning, and from appearances navigation will be possible during six or eight weeks more. Some years ago the officers of the Marine Department found difficulty in inducing the captains to take the risk of this trip. But the experience of the last two years has proven that it is quite possible in an ordinary season for a steamer to cross to the Magdalen Islands.' The same remark applies to Seven Islands. The Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) knows that winter navigation between Quebec, or the mouth of the Saguenay river, and Seven Islands is quite possible. For several years the department has sent the Montcalm once during the winter months, and the people of that distant shore have had the privilege of receiving the mails. I would like to know

what is the intention of the minister this year with regard to that? Will he continue this service and familiarize the people of this country, and other countries with the idea that winter navigation is quite possible below Quebec? There are no insuperable obstacles to winter navigation between Cape Tormentine on the mainland and Souris, P.E.I. It has been demonstrated also that navigation is possible between Quebec, St. Catherines Bay, and Seven Islands. My hon. friend knows what a boon it is for those isolated people to receive mail during the long winter.

Mr. HAZEN: The Stanley has made one trip to Magdalen Islands this year, and we hope she will make other trips. The Montcalm returned last week from Seven Islands and is now engaged in ice breaking on the St. Lawrence. Mr. Forneret, superintendent of the ice-breaking service, said it was necessary to continue this work until next week, when we shall send the vessel to Murray bay. The hon. gentleman will see that we are doing the best we can to maintain communication below Quebec.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the Champlain be soon ready for service?

Mr. HAZEN: She has been undergoing repairs, and I am informed that she is ready. They are building a new wharf to afford her safe wharfage accommodation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand that the landing at Murray bay is quite difficult. But the Postmaster General will tell my hon. friend that there are other wharfs on that shore, viz.—Cap à l'Aigle, St. Irénée, Les Eboulements, Baie St. Paul. I am not sufficiently versed in navigation to say whether a boat could easily land at those places, but an effort should be made, because the distance the people of the county of Charlevoix have to travel in order to reach the terminus of the Quebec railway is long, and mails from the city of Quebec are not delivered within a week. I would urge the hon. gentleman to do his best to afford the people of Charlevoix better facilities of communication.

Mr. HAZEN: The Champlain is that, being an ice-breaker, she is of deep-draught and would have trouble in reaching some of the wharfs to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In the summer the same boat will touch two of these wharfs—Cap à l'Aigle and St. Irénée.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Will the steamers for the Magdalen Islands start from Halifax?

Mr. HAZEN: They generally start from North Sydney.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The Stanley made the last trip?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes; she is now at North Sydney.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I have had communications from the Magdalen Islands about this matter. Can the minister tell when the next trip will be made?

Mr. HAZEN: No decision has been reached about that. The Stanley at this moment is engaged in ice breaking.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When a trip by the Stanley to the Magdalen Islands is contemplated, I presume notice is given to merchants?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, that is done by the agent at Quebec.

Mr. MARCIL: In a Quebec newspaper yesterday I observed that owing to the ice, the Montcalm has returned from an ineffectual attempt to enter Ellis bay, Anticosti, and that she intends to return there next Tuesday. Conditions at Ellis bay are very much affected by the wind; it might be filled with ice one day and be free the next. I hope the attempt to enter the bay will be kept up.

Ocean and river service—Cattle inspection, $5,000.

Mr. HAZEN: This item is incorrectly worded; it should read 'inspection of livestock shipments.' This vote is placed at the disposal of the department for the purpose of paying inspectors whose duty it is to see that the cattle and horses shipped from Canadian ports are properly provided for on the vessels. A few years ago quite a large amount was needed for this purpose, but the shipments of cattle from Canada are not as formerly. There are two inspectors at Montreal, Mr. H. Delorme and Mr. J. O'Grady, one getting $1,200 and the other $1,000 a year. There was an inspector at St. John, but the shipment of cattle from that port has practically come to a standstill, and as there is no necessity for the continuation of the office, it has been abolished. The few small shipments which do go out are looked after by the agent of the Marine Department.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is there no hope that the cattle embargo will ever be abolished?

Mr. HAZEN: I really do not know.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have no doubt that the system of inspection of livestock at Canadian ports is excellent, but when our cattle reach the other side of the water, they are prevented from going farther than Liverpool or other ports of entry, although we are an exceedingly loyal people, and we have a superlatively loyal Government; at least the Government is self-assertive in that respect. Last year the Government gave evidence of its great loyalty by asking this Parliament to make a gift of $35,000,000 to the mother country, while in various other departments of the Government the greatest facilities are offered to our friends in Great Britain. I remember, when I was Postmaster General, I gave the British newspapers special facilities and special rates in order to foster a splendid British feeling in this country. Some years ago it was rumoured that pleuro-pneumonia had taken hold of our Canadian cattle, which as we know was nothing more or less than a libel. Sir Charles Tupper, writing I think about ten years ago, said that early in the eighties he took up that matter with the British authorities and proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that the assertion that Canadian cattle were subject to this disease was nothing more than a libel upon Canadian livestock. The reason or pretext given for the continuation of the embargo is the desire to afford a measure of protection to the north of Ireland grazing interests. As I have said, we have given to the mother country many evidences of our loyalty and goodwill. Is it not time that the Government should insist upon the removal of this embargo? What steps have this Government taken to redeem the excellent reputation enjoyed by Canadian cattle in former years?

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend will have to ask the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend was in Europe two years ago, and he delivered loyal speeches before many clubs, including the Colonial Institute. He was the honoured guest of many associations, and he spoke of the good feeling existing between the two countries. I stand for the mother country, but I like to stand for my native land. As a good Canadian, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries delivered many eloquent speeches when he was in England; he even lectured that loyal Welsh lawyer, the Rt. Hon. David Lloyd George.

Mr. HAZEN: That is news to me.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Did not my hon. friend make a speech in England in which he said that the statesmen of Great Britain ought to do more for the navy, and not spend all the money of the people on so-called social reforms?

Mr. HAZEN: I made no such speech.

Mr. LEMIEUX: At all events my hon. friend gave advice to the Government of Great Britain as to their internal policy. Has he not been able to find time and words to ask the British Government to remove that embargo, and to give our Canadian cattle the standing they had a few years ago?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Did I understand the minister to say that he is not spending very much now on the inspection of shipments of cattle to Great Britain?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, there is really very little spent.

Mr. CLARK: As a matter of fact, are there any cattle going to Britain at all?

Mr. HAZEN: Last year the shipments were: from Montreal, 178 sheep, 6,469 cattle and 175 horses.

Mr. CLARK: That was in 1912-13. Of course there was a very important event in 1914 which has altered the business altogether. In 1912, in the whole year, we sent about 7,800 head of cattle to Great Britain; but in the month of November last, I read somewhere the other day, not one split hoof of cattle went to Great Britain, in the month of November. But 75,000 head, including calves, very unpatriotic cattle, went south.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Under which flag?

Mr. SINCLAIR: It might be drawn to the attention of the Imperial authority that we are better treated in the United States than we are in Great Britain in regard to this matter. I understand that our cattle are shipped from various points and are admitted to the United States without any question, whereas shipments to Great Britain have to be slaughtered as soon as they arrive. I think my hon. friend, who is familiar with these matters, ought to press the fact on the attention of the Im-

perial authorities that the people of Canada, in regard to this matter, are treated better by the United States than by the home authorities.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: On the question of the embargo, I cannot quite endorse what my hon. friend from Guysborough and my hon. friend from Rouville say in regard to that being originally a protective measure. I think the regulation was enacted in perfectly good faith by the old country Government. They believed there was disease amongst Canadian cattle, and it should be remembered that the herds kept in Great Britain by great agriculturists, from the occupant of the Throne downwards, are very expensive cattle and very valuable. I might admit that in Great Britain, as elsewhere, anything that has a protective tendency is much more easy to get on than it is to get off, and, with the very strong connection there has been between the Irish party and the Liberal party, which has been in power for a number of recent years, of course the weight of Irish opinion may have influenced the Government. I quite admit that, but I think that, in the early history of the embargo, it is scarcely right for my hon. friend to prefer a charge or even to hint that a charge of bad faith against the British authorities might be laid. I think the embargo was put on in good faith as a preventive of disease amongst the very valuable herds that are kept over there. But with the small number of cattle going now to Great Britain I cannot think that the embargo in Great Britain is a subject of very practical importance. The removal of the embargo elsewhere, which is after all the worst of all embargoes, the embargo of a protective tariff, has produced results which make the disease embargo fade into absolute insignificance.

Mr. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend misunderstood my remarks. I did not intend to cast any reflection on the good faith of the Imperial authorities, but I merely drew attention to the fact that we are better treated in the Unied States. It appears that when we want anything big done in this country we have to go to the United States for it. Nobody expects our own Government to do anything of importance in that line. We know that the greatest thing done for Canada in 1913 was done at Washington. I want to emphasize the fact that we are very well treated across the line, and it would be worth while to impress on the Imperial authorities that they should give us the same treatment in Great Britain.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: There is no doubt that the trade in live cattle between Canada and the United States is a very important trade, and we do not want to have anything done or left undone that might endanger it. If this embargo on our cattle going to Great Britain is continued on the plea that our cattle are diseased, is there not a possibility and even a probability that the interests in the United States that are opposed to our trade in cattle with that country may bring that up and may use it as an argument against the importation of cattle from this country? It appears to me that this is well worth consideration.

Mr. HAZEN: I fancy that the United States knew of the embargo long before they admitted our cattle free to that country.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: This is not a contentious matter; it is important looking to our export trade that if our cattle are not diseased everything should be done to remove the embargo between this country and Great Britain.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In the matter to which I referred a moment ago, I do not wish to quote the whole speech I delivered, but to refresh my hon. friend's memory. I said last year:

> I was surprised to read the other day a speech reported to have been delivered in England by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries before the Imperial Maritime League. He said 'A mere gift of money will have no useful effect at all. The giving of money for the navy by the Dominion of Canada will merely have the effect of saving the pocket of the Liberal Government for other schemes of so-called social reform which, being interpreted, means further sops to the United Kingdom electorate and will be of no advantage whatever to the navy.'

Mr. HAZEN: From what does the hon. gentleman quote?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I forget now. I got the speech from the papers.

Mr. HAZEN: This is the first time I have heard it. I never made such a speech as that. I do not think that any sane man going from Canada in a representative capacity would give utterances to such thoughts couched in such language. I would like to know the source of the report because it does not convey any idea of what I said on any occasion.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am very glad to hear my hon. friend say so.

Mr. HAZEN: I saw something in a Montreal paper which I corrected.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who are the inspectors in Montreal?

Mr. HAZEN: Mr. H. Delorme and Mr. O'Grady.

Mr. LAW: Does this inspection of cattle apply only to cattle for export across the sea? I would fear that there might be some conflict of authority with the Agricultural Department if there is an inspection for disease.

Mr. HAZEN: This is not an inspection for disease. It is an old vote to provide for the inspection of the accommodation provided for cattle on steamers, to see that they are put in proper pens and that proper provision is made for their treatment during ocean shipment. It applies only to cattle for shipment across the Atlantic.

Mr. LAW: I am glad that no obstacles are put in the way of the trade in cattle between Nova Scotia and the United States, because our farmers are reaping quite a harvest now and we are looking forward to quite a large trade in cattle and other articles.

Wrecking plant, $45,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like to ask whether the Government still has the Davie establishment at Quebec.

Mr. HAZEN: Mr. Davie threw up the contract a year and a half or two years ago. He was not able to make it pay. For several years there had been very few wrecks on the St. Lawrence and he made no money. He submitted his figures to the department and gave his reasons for giving up the contract.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is there a wrecking plant at Gaspé basin?

Mr. KYTE: Where is this plant located?

Mr. HAZEN: The plant of the Quebec Salvage Company at Quebec, in the St. Lawrence. The Quebec Salvage Company is to maintain the steamer Lord Strathcona and such other plant as may be required to the satisfaction of the department, from the first of May to the first of December, of each year while the agreement lasts. This boat does certain comber work within fixed zones and being equipped with wireless it can get quickly to the scene of a wreck.

Mr. KYTE: Does all this grant go to that company?

Mr. HAZEN: Oh, no, there are three wrecking companies in Canada. The company of the St. Lawrence gets a subsidy of $25,000 subject to certain conditions. If in any year during the continuance of the contract, the total amount received by the contractors from their salvage and wrecking operations, including the subsidy paid, is in excess of the cost of maintenance, including interest and insurance, the contractors shall pay to the Government fifty per cent of the amount of such excess. Last year under that clause there was paid back to the Government a sum of $8,000. Then there is the wrecking plant maintained by the Dominion Coal Company which plant is divided up between Halifax and Sydney, for which it gets a subsidy of $10,000. It places at the disposal of ship owners and others requiring the services of large steamers, the following boats when required; Cabot, Coban, Cacouna, Cape Breton, Louisburg and the tugs Douglas H. Thomas, C. M. Winch, Springhill, and the barge Glenville. The steamers above mentioned are located at Sydney in the summer, and at Louisburg in the winter. The tug Springhill, is located at St. John and the barge Glenville at Halifax. The last contract expired on the first of April, 1912, and it has been renewed for two years. The third wrecking plant, belonging to the British Columbia Salvage Company, is located on the Pacific coast. The British Columbia Salvage Company entered into a contract to maintain a wrecking plant at Esquimalt for a period of ten years from December, 1905.

Mr. KYTE: What amount of money does the Dominion Coal Company receive?

Mr. HAZEN: $10 and $25 goes to the Quebec Salvage Company under the conditions I have described.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is the subsidy to the Dominion Coal Company subject to any conditions?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. SINCLAIR: And the British Columbia Salvage Company?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does the minister propose to have a plant at Port Nelson?

Mr. HAZEN: No request has been made as yet.

Ocean and River Service—Unforeseen expenses, $5,000

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is this?

Mr. HAZEN: These are odds and ends which sometimes occur in the department. If my hon. friend would look at the Auditor General's Report, page N-44, he would see what items come under that head. The expenses for 1912-13 was $663.85.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that money used in connection with investigations?

Mr. HAZEN: There might be investigations, not covered by other votes, which it would be used for.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Did Mr. Duchemin get any of that?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think so.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There would not be enough there to pay Duchemin.

Mr. KYTE: I have a file here brought down by the Department of Marine and Fisheries which contains an account, J. A. Gillies, for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, to W. Forgeson, dated 6th, 1912, It reads:

To railway expenses to Pictou, $1.95; steamboat, $1; to Mulgrave stage, $1, $3.95; May 8, 1912, to return from Pictou to Port Royal, railway expenses, stage and boat, $5.25; hotel and travelling expenses, $3.75; loss of time 3 days at $3, $9; telegrams to J. A. Gillies, &c., $1.45; telegrams to Marine Department, 50 cents; total $23.90.

(Sgd) Wm. Forgeson.

This struck me as rather an unusual account, inasmuch as it stands in the name of J. A. Gillies for the Department of Marine and Fisheries indebted to Wm. Forgeson, Port Royal. I would like to get some information as to why this account is here in the form in which it happens to be.

Mr. HAZEN: What page is that on?

Mr. KYTE: Page 77 of a return to an order of the House dated April 7, 1913, showing a copy of all accounts, vouchers and charges incurred by and relating to the lobster hatchery at Arichat during the season of 1912, with the names of the officers and crews of the patrol boat Davies and the wages paid to each.

Mr. HAZEN: That applies to the Fisheries branch, and I may say to my hon. friend that when we reach that branch I will have the information here for him. I never heard of it before.

Mr. LAW: I would like to ask if the minister has treated any other officials in the way he beheaded Mr. Trefry, who occupied the position of shipping master at Yarmouth. The minister dismissed one of the best officials who ever occupied that position, and he was in such a hurry to dismiss him that he appointed a gentleman —I have nothing against him whatever— who was an American citizen. The minister was so eager to appoint Trefry's successor that the port of Yarmouth was without a shipping master until the new appointee could get his papers making him a British subject. Mr. Trefry had been dismissed, and we had to do without a shipping master until the new man could get his papers. I only wish to state these facts to the Committee to show the way in which the Marine Department have acted in connection with dismissals.

Mr. HAZEN: I will give the House the facts in connection with Mr. Trefry:

In April, 1895, the shipping master at the above port was Mr. J. R. Rogers, who was dismissed in October, 1896, by Order in Council, owing to charges of political partisanship. Captain John A. Tilley was then appointed shipping master in the room of Mr. Rogers. On the 11th November, 1896, an Order in Council issued dismissing Captain John A. Tilley and appointing Norman L. Trefry. On the 11th March, 1912, a letter was received at the department signed by Knowles E. Crosby, and several others, preferring charges of political partisanship against Mr. Trefry. It was stated that Trefry had used every effort to defeat the Conservative candidate and to elect Mr. B. B. Law, the Liberal candidate. An affidavit was received from Dr. A. M. Perrin of Yarmouth, testifying that in the election of 1908 he solicited votes and drove a team to carry voters to the polls; that he attended a political meeting held by the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier at Digby, N.S., absenting himself from his office and duties; that he assisted to bring Mr. Law forward as the Liberal candidate at a caucus of the Liberals in September, 1911, at which time at the grand entrance of the S.S. Prince George of the D.A.R. SS. Company, he grasped the hand of Captain McKinnon of the Prince George and stopping him on the stairway exclaimed: 'Ha, ha, we had a hard task to induce Mr. Law to offer himself for a candidate, but he has at last consented after a deal of 'petitioning;' that he took part in a political meeting held in the opera house at Yarmouth; when he was on the platform with Mr. Law.' In view of the representations in Dr. Perrin's affidavit, an Order in Council issued under date of the 10th April, 1912, dismissing Norman L. Trefry and appointing Captain Samuel Messenger, shipping master in his stead.

Mr. MACDONALD: What about his successor, an American citizen?

Mr. HAZEN: His successor is now a British subject.

Mr. MACDONALD: It is only natural to find another case of this kind. The people this Government appoint to office are American citizens. When they wanted somebody to investigate the so-called Transcontinental railway expenditure they were not satisfied to take a British subject, but they appointed Mr. Gutelius. He was not a British subject when he was appointed, and they proceeded to naturalize him in order that he might be a fit and proper person to investigate this matter. So, when we come to Yarmouth, if they cannot find in that county a good Canadian or British subject to be shipping master, and if they have to appoint an American citizen, it is a pretty curious state of affairs.

Mr. LAW: In reply to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I beg to say that Mr. Trefry absolutely declares that the whole statement is a falsehood. As far as I am personally concerned, I am prepared to state that Mr. Trefry never sat on a platform at any meeting that I held in the county of Yarmouth in 1911. Further than that, Mr. Trefry did not attend the meeting held by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in Digby. He was not out of the town at that time, but he was in Yarmouth attending to his business. Knowing Mr. Trefry as I do, I am prepared to state that his dismissal was one of the most inhuman of all the inhuman things that this Government has done. Mr. Trefry was a first-class official. He never attended any political meeting; he never was on a platform at any meeting held by me, he never attended a meeting at Digby, and I am surprised that, under the circumstances, he being a British subject, he was not considered entitled to have an investigation. My opinion is that the minister was afraid to have an investigation because he knew that he would not be able to prove the charges against Mr. Trefry. I cannot understand for the life of me why this gentleman should not have been given the investigation to which he was entitled. The other day I asked the minister if he knew that there was a patronage committee in Yarmouth. He assured me that he did not know of any such thing. Let me tell him that Knowles E. Crosby is a member of that patronage ocmmittee, and why should Mr. Crosby's statement be taken when the minister did not know that he was a member of the patronage committee?

Mr. HAZEN: I informed my hon. friend that this statement was supported by the affidavit of Captain Perrin of Yarmouth.

Mr. LAW: Mr. Trefry tells me that the statement that he acted in a partisan manner is absolutely untrue. I only bring this matter up in order to put Mr. Trefry right before the House and the public.

Mr. KYTE: The circumstances surrounding the dismissal of Mr. Trefry appear to call for the censure of this committee, but I think I can bring to the attention of the minister even a more indefensible case and one that calls for even more severe censure than that which we have just heard. At the opening of the session of Parliament in 1912, I put this question to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

> Has the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, received the evidence taken by H. P. Duchemin, commissioner at river Bourgeois, in the month of October last, on the charge of political partisanship alleged against Marin Bourque, keeper of the lighthouse of river Bourgeois, who was dismissed in the month of April last?
>
> 2. Has any report been received from Mr. Duchemin bearing on the investigation?
>
> 3. Is it the intention of the minister to reinstate Mr. Bourque as keeper of the lighthouse?

This question remained on the Order Paper from the beginning of the session until some time towards the 15th of January. This man Bourque was dismissed in the spring of 1912 without any investigation upon the ex parte statement of the Conservative candidate in the county that he was a partisan. The charge of partisanship made against Bourque was so outrageous that I felt that an investigation would show that it was without any foundation whatever, and that he should be reinstated in his office. An investigation was granted by the minister, and the commissioner went to River Bourgeois in the month of September. I was present when Mr. Duchemin called as the first witness Mr. William Levesconte, a leading Conservative there, and after he had been questioned by Mr. Duchemin no evidence was disclosed against Mr. Bourque. Mr. Duchemin was so insistent that Mr. Levesconte should ransack his memory to find some act of partisanship against Mr. Bourque, and he persisted to such an extent in the question as to whether he knew if this man had been guilty of partisanship, that the witness replied: 'How in blankety-blank do I know whether he had or not?—'blankety-blank' in this case indicating a place which is usually regarded as being the very antipodes of the abode of the blest. Knowing that evidence had been taken in an effort to prove a charge of

partisanship against Bourque, I put this question to the minister in the early part of the session of 1912. The question was allowed to remain on the Order Paper week after week. His Honour the Speaker called it time after time, but the minister always asked that the question be allowed to stand. Some weeks after that Mr. Duchemin sent a second report of the investigation which he had held into the same charges against this man Bourque. The first investigation disclosed no evidence against Mr. Bourque, and here is the answer given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to my question:

1. The investigation referred to was arranged by Mr. Duchemin to be held on the 27th September, 1912. On that date no evidence was taken. A further inquiry was held on the 12th December, 1912.

If the minister was informed no evidence was taken on the 27th day of September, he was falsely informed. If he meant to say that no evidence to prove the charge of partisanship against Bourque was taken, then the statement is absolutely true. As a matter of fact, the evidence which was given by the witness who was summoned by Mr. Duchemin to give testimony against Bourque discloses no proof of partisanship against him. While the question remained unanswered upon the Order Paper, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries lest this man Bourque should escape the dismissal which had been ordered to take place in respect to him, ordered a second investigation to be held. Mr. Duchemin the second time comes to River Bourgeois to hold an inquiry; and as to the circumstances under which that inquiry was held, I will read a statutory declaration of Bourque's wife. Bourque was an invalid; his health was not very good at the time he was dismissed, and the effect of his dismissal and the prospect of being deprived of the $100 a year, which he was receiving by virtue of his being a lightkeeper, so diminished his ability to support his family that it resulted in aggravating his illness, and when Mr. Duchemin arrived the second time to hold an investigation, Bourque was upon a sick bed and was unable to attend the inquiry. His wife took to Mr. Duchemin the summons which her husband had received, and in this declaration I have a report of the circumstances which I shall read to the House after the committee resumes.

[Mr. Kyte.]

At six o'clock the House resumed, and then took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

OTTAWA NORTHERN AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill No. 17, respecting the Ottawa Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Mr. OLIVER: Might we have some explanation of this Bill, either from the mover or from the Chairman of the Railway Committee?

Mr. LANCASTER: The Bill passed exactly as it was sent to the committee. It is a renewal, and there was a renewal last year. The three standard clauses that we were so careful about were inserted last year. No objection was raised to the Bill as drawn.

Mr. OLIVER: What ground does the charter cover, and what is the term of the extension?

Mr. LANCASTER: This Bill is to amend chapter 84 of the Statutes of 1899 and chapter 72 of the Statutes of 1900. I have not these Acts before me, and cannot give exactly the geography of this line. It is to be commenced within two years and completed within five. That is the usual time.

Mr. OLIVER: There was no objection to it in the committee?

Mr. LANCASTER: No.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

BURRARD INLET TUNNEL AND BRIDGE COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill, No. 11, respecting the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Mr. OLIVER: The hon. member in whose name this Bill stands will perhaps give us some information.

Mr. LANCASTER: The amendments to clause 1 of this Bill do not change the effect of it in any way, but merely improve—as we thought—the language. We have made it read 'the bridge, tunnel and lines of railway' instead of 'its bridge and tunnel and of the lines of railway.' And there is a repetition of the words: 'which is authorized to construct,' which we struck out. We added a third section to enact our present standard clause as to the water-

powers, to provide that, so far as they have these rights, they must conform to other cases, bringing their water-power rights down—or up, if the expression is preferred, —to our standards section.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps the hon. member in whose name this Bill stands would say where this bridge and tunnel are to be.

Mr. STEVENS: This is just a renewal of a charter. The bridge is to be at a point known as the Second Narrows, about the easterly boundary of the city of Vancouver, crossing the inlet to the north shore. Tenders have been called for the construction of the bridge, and they are to be in by the 1st of April. Everything is in good shape for the commencement of construction. So far as the tunnel is concerned, that is in the title of the Bill, and there has been a project to put a tunnel under the First Narrows, but it has not been seriously considered by the people of Vancouver and surrounding municipalities up to the present time. It may be considered in the future, for two reasons, first for traffic and second for water to provide for the mains.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it considered desirable that one company should have control of the two methods and places of crossing?

Mr. STEVENS: The company is simply a combination of the city of Vancouver, the city of North Vancouver, the municipality of North Vancouver, and the municipality of West Vancouver. These joint municipalities are affected by the works projected.

Mr. OLIVER: Is this a railroad bridge?

Mr. STEVENS: It is a railway, tram, vehicular and pedestrian traffic bridge.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it for the use by this particular railway or is it what might be called a railway highway?

Mr. STEVENS: It is absolutely open to all.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill No. 12, respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the purport of this Bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS: To authorize the building of branch lines in southern Alberta, where they are urgently needed. The matter was gone into very carefully by the committee and it is satisfactory. But the promoters have objection to an amendment put in by the committee, and if nothing is done in connection with that amendment I would ask that the Bill be allowed to stand.

Mr. ROGERS: What was the amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS: It was in connection with the time when the work should be started and completed, and provided that it should be started within a year and completed within three years.

Mr. LANCASTER: The majority of the committee thought that this was a case in which the company should be hurried up, and it changed the proposed time of commencing from two years to one, and of completion from five years to three. The vote stood 22 to 10 in favour of the amendment. These matters, of course, are within the discretion of this committee, and I am not suggesting that it cannot reverse the decision of the Railway Committee. But I will draw attention to the fact that it is not usual for the House to reverse the Railway Committee's decision in a matter which was referred to it and which it has taken the trouble to carefully consider. It is a matter of discretion in every such case as to what time shall be allowed. I do not agree with those who say that we create a precedent by our action on one such Bill, for in the very nature of things each case must stand upon its own merits. I do not object to the Bill standing over, but I hope it will not come up on Monday, as I fear it will be impossible for me to be here on that day.

Mr. CURRIE: Why not refer it back to the the committee according to the usual custom.

Mr. LANCASTER: I do not think that would be fair to the committee.

Mr. OLIVER: I understood the mover to say that the promoters objected to the change. Perhaps it was made for good reasons, and I am sure the committee would be glad to hear them.

Mr. LANCASTER: It was thought that the company was trifling, as it were, with certain townsites and entrances, and that that should be stopped by making the company hurry up and complete the line if they intend to do so. I do not pretend to be a judge of the matter, but the discussion in

the committee was carried on by gentlemen from the locality, and others. I myself did not vote, but after a full discussion of the matter, the amendment was carried by a vote of 22 to 10. I think it would be a reflection upon the committee to refer the Bill back unless some good reason be shown that the committee has made a mistake.

Mr. DOUGLAS: The principal reason why the amendment was adopted was that settlers in western Canada, particularly in Alberta, have claimed that charters were given to certain companies to build railways and that no steps were taken to complete their construction, and believing that the railway was to be completed settlers took up land along the line. The minister, who has received a great many letters in connection with the matter, was willing that an amendment should be put in limiting the time within when the work must be started to one year and providing for the completion within three years. However, the main reason for the amendment is the demand of the settlers that when a railway charter is granted the construction of the line should be rushed to completion within a reasonable time. If they are held down to one year within which to start the promoters absolutely refuse to go on with the line.

Mr. CURRIE: It would be well for the committee to understand a few of the facts in connection with the work that has been carried on in Alberta during the past year. The proposed branch line of the Canadian Pacific railway runs into the new oil region south of Calgary. This is a very important territory, into which many people are desirous of going, and there is a tremendous rush of all kinds of freight into that section of the country. Apparently the committee got the impression that the company was not doing its duty in the province of Alberta during the past year. In order to show the committtee that the railway company is alive to all these things, I wish to quote a few statistics to show what has been done during the past year in the province of Alberta. Last year 235 miles of grading was done by this road, 115·9 miles of track laid, and 113·4 miles ballasted. A railway company that has built 250 miles of solid track within a year cannot be accused of not having attended to its work. There are no less than six different branches from the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway under construction there now. In the beginning of the session the Railway Committee generally gets up in the air a little about railway lines not being carried out as rapidly as they should be—as the United States phraseology has it, they get a little bull-moosed—but when the committee gets down to business, it fixes the time for starting at two years. I do not think any interest is injured by making the time two years, but if it remains one year and the Bill is withdrawn, the people in that section of the country will suffer, because the Canadian Pacific railway have the money to build the road and it will take them a year and a half to build it. They cannot do it in a year. I would urge strongly upon the committee that the change be made.

Mr. OLIVER: In view of the fact that the committee gave this matter consideration and carried the Bill by a large majority, perhaps it would be better to let the Bill stand for the present. If this committee has to decide the matter, let it be decided when there is a larger attendance than there is to-night.

Mr. ROGERS: There is probably a good deal to be said on both sides of the matter. As I understand the facts, other similar Bills have been treated differently. At the same time, I am one of those who think one year is quite enough time for any railway company to be allowed the advantages and privileges given them by this Parliament. I do not think it would be well, perhaps, to single out one particular line and provide different treatment for it from that which you provide for others. I agree with my hon. friend that we should let the Bill stand until we have more members present, which perhaps will be when next time Private Bills are called.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I can bear out what the hon. member for North Simcoe has said with regard to the work of the Canadian Pacific railway in Alberta this year. In my constituency they have been constructing three very important branch lines. I do not think this amendment was aimed particularly at the Canadian Pacific railway; its object was to induce railways to complete the lines which they have had charters for for some time. Because of the frequency with which some of these companies come back to the House and ask for renewals of charters, the people are becoming discouraged and discontented in view of the possibility that the lines are not to be built for a good many years. I can give you an instance in my own constituency. A railway company got a charter for the construction of a branch

line, and as there was a large homestead tract of country there, the people at once flocked in. The charter has been renewed several times, the people have been there for several years, some of them being 70 miles away from a railroad. The idea of those who supported this amendment in the committee was, if possible, to limit the time of starting and completing these lines, and letting the railways know that this Parliament is serious in its efforts to expedite railroad construction. I cannot say whether or not this will expedite construction, but, if we can show those railway companies who are coming to Parliament time after time for extensions that we are in earnest and that we want them to take active steps in connection with the construction of lines for which charters have been renewed, four, five or six times, I think we should do so. The Canadian Pacific railway is the only railroad, in my part of the country, and they have been doing a lot to serve that portion of western Canada. Other railroad companies, the Canadian Northern railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific, who have charters for the construction of lines in different parts of that country, are not building their lines. Once a railroad obtains a charter for the construction of a line in a certain district, it is difficult to get another railroad to go into the same district. The Canadian Pacific railway was asked to build a branch line in one district and they answered that the Canadian Northern railway had a line under charter there, and it would not be worth their while to go in. I offer these observations to give some idea of the reason why this amendment was put in at the suggestion of certain members from western Canada. The particular question is a live one in my section of Alberta. The Boards of Trade are all behind the movement to secure some legislation by which this Parliament will not continually give renewals to railroads without some guarantee that they will immediately commence construction and try and rush the lines to completion as soon as possible.

Progress reported.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill No. 15, respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Currie.

Mr. LANCASTER: We made no amendment to this Bill except to change the language of section 10. As drafted it provided that the Bill should only come into effect after it has been approved by the shareholders of the company. We made that read that certain sections should not apply until they had been ratified by the shareholders. It seemed more dignified for this Parliament to have it worded in that way. Generally speaking, the Bill is to enable the Grand Trunk Railway Company to pay half yearly dividends without being required to have half yearly meetings to sanction these dividends. The effect is that they can raise the money more easily. They need the money to better their road, and they are asking us for this provision.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

LACHINE, JACQUES CARTIER AND MAISONNEUVE RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill No. 16, respecting the Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Mr. LANCASTER: In this Bill there is a change in the time for completion. The committee, after full discussion, concluded to leave in the Bill the time for commencing the extension, two years, but limited the time of completion to three years. The committee were almost unanimous in making this arrangement. These exceptions are sometimes made by the Railway Committee for local reasons which I must approve of, that is, they are unique cases, and if there is something in the local geography the exception is quite justified.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CENTRAL WESTERN CANADA RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill No. 13, to incorporate the Central Canada Railway Company.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

Mr. LANCASTER: This is an ordinary act of incorporation. We recommend that in order not to conflict with another railway the House change the name to the Central Western Canada Railway Company. In section 3 the capital stock has been made $7,000,000 instead of $5,000,000. In section 12 we use the expression 'approval' instead of 'order' of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the geographical location of the charter, approximately?

Mr. LANCASTER: From Winnipeg in a northwesterly direction by way of York-

ton, Saskatoon, and Battleford to the city of Edmonton.

Mr. OLIVER: That route would closely parallel throughout the present connection between Winnipeg and Edmonton, via the Canadian Pacific railway and, at no great distance, the lines of the Canadian Northern railway and the Grand Trunk. Was that considered in the committee?

Mr. LANCASTER: It was mentioned by somebody, but the committee takes the view that you cannot refuse to let a dozen lines parallel each other if they want to. We cannot force a railway to build in some place where it does not want to build, and we do not consider that we would do any harm in granting wholesale charters between points.

Mr. OLIVER: I was given to understand that the Minister of Railways made a statement in connection with this charter, and as the minister is not here I would be very glad if we could have the statement repeated so as to have on record the policy of the Government in regard to lines paralleling each other.

Mr. ROGERS: Does my hon. friend object to the Bill going on?

Mr. OLIVER: Not at all, I am merely asking for as much information as possible while the Bill is before the committee. I may say that the recent occurrences at Quebec will, I think, satisfy every member of the House that it is not desirable to let private legislation go through without letting the members know what it is.

Mr. CURRIE: It has been the policy, openly expressed in the Railway Committee for six years at least, that there shall be free trade in railway charters. That is, if a man wants a charter in any district he can get it, and if another man wants a charter over the very same ground he can get it. That has always been the policy of the committee since I have been a member of it, so there is no use in talking of detectaphones, or the deaf and dumb alphabet, or any dodges of that kind.

Mr. NEELY: Like my hon. friend (Mr. Currie), I am a member of the Railway Committee, and while the general policy of free trade in railway charters has undoubtedly been agreed upon by the members of the committee, free trade in charters where lines of railway have already been built, has never been agreed upon to my knowledge. That is a new doctrine to me, Where railroads have not been built in a district for which a railway company has a charter, there is no objection raised in the Railway Committee to somebody else getting a charter for the same territory; but if the line has already been built there surely should be some announcement of policy by the minister as to whether somebody else can come along and parallel that line for hundreds and hundreds of miles, perhaps within half a mile or a mile. That policy, I say, has never been agreed to by the Railway Committee. As I understand the request of the member for Edmonton he is asking for some statement by the Minister of Railways, or in his absence by some member of the Government, as to the policy of the Government in regard to parallel lines: whether or not the Government proposes to let this company—if the charter goes through, as no doubt it will—parallel the present lines already covering this territory, in such close proximity that the people will not be better served, and the only result of which will be competition that would be destructive to the line already built, and of no particular benefit to the public.

Mr. CURRIE: Is the hon. gentleman opposed to competition among railways?

Mr. NEELY: Not at all, but I am opposed to the idea of letting the railway companies spend money in building unnecessary lines, when there is such an enormous demand throughout the West, and East too, for lines that are absolutely needed to serve the public. So far as competition among the railroads is concerned, of course we want competition; but we do not want the kind of competition that will not be of any benefit to the people, and that will only be destructive of the welfare of lines already built.

Mr. LANCASTER: Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question for my information and guidance? Would he say that when a railway asks to parallel another, that we should refuse a charter? We have either to grant it or refuse it, but we cannot grant it, and say: You must go where you have no intention of going. Will the hon. gentleman say that the committee should refuse that charter because it seeks to parallel another line?

Mr. NEELY: The Chairman of the Railway Committee compliments me by asking for my advice on this point. I am looking

to the chairman myself for light and information.

Mr. LANCASTER: Don't I need it, also ?

Mr. NEELY: I have no objection whatever to the granting of this charter. I should think that the Chairman of the Railway Committee ought to be sufficiently in the confidence of the Minister of Railways—they sit side by side in the committee—to tell us what the policy of the minister will be when, having granted this charter, as I have no doubt this committee intends to do, the railway proposes to parallel the line already constructed.

Mr. LANCASTER: I may tell my hon. friend that I am not in any such confidence, nor do I think I should be. I am simply Chairman of the Railway Committee. I cannot tell any better than the hon. gentleman himself what the particular policy of the Minister of Railways is in this regard, nor do I think I ought to assume that I am sufficiently in the confidence of the Minister of Railways, to have the right to ask him. I do not pretend to be anything but Chairman of the Committee representing the Parliament in that committee—not the Government, not the Opposition, not the supporters of the Government, but the whole of this House of Parliament, and the committee has to take the responsibility. And with all deference to my hon. friend, I do not think it is a matter that the Government should have a policy upon. I think it is a matter for this parliamentary committee to settle. In some parts of Ontario we would like to see the railways paralleled. In my own district there is a railway that cannot begin to do the work and we need a parallel line badly. We need competition and extra facilities. I could name many instances where it is absolutely necessary in the public interest to get more than one railway between the same cities, practically paralleling each other. But what I want to ask my hon. friend is whether he individually thinks that we ought to go to the length of saying to a railway company : bebecause you are paralleling another line we shall not give you a charter. I do not know that we have the right to ask for the confidence of any minister to guide us in the committee, so long as we act pursuant to the Railway Act.

Mr. NEELY: I accept the position taken by my hon. friend, that he is Chairman of the Railway Committee for this whole House. But at the same time I say that when this Bill leaves the Railway Committee and comes before this House we are entitled to a pronouncement by the Minister of Railways as to what his policy is, when it comes to a question of giving or withholding his consent when the final plans of the promoters of a Bill are brought before him for his consideration.

Mr. ROGERS: If there is any objection to the Bill we will be very glad to let it stand until some future time.

Mr. OLIVER: Perhaps it would be just as well. There are other Bills on the list that would not be contentious, but this is a very important Bill, and to my mind raises a very important question.

Progress reported.

WEST ONTARIO PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill No. 19, respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

On section 1:

Mr. NESBITT: The amendment to insert the standard clauses, which have been put in all Bills with respect to crossing highways.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill No. 20 recpecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

On section 2—new lines authorized:

Mr. OLIVER: I understand this Bill was amended in committee. Perhaps the chairman of the committee will explain what the amendment is.

Mr. LANCASTER: The amendments were to add two clauses to bring these lines within our policy as to the protection of municipalities in regard to light and power on highways and as to construction. The Canadian Pacific last year got a Bill in which we enacted section 9, to this effect:

> Nothing in this Act or in the Telegraph Act shall authorize the company to construct or operate any telegraph or telephone lines, or any lines for the purpose of distributing electricity for lighting, heating or motor purposes, or disposing of surplus power generated by the company's works and not required for the undertaking of the company upon, along or across any highway or public place, without first obtaining the consent expressed by by-law of the municipality having jurisdiction over such high-

way or public place, and upon terms to be agreed on with such municipality, or to sell, dispose of or distribute power or energy within or for use within the limits of any municipality, without the consent, expressed by by-law, of such municipality.

This is the standard clause, There was also clause 10 enacted last year providing that there should be no construction upon highways without the consent of the municipality. We bring that into this Act by saying, in an additional section, that the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of chapter 96 of the statutes 3 and 4, George V, shall apply to the lines of railway mentioned in this Act.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY.

House in Committee on Bill No. 43, respecting Queen's University at Kingston.—Mr. Nickle.

Mr. MICHAUD: Was this Bill before the House last session?

Mr. SAM. SHARPE: This is a non-contentious Bill, all parties being agreed upon it. The Bill provides for the striking out of the words 'and the Minister of Education for the province of Ontario.' The Bill of 1912 made the Minister of Education for Ontario one of the governors of Queen's University as well as an appointee of his, called an assessor. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), representing all parties, appeared before the Private Bills Committee and had the Bill passed by consent.

Mr. MICHAUD: I want to know whether this is the same Bill that was presented to this House last session.

Mr. SHARPE: No, it has nothing whatever to do with it. The Bill has been introduced at the suggestion of the Minister of Education for Ontario because he does not wish to sit on the board of an educational institution of this kind.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE.

THIRD READING.

Bill No. 18 respecting the Tillsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Currie.

[Mr. Lancaster.]

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 56, respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. Michael Clark.

Bill No. 57, respecting British Trust Company.—Mr. Baker.

Bill No. 58, to incorporate the Sudbury, Kepawa and Bell River Railway Company.—Mr. G. V. White.

Bill No. 59, respecting the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 60, to incorporate the United Empire Loyalists' Association of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

Mr. KYTE: When the committee rose at six o'clock, I stated that the lightkeeper, Mr. Marin Bourque, was so ill at the date fixed for the second investigation to be held on the charge of partisanship preferred against him that he was unable to appear before Mr. Duchemin. I have here a statutory declaration signed by his wife verifying the facts. It reads:

In the matter of dismissal of Marin Bourque, keeper of the lighthouse at River Bourgeois, Richmond county, N.S.

I, Catherine Bourque of River Bourgeois in the county of Richmond do solemnly declare that I am the wife of Marin Bourque ate keeper of the lighthouse at River Bourgeois. That my husband received a notice from H. P. Duchemin, commissioner, on the evening of December 11, 1912, to appear before him in the office of William Dorscoute at River Bourgeois for the investigation of charges of political partisanship against him on December 12, 1912.

That at the time my husband received this notice he was confined to his bed by illness and was unable to attend the investigation.

That I went to see Mr. Duchemin at the office of Mr. Dorscoute on December 12, and told him that my husband could not leave his bed and was therefore unable to appear before him.

That Mr. Duchemin then told me he wanted my husband to make a statement to him in regard to the charge of political partisanship preferred against him. He said that at the previous investigation my husband was prevented from making a statement by Mr. Kyte, M.P., and Dr. Bissett, M.P.P.

I then told him that my husband had already made a statement under oath which had been sent to Ottawa. Mr. Duchemin said he wanted a statement made to him as he was appointed for that purpose. Mr. Duchemin did not tell me that there were any witnesses to be examined against my husband but he said he came for the purpose of getting a statement from my husband. And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

Declared before me at St. Peter, N.S., this 2nd day of January 1912.

her
(Sgd) Catherine x Bourque.
mark

(Sgd.) C. P. Bissett,
Commissioner for taking affidavits in the county of Richmond.

In the face of the facts as alleged by Mrs. Bourque, Mr. Duchemin proceeded to hold a second investigation into the charge of partisanship against her husband, and I have under my hand the report which I purpose reading before I resume my seat. In order, however, that there may be a consecutive statement as to the whole transaction placed upon the records of the House, I purpose reading some documents from the files which were placed in my hands during the last session of Parliament.

The first letter, dated March 19, 9 p.m. 1912, is as follows:

Hon. J. D. Hazen,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Hazen:

Marin Bourque, the lightkeeper at River Bourgeois, has been a violent political partisan during the past several elections. At the federal election in September last he canvassed actively and openly for the Liberal candidate and attended Liberal meetings at which he was violently demonstrative in behalf of the Liberal candidate. I have personal knowledge of all of this, and I respectfully ask for his dismissal as keeper of this light, and I beg to recommend Mr. Daniel Sampson (son of Charles) as his successor. Sampson is a young man of excellent character and has the respect and confidence of the community in which he lives, and will make an excellent official.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd) J. A. Gillies.

Mr. Gillies was the defeated Conservative candidate in the county of Richmond at the last election.

Ottawa, March 26, 1912.

Re Lightkeeper at River Bourgeois.

My Dear Sir:

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 19th instant, recommending the dismissal of Mr. Marin Bourque, keeper of the above light.

In view of your statement that you have personal knowledge that Mr. Bourque has been guilty of offensive partisanship at the last election, I am directing that the services of Mr. Bourque shall be discontinued from and after the 1st of May next.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd) J. D. Hazen.

J. A. Gillies, Esq., K.C.,
Sydney, N.S.

You will observe that without any investigation whatever the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries accepted the statement of the defeated candidate and promised him that Mr. Bourque's dismissal would take place forthwith.

April 12, 1912.

Sir,—The accompanying letters, one advising Mr. Marin Bourque that his services as keeper of the light at Bourgeois Inlet, N.S., 1912, will not be required after the 30th of April, 1912, owing to active political partisanship, and the other intimating to Mr. Daniel Sampson his appointment to the position alluded to in Mr. Bourque's room and stead, with a salary at the rate of $100 per annum, rising by annual increments of $5 subject to good behaviour and efficient service, to a maximum of $120 per annum, you will please have delivered and arrange for Mr. Sampson taking charge of the light on the 1st of May, 1912.

I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) C. Stanton,
Assistant Deputy Minister.

The Agent,
Department of Marine and Fisheries,
Halifax, N.S.

(Enclosure)

April 12, 1912.

Sir,—I have to inform you that owing to active political partisanship your services as keeper of the light at Bourgeois Inlet, N.S., will no longer be required after the 30th April, 1912.

I have also to inform you that Mr. Daniel Sampson has been appointed keeper in your room and stead, to whom I have to request you to give up possession of the light and all Government supplies pertaining thereto, when required.

I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd) C. Stanton,
Assistant Deputy Minister.

Mr. Marin Bourque,
Rivière Bourgeois,
Richmond County, N.S.

You will observe that no time was lost, and that just as fast as instructions could be prepared by the department, they were forwarded to the dismissed official.

(Enclosure)

April 12, 1912.

Sir,—I have to inform you that the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been pleased to appoint you keeper of the light at Bourgeois Inlet, N.S., with a salary at the rate of $100 per annum, rising by annual increments of $5 subject to good behaviour and efficient service, to a maximum of $120 per annum. Your appointment is to fill the vacancy caused by the services of Mr. Marin Bourque being dispensed with. Mr. Bourque has been informed of your appointment and directed to give up possession of the light and all Government supplies pertaining thereto, when required.

The accompanying form relating to date of birth, etc., please fill in and forward to the agent of the department at Halifax, N.S., for transmission. Whenever you desire to communicate with the department on matters per-

taining to your duties please do so through the agent.

I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) C. Stanton,
Assistant Deputy Minister.

Mr. Daniel Sampson,
River Bourgeois,
Richmond County, N.S.

I was so astonished when I learned that Mr. Marin Bourque had been dismissed on the charge of political partisanship, that I immediately wrote to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the subject. I had known Mr. Bourque for many years and, so far being an active offensive political partisan, he was one of those excellent men who possess neither language nor ideas outside of the discussion of the affairs pertaining to their own business in life. He was a fisherman, uneducated, not familiar with the English language, and by no means eloquent even in his own tongue. He was known to be an inoffensive man, and so little interested in political matters that he rarely voted. He did not vote, I believe, in the election of 1908 or in the election of 1911. Knowing the man, I addressed the minister the following letter:

St. Peters, April 25, 1912.

Hon. J. D. Hazen,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir:

Mr. Marin Bourque, keeper of the light at River Bourgeois Inlet, was, by letter dated the 12th instant and signed by the assistant deputy minister, informed of his dismissal owing to active political partisanship. I beg to say that such a charge is absolutely without foundation. Mr. Bourque has to my knowledge not even voted in the last two federal elections, and I believe he has not voted in any other election since his appointment as lightkeeper. He has never in his life canvassed any person, or even discussed politics with any person. I am prepared to substantiate this statement by an affidavit from Mr. Bourque himself who unfortunately is ill at the present time, and has been ill for some months and unable to leave his house. I am quite sure that you would not have ordered his dismissal had you known all the facts. The statement of ministers, often repeated during the late sessions of Parliament, if they meant anything, constituted a declaration of policy securing immunity from dismissal to all Government officials who have not interfered in politics. It was declared that where an official was dismissed on charges that afterwards appeared to have been false he would be reinstated.

I ask on behalf of Mr. Bourque that an investigation be granted him upon the charges made against him, and his accuser obliged to support them upon sworn evidence, and further that on failure of such proof he be reinstated.

Yours faithfully,
Geo. W. Kyte.

To this I received the following reply:

Re River Bourgeois Light.

6th May, 1912.

My Dear Sir:

I am by direction to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th ultimo, addressed to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, on behalf of Mr. Marin Bourque, keeper of the above light.

The minister desires me to say that, if you will forward to him such an affidavit as referred to in your letter, he will without hesitation order an investigation into the charges which led to the removal of Mr. Bourque.

Yours very truly,
A. Johnston.

Geo. W. Kyte, M.P.,
St. Peters, N.S.

I thereupon wrote the following:

St. Peters, N.B., May 16, 1912.

A. Johnston,
Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir:

Replying to your letter 20,437-K, dated the 6th instant, I beg herewith to enclose a statutory declaration from Marin Bourque, late keeper of the River Bourgeois Inlet light, in which he specifically denies every species of political partisanship. I therefore demand on his behalf that an investigation be granted him and if the charges are not sustained that he be reinstated.

I need scarcely point out to you that the investigation should offer Mr. Bourque every opportunity and facility to combat any false evidence that may be supplied to bolster up the charges.

Yours truly,
Geo. W. Kyte.

I will now read the statutory declaration forwarded to Ottawa by Mr. Bourque:

I, Marin Bourque, of River Bourgeois, in the county of Richmond, former keeper of River Bourgeois Inlet light, hereby solemnly declare:

That I did not act on any committee in any election.

That I did not represent any candidate at the polls.

That I did not drive any voters to the polls.

That I did not check any list of electors.

That I did not treat any electors during any election.

That I did not canvas any electors during any election.

That I did not attend any political meeting since my appointment as lightkeeper.

That I did not vote at the federal elections in September, 1911.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and in virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

(Sgd) his
Marin X Bourque.
mark

Solemnly declared before me at my office in River Bourgeois this 15th day of May, 1912.

M. J. MacNeil,
Justice of the Peace in and for the county of Richmond.

That declaration was forwarded to Ottawa on the 12th of April, 1912. After some

delay, Mr. Duchemin was instructed to proceed to River Bourgeois to investigate the charges on which Mr. Bourque had been dismissed. That investigation took place on the 27th of September, 1912. I was present at the investigation, not so much for the purpose of taking part in the inquiry or cross-examining witnesses—because it had been intimated to me at a previous investigation that that right would not be accorded me—as to make a record of the proceedings that took place. I have before me the evidence that was given in the case against Mr. Bourque. Mr. William Levisconte, a prominent Conservative worker, and apparently the man who had made the charges, or who was responsible for the making the charges, of partisanship against Mr. Bourque as well as against other officials in the vicinity was examined. I will read the evidence as I took it down:

William Levisconte: Have no evidence to give against him, only that he is a Grit. Don't know when he used any offensive language. It might have been prior to 1908; I don't know. The evidence I have to give is that he is a Liberal and always was a Liberal. Bourque is now out, and he will stay out. I canvassed him once, and he told me he would not vote for my dirty party.

Mr. D. Duchemin: At what election was that?

Mr. Levisconte: I dont know when it was.

Mr. Duchemin: Was it at the last election?

Mr. Levisconte: I dont know when it was.

Mr. Duchemin: Was it at the election of 1908?

Mr. Levisconte: How in h—l do I know when it was?

After that evidence had been given Mr. Bourque was requested by Mr. Duchemin to be sworn and give evidence, but I stated that, as Mr. Duchemin admitted that there was no evidence given by the preceding witness to justify the department in dismissing Mr. Bourque, Mr. Bourque was not called upon to make a statement. Mr. Duchemin said he wished to forward a statement from Mr. Bourque to Ottawa. I replied that Mr. Bourque's statement in the form of a statutory declaration was at Ottawa, and that it was unnecessary for him to make any further statement. Now, I am going to read the report made by Mr. Duchemin as to what took place at River Bourgeois that day:

Sydney, N.S., Oct. 8, 1912.

Hon. J. D. Hazen,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, Canada.

Re Marin Bourque, Formerly lightkeeper, River Bourgeois, N. S.

Dear Sir,—On the 27th ultimo, I went down to River Bourgeois, pursuant to a notice which I had sent out to the accused, Mr. Burke, and the local complainants.

At the date of the hearing Mr. Bourque appeared, but no witness appeared to give any testimony against him. I asked Mr. Burke if he wished to make any statement under oath, to be transmitted to the department, pointing out to him that on his dismissal, he had asked for an investigation into his case. Mr. Bourque,, however declined to be sworn, or to make any statement to be transmitted to the department.

In the circumstances, I was unable to furnish any information to the department, concerning this particular official.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
H. P. Duchemin,
Commissioner of Inquiry.

Here is a case in which Mr. Duchemin absolutely deceived and misinformed the department which had employed him to carry on a serious investigation into the truth of allegations made against an official who had already been dismissed. He states that no evidence was given at that inquiry and that no person appeared to give evidence. I state that Mr. Levisconte was called and gave evidence as I took it down at the time and as I have read it to this committee. After Parliament opened in December, 1912, I put upon the Order Paper the questions which I read to the committee at the opening of my remarks this evening. In order that the import of Mr. Duchemin's report to the minister may be well appreciated, I will read the questions again, together with the answers:

1. Has the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries received the evidence taken by H. P. Duchemin, commissioner at River Bourgeois, in the month of October last, on the charge of political partisanship alleged against Marin Bourque, keeper of the lighthouse of River Bourgeois, who was dismissed in the month of April last?

2. Has any report been received from Mr. Duchemin bearing on the investigation?

3. Is it the intention of the minister to reinstate Mr. Bourque as keeper of the lighthouse?

Mr. Hazen:

1. The investigation referred to was arranged by Mr. Duchemin to be held on the 27th September, 1912. On that date no evidence was taken. A further inquiry was held on the 12th December, 1912.

2. Yes.

3. No.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was absolutely misinformed by his commissioner, and upon the strength of that misinformation he ordered a second inquiry. A person having been charged with political partisanship, an inquiry having been granted and witnesses having been examined, it might fairly be assumed, if no evidence were adduced against the official, that there was nothing to be proved against

him. Mr. Duchemin has cost the country enough money without sending him to cover the same ground twice, merely to enable him to ferret out, if possible, testimony to support the charges made against an official by those who are anxious to get his position for their friend. On the occasion of the second inquiry, which was ordered by the minister to take place at River Bourgeois on December 12, Mr. Bourque was too ill to appear before the commissioner. His wife was there, however, and Mr. Duchemin told her that he came there for the purpose of getting a statement from her husband. As her husband was too ill to attend, he could get no statement from him. After Mrs. Bourque left the office of Mr. Levisconte, Mr. Duchemin did hold an inquiry and did examine witnesses into the allegations of partisanship made against Mr. Bourque. If Mr. Duchemin was desirous of acting in good faith, he would at least have told Mr. Bourque's wife that he would examine any witnesses who might be brought before him, and that such evidence as he was able to procure would be forwarded to Ottawa. But he made no such assertion, rather intimating to her that he came merely for the purpose of taking a statement from Mr. Bourque himself. I have here a copy of the report of the second investigation made by Mr. Duchemin, which is as follows:

Sydney, N.S., Dec. 16, 1912.

Hon. J. D. Hazen, M.P.,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir:

On the 12th instant, I took evidence at River Bourgeois, in the matter of Marin Bourque, formerly lightkeeper at that place.

Mr. Bourque was duly notified of the time and place of the hearing, but was not present. His wife, however, came before the beginning of the inquiry, and stated that her husband was not feeling well enough to be present, but that, in any case, he wished to tell me he did not intend to appear, as he had nothing further to say in addition to the statement already sent forward. I advised her that any statement he had previously sent forward to the department would be of no avail at this investigation, and it would be necessary for him to come personally before me if he wished to have any statements sent forward to the department. I further advised her that he might appear either during the inquiry, or at any time before I left River Bourgeois, and that I would submit to him the evidence taken, and would be pleased to transmit to the department any statement he might wish to make. She again assured me, however, that he would not appear, and as a matter of fact Mr. Bourque did not appear before me either during the inquiry or thereafter.

The reason why he did not appear, as is set forth in Mrs. Bourque's declaration, was because he was too ill to attend. Mr. Duchemin proceeds:

Testimony was given by Wm. J. Levisconte, merchant, of River Bourgeois, and Wm. Boudreau, master mariner, of the same place.

Mr. Levisconte testified that he had been doing business at River Bourgeois for about twenty-one years, and that he knew everybody living in the district. He added that he had always taken an active interest in political matters on the Conservative side, and was well acquainted with the political workers on both sides of politics; that he had known Mr. Bourque for years, and declared that he had for years been a most objectionable Liberal partisan. Mr. Levisconte said: 'In the Dominion election of 1908, when the campaign was in progress, Marin Bourque used most objectionable language towards the Conservatives. He spoke of them as "that dirty party."'

A few moments ago I read the evidence given by Levisconte in the inquiry of September 25, and these are the exact words that he used. But, when pressed by Mr. Duchemin to say when Bourque used that language attributed to him, he was unable to do so, and became very angry because Mr. Duchemin insisted that he should tell at what election that language was used. However, at the second inquiry, if Mr. Duchemin's report be true, Mr. Levisconte had refreshed his memory and was able to say that the language was used in the election of 1908.

He said: 'I would never vote for that 'dirty party'. He said this to me here in River Bourgeois.' Mr. Levisconte added that while Marin Bourque was not a man who exercised much influence in the district, he had nevertheless always been offensive and objectionable as a Liberal partisan.

Wm. Boudreau testified that Mr. Bourque had been in the habit of talking politics openly in a nasty and insulting way. Witness said: 'In the 1908 elections I was working in the interests of Mr. Ferguson, the Conservative candidate. A few days before the election Mr. Bourque said I was a fool to be working for that party (the Conservative party) because they were going to be licked anyway. Mr. Boudreau corroborated the statement of Mr. Levisconte—that while Marin Bourque was never in a position to do much for his party, that he had always been openly offensive when elections were taking place.

I therefore find that Marin Bourque has been an offensive partisan, and that on this ground the department was warranted in dispensing with his services.

In the investigation held in the month of September, at which I was present for the purpose of taking a record of the proceedings, Mr. Levisconte was not in a position to furnish any evidence that could be considered sufficient to support the charge made against Mr. Bourque. In my presence Mr. Duchemin said that there was no

evidence upon which the dismissal of Mr. Bourque could be justified. In the second inquiry that took place in December, the same witness was examined and the evidence given was exactly the same, except in so far as the witness is alleged to have said that the language referred to was used in the election of 1908. Wm. Boudreau, the other witness, did not pretend to say in what particular Mr. Bourque was an offensive partisan, or in what instances he had canvassed or worked for the Liberal party; he merely said, in a general way, that Mr. Bourque was an offensive partisan. The point I desire to make is that, Levisconte, having failed to furnish evidence against Mr. Bourque in the inquiry which took place in September, and no other evidence having been subsequently adduced to justify the minister in dismissing this man, he should have been reinstated without an instant's delay. There was no justification for the department going to the expense of holding a second inquiry, particularly in view of the fact that the important witness was the same person who gave evidence in September. I need scarcely remind the committee that where a witness is called to give testimony in a certain case, and on another occasion goes upon the witness stand in the same case and tells the court another story, his evidence is always regarded with a good deal of suspicion. As I stated, Bourque was in ill health when he was dismissed from the lighthouse. He continued to be in ill health, and, if it is any satisfaction to the minister to know it, Bourque is not in a position, nor never will be in a position in the flesh, to rise up and condemn him for his conduct; he died a few months ago. His case is an extremely sad one. His death was no doubt accelerated by the treatment he received at the hands of Mr. Duchemin and at the hands of the Minister of Marine. This man Bourque was not a partisan in any sense of the word. He was a man without language to express his ideas in any matter outside of his own particular duty. He took so little interest in politics that he voted but once, I believe, since he was appointed to the lighthouse. He never attended a political meeting, notwithstanding the statement of Mr. Gillies, the defeated Conservative candidate, that he was an open, violent partisan, went to public meetings, canvassed openly, took voters to the poll, and did everything that constituted offensive partisanship. It is very strange that, when an inquiry took place, his neighbour, Mr. Wm. J. Levisconte, who knew him for twenty-one years, was called, but could not testify that Bourque had ever canvassed anybody or attended public meetings or hauled a voter to the poll. All he could say was that this man told him once that he would not vote for his dirty party. He would not undertake to say at what election he made that statement, but, if he made the statement, it was fair to assume that it was before he was appointed to the office of light-keeper, because we have the declaration of Bourque that ever since he had been appointed lighthouse keeper he had never attended a public meeting or taken any part in politics, and had never committed any offence which would justify dismissal. I would like to know if there is to be finality to these investigations. Ordinarily, when a charge is made, the accused is put on trial, the evidence is all put in, and the charge dismissed or sustained and the case closed for all time. As regards the poor official, he never knows when he is going to be at rest. An investigation may be called this month, and if no evidence is produced against him, there may be another one next month or a month after. But once Nemesis, in the shape of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is on the trail of an official in his department, there is to be no rest or contentment for that man; he must go sooner or later, whether the facts and circumstances justify his dismissal or not.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. member for Richmond has discussed this matter at very considerable length, and has read the different papers and reports that are in possession of the Marine and Fisheries Department bearing on this subject. As the hon. gentleman's object was no doubt to get these papers and reports embalmed on the records of 'Hansard,' his purpose is accomplished. What are the facts as they present themselves to the department and as they present themselves from a careful perusal of the reports and documents received? The facts are, that Joseph A. Gillies, a former member of this House of Commons, a gentleman very highly respected in the community in which he lives, and a candidate in the last election at Richmond, reported to the department that this man Bourque had, to his own personal knowledge, been guilty of active partisanship, reciting the details of the partisanship and asking for his dismissal. I cannot

bring myself to believe for one single minute, knowing Mr. Gillies as I do, that Mr. Gillies would take the responsibility of making an accusation saying he did it from personal knowledge of the facts, if he did not have personal knowledge of the facts and was not sure of his ground. On Mr. Gillies' recommendation, it was decided to dismiss Bourque from his position as lightkeeper; but, yielding to the request of the hon. member for Richmond, I ordered an investigation to be held, and the matter was placed in the hands of Mr. Duchemin, who was conducting investigations into matters of offensive partisanship in the eastern part of Nova Scotia. Mr. Duchemin reported to the department that he had decided to hold an investigation on the 27th of September, that notice had been sent to Mr. Bourque and to the complainant, that Bourque had appeared, but no witnesses had appeared to give testimony against him. Bourque declined to be sworn or to make any statement under oath to be transmitted to the department. There is the report received from Mr. Duchemin, that no witnesses appeared to testify and Bourque declined to be sworn or to make any statement that could be sent to the department. Now, the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) says that is not a true statement of what took place. It is a statement given in the solemn report of the commissioner to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the only statement regarding the matter that I have before me; and not one single statement to the contrary effect was ever made to me until I heard it here to-day by the hon. member for Richmond. It was represented to me that there was a mistake, that witnesses were prepared to attend and give evidence that Bourque was a notorious partisan and an active worker in the Liberal interests; and in consequence of that Mr. Duchemin was instructed to take up the matter, to notify Bourque and the complainant and get the evidence on both sides. Mr. Duchemin, having received those instructions, reported to the department that Bourque was duly notified of the time and place of hearing; but was not present; that his wife came before the beginning of the inquiry and stated her husband was not feeling well enough to be present, but that in any case he did not intend to appear as he had nothing further to say in addition to the statement already sent forward.

I wrote to the hon. member for Richmond and told him that if Bourque would state that he had not taken part in elections I would order an investigation to be held. Therefore we have the statement of Mr. Duchemin to the effect that Bourque's wife appeared before him and said he did not intend to appear before him and in any circumstance he had made a statement that had been sent to the department. Mr. Duchemin says:

> I advised her that any statement he had previously sent forward to the department would be of no avail with this investigation, and it would be necessary for him to come personally before me if he wished to have any statement sent forward to the department. I further advised her that he might appear either during the inquiry or at any time before I left River Bourgeois and that I would be pleased to transmit to the department any statements he might wish to make.

According to that report of Mr. Duchemin, every opportunity was given to Bourque to reply to the evidence that was to be given at that investigation. He made no attempt to do so and had he represented to Mr. Duchemin that he would give on a later date a reply to the evidence given at that investigation, I have not the slightest doubt that every opportunity would have been afforded him to do so. But on the contrary he did not do so, and we have the statement of the commission that his wife told him he did not intend to appear anyway because he relied upon the statement he had previously made and which had been filed with the department. The commissioner went on to take the evidence and made his report. Three witnesses were examined and this is the report:

> Mr. Levisconte whom I understand is a native of River Bourgeois testified that he had being doing business at River Bourgeois for about twenty-one years and that he knew everybody living in the district. He added that he had always taken an active interest in political matters on the Conservative side and was well acquainted with the political workers on both sides of politics; that he had known Bourque for years and declared he had been for years a most objectionable partisan.
>
> Mr. Levisconte said: 'In the Dominion election of 1908, when the campaign was in progress, Marin Bourque used most objectionable language toward the Conservative. He spoke of them as 'that dirty party.' He said: 'I would never vote for that dirty party'. He said this to me here in River Bourgeois. Mr. Levisconte added that while Marin Bourque was not a man who exercised much influence in the district, he had nevertheless always been offensive and objectionable as a Liberal partisan.

Another witness appeared and gave evidence. Mr. Boudreau testified:

> That Mr. Bourque had been in the habit of 'talking politics openly in a nasty and insulting way.' Witness said: 'In the 1908 election, I was

working in the interests of Mr. Ferguson, the Conservative candidate. A few days before the election, Mr. Bourque said, 'I was a fool to be working for that party (the Conservative party) because they were going to get licked anyway.'

If that is not canvassing and trying to influence voters in an election I would like to know what is.

Mr. Boudreau corroborated the statement of Mr. Levisconte that while Marin Bourque was never in a position to do much for his party, that he had always been openly offensive when elections were taking place.

Mr. Bourque had an opportunity of appearing at the investigation, or at any time later on when the commissioner was in River Bourgeois, to give evidence and deny the truth of the statements made against him but he did not choose to do so, and I say it is no wonder therefore that the commissioner concludes his report by saying:

I therefore find that Marin Bourque has been an offensive partisan and that on this ground the department was warranted in dispensing with his services.

These are the facts as they appear on the files of the department. The hon. member for Richmond asked me to accept his statement to the effect that Duchemin has acted in a most dishonest and outrageous manner: that he has made statements that are not true, to the department; that he has deceived the department and that the statements contained in his report are false and untrue. I fail to understand what purpose Mr. Duchemin could have in doing anything of that sort. He was acting under a commission from the Government under the Enquiries Act, and what purpose he could have had in making a report to the department that was not true, is something which I entirely fail to understand, and I will not accept that as being true in regard to Mr. Duchemin, unless absolute evidence is given of that fact. Mr. Duchemin has been accused by my hon. friend from Richmond. He is not here to defend himself, and I want to say to my hon. friend from Richmond that I will accept that report of Mr. Duchemin until the contrary is shown to be true, for I cannot believe that any responsible man, as I believe Mr. Duchemin to be, would take the course of making false statements regarding evidence given before him, when the making of those false statements would injure a man, who in the opinion of my hon. friend from Richmond, was innocent of the charges made against him. The facts are all there and quite clear. If the facts contained in that report of Mr. Duchemin are true, there is no doubt whatever that this man was a partisan, and a most objectionable partisan, and under the rule laid down by this House some years ago, he had no reason to find fault because of his dismissal from office.

Mr. KYTE: If this was the first time we had heard of Mr. Duchemin's conduct in the province of Nova Scotia, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries might more successfully put on an air of seeming offence at the challenge offered as to the character of his commissioner. Does the hon. minister forget that in the last session of Parliament a case was brought by me to his attention where he summoned Michael O'Brien, keeper of the light of Bear Island, to appear before him at Port Malcolm to answer certain charges. Mr. Duchemin held the court at Port Hawkesbury, nine miles away, so that it was impossible for O'Brien to attend to answer the charges. It may become the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to have a defective memory to-night, because it is not convenient to remember all the facts and circumstances brought to his attention with regard to his blessed commissioner down in Cape Breton. Does the hon. minister not know that it was brought to the attention of the House, that notwithstanding Mr. Duchemin was directed to allow counsel to appear for the accused, he absolutely refused to hear counsel and took the conduct of the case entirely in his own hands. Mr. Duchemin in his second report to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not state that he told Mrs. Bourque that it was his intention to summon other witnesses to give testimony against her husband. He simply said: I come here for the purpose of getting a statement from your husband, inasmuch as no statement has been made by him that I can forward to Ottawa. Had Mr. Duchemin told Mrs. Bourque: 'there are two witnesses who are prepared to give evidence against you,' and if in face of the knowledge of that fact Bourque had shown indifference to his interest and refused to attend the inquiry, then the Minister of Marine might have some semblance of excuse for the conduct of Duchemin in this respect. Mr. Bourque knew that at the investigation held in the month of September no evidence was given against him, and that no evidence could be given against him in that regard. He knew he was not obliged to give evidence in reply to a charge that had not been proved against

him, and inasmuch as his statement made on oath was in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, did he not do what any sane man would have done under the circumstances when he said: As there is no evidence against me, there is nothing for me to answer and my statement stands in the office of the Department of Marine at the present time. There is the whole case. The Minister of Marine says that Bourque had an opportunity of appearing before Duchemin. Opportunity to appear for what purpose? He appeared before him in the month of September. Mr. Levisconte, the star witness, was called and his evidence was so ridiculous, so defective, and fell so far short of proving the charge against Bourque, that even Duchemin, in view of my presence and the presence of others there, would not undertake to report that evidence was given against him sufficient to justify his dismissal. But I state that Duchemin sent a deceptive report to the Minister of Marine, for which, of course, I do not hold the minister responsible, because I aver again that Levisconte was called and was examined by Duchemin, and having failed to give evidence to implicate the accused as regards the charges made against him, Mr. Duchemin was obliged to drop the case. After I made the inquiry as to whether or not the lightkeeper was to be reinstated, I found that a second inquiry was ordered by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. When I heard that I addressed a letter to the minister expressing my astonishment. The letter is dated December 16, 1912, and reads as follows:

Hon. J. D. Hazen,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—With reference to the dismissal of Marin Bourque, lightkeeper at River Bourgeois, who was dismissed in the month of April last; You are aware that an investigation was held into the charges of partisanship made against him, before Mr. Duchemin on the 26th day of September, last.

I am very much surprised to learn that Mr. Bourque was again summoned to appear before Duchemin for investigation on the 12th of December instant, to answer to the same charges. I cannot believe that Mr. Duchemin had authority from you to institute the second inquiry, and I would be obliged if you will inform me whether or not he was so instructed.

To which letter I received the following reply:

Office of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of Canada,
Ottawa, December 18, 1912.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of yours of the 16th instant expressing surprise that further investigation was held into charges preferred against Mr. Marin Bourque, keeper of the light at River Bourgeois.

In reply I have to inform you that subsequent to the receipt of a report from Mr. Duchemin, barrister, Sydney, N.S., who was instructed to examine into the charges of partisanship preferred against Mr. Bourque, verbal representations were made to me to the effect that testimony was available to prove the allegations made against Mr. Bourque, and that further opportunity should be offered for its production.

After carefully considering the matter, I decided to re-open it and instructed Mr. Duchemin to arrange for a rehearing at River Bourgeois at his early convenience, serving all interested parties with notice of the time and place of inquiry. I am awaiting Mr. Duchemin's report.

Yours faithfully,
J. D. Hazen.

I am curious to know from what source the minister received this verbal information. Perhaps he would not mind stating to me now who was the person who gave the information to him.

Mr. HAZEN: One of them was Mr. Gillies, and I think there were others.

Mr. KYTE: Mr. Gillies is the gentleman who made the statement in the beginning that this man Bourque was a partisan, a man against whom not a single tittle of evidence could be produced by men who had known him for twenty years. Mr. Gillies lives in the city of Sydney, almost 100 miles from where Mr. Bourque resided. He does not visit the county of Richmond except when an election campaign is on and how could Mr. Gillies be in possession of certain facts of an intimate character that his friend, Mr. Levisconte, did not know about although he had lived for twenty years within gunshot of Mr. Bourque himself?

The name of Mr. Gillies is not heard in this House to-night for the first time. I will refrain from making a reply to the compliment that the minister paid him this evening for the reason that Mr. Gillies is not present and is therefore not able to defend himself. But it is within the recollection of the members of this committee that certain facts and circumstances were brought before the attention of this House last year which do not reflect very much to the credit of Mr. Gillies and do not contribute very much to the credit of the minister himself who acted upon the recommendations which Mr. Gillies made to him. One of the most serious allegations brought against any member of this Government was made during the last session of Parliament by myself in respect to the release

from jail of a man who had been tried and committed for forgery, in order that he might enjoy the emoluments of public office conferred upon him by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on a recommendation that was made by Mr. Gillies. In view of the fact that the minister is able to stand up to-day without a blush upon his countenance and speak of the high character of Mr. Gillies, and justify himself in accepting his recommendation, I have very little hope that the minister will alter the fatuous course he has pursued with regard to taking Mr. Gillies to his political and personal bosom as he has done heretofore.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The discussion in regard to our old friend, Mr. Duchemin, makes it necessary for me to make a correction in a statement of the hon Minister of Marine and Fisheries appearing in 'Hansard' a few days ago in regard to the money that is being paid to this executioner in the province of Nova Scotia for cutting off the heads of decent people. I made inquiries last year in regard to the large sums that were paid to this gentleman for the very unfair and disreputable work that he has been hired to do in that province, and the Government were kind enough to give me a pretty full return. The other day I wanted to pursue this inquiry a little further and obtain additional particulars as to the amount of money paid to Mr. Duchemin since the time at which the previous report was placed on the table, the 21st May, 1913. I accordingly framed a new series of questions for that purpose. My first question is:

1. What was the gross amount paid by all departments of the Government to H. P. Duchemin, commissioner, from the date of his appointment to December 31, 1913, for his services in connection with investigations of partisanship, including travelling and living expenses?

The minister undertakes to answer that question, and this is his answer as it appears in 'Hansard':

Mr. Hazen: 1. $1,664.85.

I submit that this answer is incorrect, and I assume that the mistake arises from the minister referring only to his own department and not to all the departments of Government.

Mr. HAZEN: That answer, of course, should have gone to the Secretary of State.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It was produced in the House by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The answer was handed to the clerk and it appears in 'Hansard' as the answer from all the departments of the Government. The answer I got last year from the various departments of the Government who made answer was—

Mr. HAZEN: Will the hon. gentleman tell me what page of 'Hansard' that is on?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I think it was yesterday or the day before. It was quite recently. I was pointing out that last year, on the 21st May, when I made this inquiry in regard to the money paid to this gentleman, by all the departments of the Government I got the following reply:

Post Office Department, $1,053.78; Railways and Canals, $1,850.15; Marine and Fisheries, $1,691.10.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that the sum paid by the Department of Marine and Fisheries last year was larger than the sum that the hon. minister tells me now was paid by all the departments of Government since the appointment of Mr. Duchemin.

Department of Public Works, $389.48; Department of Customs, $1,190.66; Department of Agriculture, $124.66.

Making a total paid to Mr. Duchemin of $6,299.77 up to the 21st day of May, 1913. In addition to that certain sundries were charged up by this gentleman and paid by the various departments amounting to the sum of $697.21. It is clear, therefore, that there must be some error in the return that has been given to me by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. HAZEN: It is perfectly clear what that error was. These answers are all prepared in the departments and sent to the Department of the Secretary of State which is the collecting department. The Secretary of State has to answer general questions of this sort addressed to the Government, the answers to which have to come from the several departments. This answer should have been handed to the Secretary of State, but evidently, through some mistake, it has been sent to me here in the House by an official of the department, and I have handed it in as the answer to the question. Instead of that, it should have gone to the Secretary of State and he should have collected the answers from the different departments and totalled the amounts up altogether.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister see that this is corrected and that a full and accurate report is given to the House?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes. I think that ought to be struck out of 'Hansard' because it gives an entirely incorrect impression. The question ought to be answered by the Secretary of State giving the full information after having collected it from the different departments which have used the services of Mr. Duchemin as a commissioner. I do not know whether it can be struck out of 'Hansard' now or not, but I will consult with Mr. Speaker and see what can be done.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister explain to me how it was that on the 21st May, 1913, his department reported to the House that $1,691.10 had been paid for expenses to Mr. Duchemin. It also appears by the answers I have just referred to that Mr. Duchemin did additional work during the current year since the date of the answers. The amount which is now stated is less, namely $1,664.85. Can the minister explain that?

Mr. HAZEN: I cannot explain it at the moment. I will have to find out at the department. I do not prepare these answers. They are prepared by the accountant of the department. Will the hon. gentleman let me get the facts? The question was:

What was the gross amount paid by all departments of the Government to H. P. Duchemin, commissioner, from the date of his appointment to December 31, 1913, for his services in connection with investigations of partisanship, including travelling and living expenses?

And the answer given is:

$1,664.85.

You say that the answer given last year conflicts with this?

Mr. SINCLAIR: The amount on the 21st of May, 1913, was stated as $1,961.10.

Mr. HAZEN: What question is that in answer to?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I have not the question, but you will find it in 'Hansard' of the 21st of May, 1913. There will also be an error in the number of investigations or the number of parties whose dismissal Mr. Duchemin recommended. The question is, 'How many dismissals of officials did the said Mr. Duchemin recommend in all the departments?' The answer is 'sixty-seven,' which of course is incorrect, as well as the amount of money.

Mr. HAZEN: That refers to the Department of Marine and Fisheries only.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

Mr. SINCLAIR: I thought that last year, after all the information that we had laid before the minister in regard to this gentleman, Mr. Duchemin, that my hon. friend would have made some investigation in regard to Mr. Duchemin's character, and that he would not come before the House at this date and say that he would give him the benefit of the doubt in regard to the conduct of investigations. Mr. Duchemin violated the law in many particulars, which were pointed out to my hon. friend and the other members of the Government at the last session of Parliament. Everybody knows that under the Investigation Act, every official has the right to be represented by counsel. It is the common right of every British subject. I do not care what the charge against a man is, it may be murder, treason, or any capital charge, but it has always been recognized in every British court that a man charged with any kind of crime has the right to be represented by counsel. This was so apparent to everybody that the Prime Minister insisted on placing it in the Investigation Act, and some of his friends had headlines placed in the newspapers showing what a magnanimous gentleman the Prime Minister was that he would give those poor Grit officials who were being charged with partisanship the right to be represented by counsel. This must have been known to Mr. Duchemin, because he is a lawyer; and if he had not read the Investigation Act, certainly he was not fit for the position in which my hon. friend had placed him. I am not charging Mr. Duchemin with anything that I cannot prove. If my hon. friend requires any proof, I can give it to him from the mouth of Mr. Duchemin himself. If my hon. friend will refer to a return that was placed before the House last year, in regard to the dismissal of Mr. R. Conroy, postmaster at Country Harbour, N.S., he will find the following language from Mr. Duchemin's report. Mr. Duchemin says:

Mr. Floyd, who is, I understand, a solicitor in the town,—

that is, the town of Guysborough——

—asked if he might represent one of the accused at the hearing. I declined to allow him to act, herein following the precedent laid down by Mr. J. T. Ross, the commissioner appointed in 1896-7, to do similar work. I had months before declined to hear counsel on the ground that it would unduly prolong these hearings and would involve very great delay in reaching the many cases that had to be taken up.

There were so many people who had to have their heads cut off that Mr. Duchemin could not be bothered going into the de-

tails to see whether a man was guilty or not. What he considered to be his duty was to go along as fast as possible and to do this work without finding out whether there was a defence or not. He goes on to say:

> My attitude in this regard was subsequently confirmed by the department for which I was carrying on the inquiry.

I do not know whether that is true or not. On several occasions I have tried to find out what department that was. I have a question on the Order Paper now, and I trust my hon. friend will be able to give me that information.

Mr. HAZEN: The question on the Order Paper is not addressed to me.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Mr. Duchemin, whom my hon. friend represents here to-night as being a fit official to conduct investigations, makes the statement that some department of this Government instructed him not to allow counsel to be present at these hearings. He further states that his attitude in this regard was subsequently confirmed by the department for which he was carrying on the inquiry.

Mr. HAZEN: He made that answer in a letter written to me, and I instructed him to retain counsel. Therefore, it does not refer to me.

Mr. SINCLAIR: This refers to the Post Office Department, but I would like to have some department answer that question. I am addressing my speech now to the Secretary of State who represents all these departments. If a commissioner, who is appointed by an Order in Council, has been instructed by any department of the Government not to allow counsel to be employed in these investigations, I think it is our right to know which department of the Government has violated the law in that respect. I have endeavoured several times to find out which department it was, but so far I have not got any answer.

That is one instance, and Mr. Duchemin admits that for months he was travelling around the country dismissing officials, refusing them the right to be represented by counsel and practically not taking enough time over these investigations to discover whether the men were guilty or not. This is the man to whom we have paid the large sum of between $6,000 or $7,000 for doing work which it would have been far better not to have done at all. If there is anything at all worth while having in this country, it is fair play and justice. If we could get that, we would not mind paying for it, but we do not want to be compelled to pay good money for the kind of justice that we have been getting from Mr. Duchemin. It is an imposition, and it would be much more to the credit of my hon. friend if he would dismiss these officials at once, take the heads off all these lightkeepers who were Liberals without any investigation or without anything more than simply a letter or a telegram as was done in some instances in my constituency, than that hasty investigations should be carried on and men who were innocent should be found guilty without a proper trial. There was a case of very great hardship in my constituency. It was a very small affair, but it just shows how small a great political party can be on some occasions. A man by the name of George Jollotta was employed as fishery guardian on the St. Mary's river. He had held the position for a number of years, and was a good officer. He was unfortunate in having a very severe illness which ended in the amputation of both his legs above the knee. He was therefore very much crippled, and it was only because he was a man of great pluck and perseverance that he was able to make a living at all. Everybody was pleased at the fact that Jollotta under such circumstances still kept on the struggle to make a living and did not appeal to the county to assist him. He had a very small position of fishery guardian on the St. Mary's river at a salary of $20 a year. He had filled the position for four or five years, and he had filled it very well. The principal duty of an officer on that river is to watch the salmon nets and to see that the nets are not placed too far across the channel of the stream. Jollotta furnished himself with a motor boat, and was able to get up and down the river, watch the nets and do his work very well. Last year when I referred incidentally to this matter, hon. members asked me why we employed a man of that description as a fishery guardian. I want to explain to the House that he was able to do the work very well indeed. He was a faithful officer, and owing to the fact that he could get among the nets with his motor boat he could do just as well as a man who was able to use both his legs. Without an investigation Mr. Jollotta was dismissed and his position given to one of the friends of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. This is perhaps one of the worst cases that happened in the county I have the honour to represent. I know what the

minister's answer will be. He will say that fishery guardians are appointed not by Order in Council, but at the will of the Government, and are supposed to be appointed every year. That is true, but the minister will find, if he looks over the records, that in my constituency at all events, the same fishery guardians have held office for many years. A man becomes accustomed to the work, and if he proves a good officer we never think of changing him. It would be a very poor excuse for taking away a little twenty-dollar job from a man like this—that the reason you took the job from him was that you had the power to do so. The story of this man is very well told in a statement which appeared in the Morning Chronicle at the time it happened:

> The said George Jollotta a few years ago was the victim of tubercular disease of the knees, and his life was saved by having his legs amputated at the hips. By industry, frugality, and the help of friends, he was enabled to have himself fitted with a pair of artificial legs. Mr. Jollotta's family consists of his widowed mother, about 80 years old, and two children about five and six years old.
>
> Nothwithstanding these infirmities, by industry and perseverance, he was able to make a living for himself and family. The $20 he received for duties as river warden was a great help to him in his struggles. He built himself a little boat in which he had a three horse-power gasoline engine installed. In this boat he performed his duties of river warden and followed his occupation, fishing.
>
> People were glad to see this young man's energy and admired his pluck and enterprise. Any help that could be rendered him without hurting his sense of independence was always gladly given by well disposed people. Many a person in like circumstances would have given up the fight and have become a charge on the public. Not so with George Jollotta. Despite his disabilities he struggled on and made a living for himself and helpless dependents.
>
> On September 21, 1911, a change took place. The 'party of gentlemen' came into power and they immediately cast envious eyes on the $20 job of this worthy citizen, and one of the first public acts of the great 'Imperialist,' Mr. Borden, the guarlian of the public service, was to deprive poor crippled George Jollotta of this little $20 job and give it to one of the hungry Tory office seekers—to a man in the prime of health and strength, and who rumour says had no time to attend to any of the duties of river warden, without it is, to draw the $20 salary.
>
> So much for an example of the acts of the great 'Imperial party of gentlemen' in this county.

I know that the minister himself is a very high-minded and honourable gentleman, which makes it all the more amazing that he should permit his supporters, for the sake of a shabby twenty dollars, to take a position away from a man who had lost both his legs. I thought, therefore, that the case should be placed on 'Hansard' to show how far these gentlemen will go in these matters.

My hon. friend, in his speech the other evening on the transportation of fish, boasted about what his party had done in the fish hatcheries throughout the country. I took the trouble to look the matter up to see if any new departure had been taken in this important matter, and to my amazement I found that nothing had been done except to dismiss sixteen skilled officers from the fish hatcheries and replace them with sixteen untrained men. Everybody knows that fish hatcheries must be run by skilled men, for it takes years to learn the business. The late Government would not appoint a man in charge of a fish hatchery unless he had had a training in some other hatchery and understood the work. There are some branches of the public service that ought to be clearly above politics. These fish hatchery positions are small at the best. But the importance of the service should be considered. I told the minister last year and I repeat now, that the life saving service on the coast should not be regarded as political and that even if a man in charge of a life-saving station should be indiscreet enough to say a word in favour of the other side in politics, that is no reason why he should be dismissed if he is a good man. The position is so important that if the man is the right man for the position, the Government might well take the position that the life-saving service—and the same applies to the hatchery service—should be outside of politics. Otherwise, see what the result will be. If the Government should change next year, as we expect it will, there will be a demand for the dismissal of these sixteen men from the hatcheries and the reinstatement of the sixteen men who had been dismissed before. The same with the life saving service. And I must say, looking at it from this distance from the event, that that is the right thing to do, for I have no doubt that in many cases these dismissed officers had more experience and were better, practical men than those who succeeded them. But under this principle you could not build up good service in this or any department. These are matters which, because of their importance, I lay before the committee and call to the special attention of the minister.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. gentleman referred to a case in his county of George Jollotta. I think he is hard up for material

when he brings that case before the committee. He knows that the position which Mr. Jollotta occupied is a mere temporary position and that the practice which prevails now prevailed when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office—the member for the constituency supporting the Government was asked to name parties to fill these positions. The hon. gentleman said that the same men continued to hold these offices in Guysborough year after year. So they did, probably, some of them, for about fifteen years, but that was because the same party was in power during the whole of that time. But in 1896, when the Government he supported came into office, practically every fishery guardian in Canada was dismissed and new men put in their places—or rather not dismissed, but simply not reappointed, for these are temporary employees. The hon. gentleman sheds tears over this case,—I never heard the man's name before—yet he supported a government that treated in the same way practically every fishery overseer in Canada.

Mr. SINCLAIR: We never dismissed a man who had no legs.

Mr. HAZEN: I quite fail to understand how a man who had no legs could be an efficient fishery guardian, although we would not, of course, expect a man to do very much for $20 a year. With regard to the fish hatcheries, it is the opinion of the officers of the department who have charge of that work that the fish hatcheries in Canada were never in as efficient a condition as they are at the present time. This year they are filled with eggs practically to capacity, and we expect next season to have the best results that have been obtained since we first had fish hatcheries in Canada.

Mr. MACDONALD: I regret that I was not here the whole evening, but I have heard enough of the debate to enable me to say a word or two to my hon. friend the minister in regard to the methods in which dismissals are made in Nova Scotia through the agency of Mr. Duchemin. When my hon. friend started out to make dismissals, I am surprised that this Government did not find some better instrument for that work than this bold and ruthless gentleman, Mr. Duchemin, who is simply a cheap partisan, possessing no qualifications whatever to carry out any judicial duties or to conduct examinations. True, he was a member of the bar, but that is about all that can be said of him. So far as his judicial aptitude is concerned, I know of no member of the bar in the province of Nova Scotia who is less fitted than this man to perform judicial duties. Let us consider his method of administering oaths. Does my hon. friend the minister know whether he administered oaths in any of the inquiries which he conducted, and, if so, what kind of oaths did he administer ? Of course the minister accepted as a matter of course anything that this gentleman said. But let me tell him a little story concerning the manner in which this exemplary judicial official administered oaths. A charge was made against a gentleman in another department of the Government in the province of Nova Scotia, and at the inquiry a witness by the name of Currie was called to give evidence. This gentleman gave testimony which would go to indicate that the accused person should be dismissed. Immediately after the investigation was held the gentleman accused denied upon oath the assertions made by Mr. Currie, and proceeded to have him arrested for perjury. When the case came up for trial at the Supreme Court, what defence do you think Mr. Currie made? He said: 'I was not sworn at all; no legal oath was administered to me.' He asserted that Mr. Duchemin did not administer to him the oath the law contemplates, asking him to pledge the truth of his statements. And whom did Mr. Currie call as a witness on his own behalf but Mr. Duchemin himself, who proceeded to swear that he had not handed a copy of the Holy Gospels to Mr. Currie when the oath was administered; he simply asked him to hold up his hand.

Mr. STANFIELD: They are a bad crowd of lawyers in Nova Scotia.

Mr. MACDONALD: Not a bad crowd of lawyers, but a bad investigator, and, in this particular case, a bad witness. This Mr. Duchemin, this splendid judicial officer whom the Government picked out to try this case with such beautiful impartiality, in order to save his good Tory friend, Mr. Currie, from the necessity of serving a term in the penitentiary, swears that he did not administer to him an oath in the manner in which it is administered in the Nova Scotia courts. The jury, however, under the direction of the judge, who instructed them that this was an oath pro forma, proceeded to find Mr. Currie, this good Tory, guilty of perjury. He was sent to the

penitentiary, and he is there now. But the Conservative organization immediately proceeded to have the case taken on a reserved question before the full Court of Nova Scotia. Here it was argued long and seriously that the evidence given by Mr. Currie was no evidence at all, because it had not been given under oath administered upon the Holy Gospels. It appeared that Mr. Duchemin at no time in any of his investigations had ever asked a witness to swear upon the Holy Gospels. What occurred? Two of the learned judges of the province of Nova Scotia, one of them in a judgment which is remarkable so far as judicial investigation upon oaths is concerned, decided that Mr. Currie had not been properly sworn by Mr. Duchemin. By a majority of one, the court decided that the oath having been an oath pro forma and having been taken by Mr. Currie with the intention of pledging himself to the truth, the charge of perjury would lie. But the Conservative organization of Nova Scotia, which had promoted the prosecutions in the counties of Guysborough, Yarmouth—indeed, in all the counties of Nova Scotia, including that of Richmond—put up the funds necessary to raise the issue that the methods adopted by Mr. Duchemin in swearing witnesses examined by him were wholly and totally illegal. The Conservative organization put up further funds; they carried the case to the Supreme Court of Canada, applied for a writ of habeas corpus, and asked that court to review the decision of the Nova Scotia court. The higher court held, as did the majority of the judges of the Nova Scotia court, that, an oath pro forma having been administered to this witness, and the witness having pledged himself to the truth, there was perjury in law. This gentleman, Mr. Currie, unless my hon. friends have let him out within the last day or two, as they did in the case of Landry from Richmond, is now in the penitentiary serving a term for having sworn falsely before this great inquisitor. It appeared in the course of the investigation in regard to Mr. Currie's case that Mr. Duchemin had at no time asked the witness to pledge himself to the truth by kissing the Book. So that, if my hon. friends want to be fair in regard to this matter, they ought to issue a second commission to go out and investigate Mr. Duchemin, and ascertain how many people have committed perjury in giving evidence before him.

Mr. STANFIELD: When you spoke of the Conservative organization of Nova Scotia, did you mean the provincial or the local organization?

Mr. MACDONALD: If my hon. friend will tell me which one it was that put up the money, I will tell him which I meant.

Mr. STANFIELD: I am a member of the executive of the provincial organization in Nova Scotia, and not one dollar was put up by that organization.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend did not attend all the meetings, I hope. Or is there a secret service executive of the association?

Mr. STANFIELD: I have made my statement. I know what I am talking about.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend has told us he knows all about it.

Mr. STANFIELD: I do not. I simply make one statement.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will he tell whether there is an executive committee of the provincial association of Nova Scotia?

Mr. STANFIELD: I am a member of it.

Mr. MACDONALD: Have you been present at all the meetings?

Mr. STANFIELD: I have not, but I know all that is going on.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend has a system of mesmeric knowledge in regard to these things. He knows what is going on when he is not there. I presume they did not take him into their confidence when they raised this issue that the men who had purported to have sworn before Duchemin had never sworn. This particular combination of the executive knew that my hon. friend would be up here in the House and they said: We will settle this thing without consulting John Stanfield, so he will know nothing about it. The consequence was my hon. friend was not present when that was done. But everyone in Nova Scotia who looks at the counsel who argued the case knows that they had not done the work for nothing. They also know that Curry has no money to put up to employ counsel and also that the argument was made to save Curry from remaining in the penitentiary where he had gone. Who put up the money to make the argument before the Supreme Court? This is the kind of splendid judicial inquiries we have been having under this Government. I admire the assurance of the Minister of Marine. I would accept his word in regard to matters connected with his own province, but I want

to tell him that he should not labour under any delusion as to the status of the gentleman who conducted these inquiries in Nova Scotia. The character of these investigations is evidenced in the prosecution and detention in the penitentiary at this moment of one of the gang who went out in that province to swear away the livelihood of honest men who had been faithfully performing their duty. He had better beware of his advisers from Nova Scotia and of the character of the investigations held there under his department. The hon. member for Yarmouth called attention to a case in which my hon. friend did not find it necessary to send anyone to take an oath. I would rather see him cut off the head of anybody on the evidence of a reputable man, if he was a member of this House, than to proceed in the method in which they did in the province in connection with Mr. Duchemin's investigations. One of the first duties that every administrator of a Government has to the people who put him there is to preserve unstained the respect for the administration of justice in every form. Over and above any mere question of party political expediency or advantage to be gained for the moment through the dismissal of men to find places for party friends, stands the preservation, clear and without taint, of the administration of justice in every province. But the minister proceeded by appointing a commissioner like Mr. Duchemin, who has dragged in the mire the administration of justice in Nova Scotia. The disclosures in the Curry case show that oaths were considered to be of no consequence whatever, and that statements were obtained from men under the pretence that the making of oaths in a tribunal was a mere figure of speech, which had no effect as a matter of law or of right. The Government will do better, when they want to make a dismissal, to take the word of men in this House, whose word I would accept because they are prepared to defend it; but when they go outside and take suggestions from indiscriminate quarters or appoint men to carry on the administration of justice after the manner of this tribunal, with the results I have indicated in the prosecution and detention of this man Curry and this argument before the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, they do more wrong to the whole body politic of this country in obstructing the administration of justice than they could possibly inflict in any other way.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the minister intend to investigate the conduct of Mr. Duchemin?

Mr. HAZEN: I have no such intention.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It is a matter of great importance, I understand, from the answer received the other day, that Mr. Duchemin is still in the employ of his department, and that if any more trials are to take place in eastern Nova Scotia, Duchemin is the man to conduct them.

Mr. HAZEN: We hope we will have no more trials.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I have pointed out to my hon. friend that Mr. Duchemin has disregarded the law in regard to persons being represented by counsel, that he did that over and over again at the various trials in my constituency and in other constituencies in eastern Nova Scotia. I pointed out last year to my hon. friend that in the trial of Phillip H. Ryan, which afterwards came before the Supreme Court at Guysborough, he wilfully suppressed important evidence that he ought to have disclosed to the department at the time. My hon. friend from Pictou has pointed out his disgraceful conduct in regard to the case of Currie, who is now in the penitentiary. If the Minister of Marine will not say at this stage, after all these charges have been so specifically laid against Duchemin, that he will make an investigation into his manner of holding inquiries and also of charging fees, it will be a great disappointment to this House. The hon. member for North Cape Breton last year drew attention to a case where he tried some four people in one afternoon in some place in Cape Breton, all charged with partisanship. The whole proceeding only occupied two or three hours. He was entitled to $15 a day for his work. He split up the different trials that he held on that afternoon into four days as I understood the hon. member for North Cape Breton, and charged $60 for work for which he ought to have charged only $15. There are specific charges made against this man, over and over again, in this House and if the minister will not take any action he must be held responsible for the conduct of Duchemin.

Mr. TURGEON: The minister will remember that directly on coming to office he dismissed nearly all the officers in his department in the county which I represent; the fishery officers especially were

dismissed at the request of the defeated candidate, for partisanship.

When I saw my hon. friend taking that action, I took it for granted that it was based on the lofty principle of reform of the Civil Service, and that it meant that the new men appointed to the vacancies would certainly be very reticent and would attend to their duty without any interference in politics. However, knowing, as I happen to know, the men appointed, their political tendencies and their activity in elections, I hesitate to believe that their appointment will bring about reform in the Civil Service in the county of Gloucester. I may say to my hon. friend that many of these men—I can give the names if he wishes it—have been very active and even after their appointment have remained members of the organization committees in their respective homes in the county of Gloucester. They have even signed petitions for the decapitation of other officials who have been dismissed from office at their request. I put a question a few days ago to the Minister of Customs in regard to two of his officers, sub-collectors at Lameque and Tracadie, and he told me they would have to quit the political organizations. He even offered to write them immediately, advising them to retire from those organizations. I have no doubt that has been done. And would my hon. friend the Minister of Marine be not only as courteous to me, but as faithful to his principles already enunciated, to similarly notify those officials whose names I will give him if he tells me he will write them. They are men who have been very active until a few days ago. I might tell him that on the 14th of January last, just before I left home to come to this Parliament, the Conservative Association of the county of Gloucester had a meeting in Bathurst at which four or five of these officials attended.

Mr. HAZEN: Are they temporary or permanent officials?

Mr. TURGEON: They have replaced permanent officials. These men left their official positions to attend the meeting of the association for purposes of organization, and I might say that so far as my information goes, if the officials had not been there the meeting would have been a very small one. I do not raise any objection against the dismissals my hon. friend has made, but they must have been made upon a principle—offensive partisanship, and I want to tell my hon. friend that all these officials for a long time past have been offensive partisans and offensive both in nature and manners and I would like to give their names to the hon. minister: James J. Doucet of Petit Rocher, Edmund Arseneau of Inkerman, and Joseph O. Chiasson of Lower Caraquet. The hon. minister should certainly appoint other men in place of these officials, and that will show that the dismissals of the past have not been made merely to punish men for being Liberals. I do not find fault with my hon. friend for appointing one of his own friends when there is a vacancy. I myself have appointed Liberals from among my own friends. I only ask that the Government, if it really means to reform the outside civil service, should insist upon the officials sticking to their duty and if they wish to show any political activity remove them from office.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL: I do not want to take part in this phase of the debate to-night except to say that I am very glad indeed that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not find an executioner in New Brunswick like the one in Nova Scotia. I think you will pardon me if I congratulate him along that line. I must congratulate him upon the general standing of the gentleman who occupied that position in the province of New Brunswick. While this may not be the proper time, I want to give my friend a little information and see whether he can give me a little information. He will remember that on the St. John river, some years ago there was an arrangement made by which people were allowed to fish for salmon.

Mr. HAZEN: That is a fisheries item. We are dealing with the Marine items now.

Mr. CARVELL: I am just giving my friend an outline so that he can look it up and let me know later. An arrangement was made I think by which they could fish for two weeks in the season. The close of the fishing season is, I think, August 14, or 15. It is a well-known fact that last year when the water was very low, the St. John had nets practically all the way across it, up in the county of Carleton, much later than the 14th of August. They were kept there right to the end of the month and even into September, and when objections were raised the reply was that they had authority to do it. I do not believe that is a fact but I wish the minister would look it up.

Mr. HAZEN: That would be impossible of course, but I will look into the matter.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think myself that they had authority but I wish to point out to the minister that he has two officials in the county of Carleton who are simply a disgrace.

Mr. HAZEN: Who are they?

Mr. CARVELL: One man's name is Parker. I have not seen them fishing myself, but I am told by responsible people that they fished in season and out of season.

Mr. HAZEN: Will you give me the name of the other man?

Mr. CARVELL: I will get it for you. These men I am told—and I would not make a statement like this publicly if I did not have some grounds for saying so—fish in season and out of season. They are well known poachers and succeeded in getting appointed for the simple purpose of poaching and allowing their friends and relatives to poach; and I wish my hon. friend would see if any such instructions or authority were given. While I do not believe they were, I want to be sure when this matter comes before the committee.

Mr. HAZEN: I will certainly get the information for my hon. friend as the charge which he has made is, of course, a very serious one against men appointed to protect the fisheries. No time will be lost by my department in investigating the matter and finding out if there is any truth in it; and if such is the case, those men will not be allowed to continue in the department for a single minute.

Mr. CARVELL: I have lots of evidence.

Mr. KYTE: What is the attitude of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to be towards persons appointed to office by him and who are found to be notorious partisans. Will he insist that these persons shall refrain from taking part in political work during their incumbency of office?

Mr. HAZEN: I have no doubt my hon. friend, when he gets into office, will turn them out very speedily.

Mr. KYTE: I am glad to know that the minister understands my character so well. That is what I would insist upon doing. If a man wants to interfere in politics he must take the responsibility of giving up his official position. That is the stand I have always taken, and, should I continue to be in public life and should my party come back to power, I shall adhere to that stand. But I would like to get an answer from the minister on that subject. We had an answer from the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) last year. He was frank enough to say that he would not permit any partisanship on the part of any official appointed to office by him. I would like to know if the minister agrees with the position taken by the Postmaster General.

Mr. HAZEN: I certainly agree with him.

Mr. KYTE: Then, I would inform the minister that an official of his department, appointed by him, in St. Peter's, was recently elected secretary of the Conservative Association for the county of Richmond. I would like the minister to take note of that matter and to give this official the choice between his official and political offices.

Mr. HAZEN: Certainly, if the hon. gentleman will give me the name.

Mr. KYTE: Dr. John A. Macdonald, junior, port physician of the harbour of St. Peter's, who was, in the month of December last, elected to the position of secretary of the Conservative Association for that county.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Monday, Feburary 16, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA CONVENTION.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN moved for leave to lay on the table of the House a copy of the convention concluded in London on January 20 last by the International Conference on the Safety of Life at Sea. He said:

In view of the world-wide importance attaching to this convention, it may not be inappropriate that I should, in submitting it to the consideration of hon. gentlemen of this House, make a few observations in relation to the calling of the International Conference, and to the conclusions that have been arrived at. I desire, therefore, with the permission of the House, to summarize as briefly as possible some of the leading features of the convention, and, in so doing, to direct attention to the fact that for a number of years past there has been manifested from time to time a disposition to make the regulations for the safety of

life at sea international and of a higher standard.

Before the calling together of this conference, substantial progress had been made along these lines by several of the principal maritime powers. It was not, however, until the terrible disaster of the Titanic, in April, 1912, that there was a general awakening of the nations to the necessity, in the interests of humanity, of examining with the greatest thoroughness the possibility of strengthening existing measures for the safety of life at sea.

It will be within the recollection of this House that immediately following the loss of the Titanic, inquiries into the cause of the disaster were undertaken by the authorities of the United States and of Great Britain. The conduct of this investigation was entrusted by Great Britain to Lord Mersey, and so comprehensive was the inquiry and so complete was his report that it arrested the attention of the whole civilized world, and made it abundantly clear that the day had arrived for stock-taking on the part of the nations. The British Government, profoundly impressed by the report of Lord Mersey, hastened to take action, and accordingly issued invitations to the principal foreign maritime nations to come together for the purpose of devising, if possible, means for the greater safety, not only of those who travel by sea, but also of those whose calling is of the sea. The Imperial Government extended invitations to Canada, Australia and New Zealand to attend this conference. The following extract from the invitation will help hon. gentlemen better to understand the objects sought to be attained:

> It would be the object of the conference to endeavour to bring about agreement among the participating states with reference to the conditions necessary for safety to be laid down in the case of passenger steamships, and with reference to other measures in the interests of the safety of maritime passenger traffic. In the event of such agreement being arrived at and embodied in a convention, each signatory state would be responsible for giving legislative and administrative effect to the provisions of that convention and issuing the necessary certificates to its national ships which comply with those provisions. The conference would further deal with the conditions under which certificates so issued should be accepted as valid by the other signatory states.

The invitation of Great Britain immediately received the consideration of the Government, and, having regard to the great importance of the question, to the widespread interest in it and to my desire to help to the greatest possible extent, I recommended its acceptance to my colleagues. This recommendation met the cordial approval of the Government and the necessary steps were taken to have Canada represented at the conference, which met in London on November 12, last.

The conference was attended by plenipotentiaries representing the British Empire, including Canada, Australia and New Zealand, Germany, France, the United States, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Spain, Sweden, Norway, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Russia and Japan. Having regard to the circumstances that led up to the calling of the conference, it will, I am sure, surprise no one that Lord Mersey, the principal British delegate, should have been unanimously chosen as its chairman.

The first work to engage the attention of the conference was the consideration of a suggestion by the British Government to classify the different subjects that were to be dealt with, as follows:

Life Saving Appliances; Safety of Construction; Safety of Navigation; Wireless Telegraphy; International Certificates.

The suggestion was acted upon, and and committees were appointed to consider and report upon the respective subjects. Every state participating in the work of the conference was represented on each of these committees. After their work was finished, Lord Mersey, speaking of these committees, said:

> They were composed of men of great knowledge and experience in regard to matters with which they were to deal, and I venture to think that it would have been impossible to have found anywhere men better fitted for the tasks they undertook.

It may be interesting to recall here the names of the gentlemen who served as chairmen of these committees. They were:

Life Saving Appliances: Sir John Biles, Professor of Naval Architecture, Glasgow University.

Safety of Construction: Admiral Washington L. Capps, Chief Naval Constuctor for the United States.

Safety of Navigation: Sir Norman Hill, President of the Marine Advisory Board.

Wireless Telegraphy: Mr. E. G. Moggridge, Assistant Secretary, Marine Department, Board of Trade.

International Certificates: His Excellency, Dr. Van Kerner of the German Foreign Office at Berlin.

The manner in which these gentlemen have done their work, is aptly expressed by Lord Mersey, who said: 'The admirable work they have severally done is the best proof of their ability.'

It will probably be considered by many that the most important article of the Convention is the one laying down the principle that there must be accommodation in life boats or their equivalents for all persons on board of any steamship. For the carrying into effect of this principle the convention lays down detailed regulations regarding the construction of the different types of boats, their equipment, stowage, strength of davits, number and construction of life buoys and life jackets. It is further provided that as large a number as possible of the boats and rafts may be launched on either side of the ship, so that as few as possible need be launched on the weather side. It is further provided that there must be a minimum number of members of the crew competent to handle the boats. Men will not be considered competent for this purpose who do not hold a certificate of competency issued under the authority of the government of some one of the signatory states. There is, in addition, a provision to the effect that all ships to which the convention applies, must be efficiently and sufficiently manned from the point of view of safety of life at sea.

The carriage of dangerous goods is forbidden, and the signatory states will from time to time issue official warnings as to what goods are dangerous, either singly or in combination, and will prescribe regulations in that connection. The convention in this respect is but approving internationally the policy already adopted and carried out by my department.

The House will remember that quite recently there have occurred several disasters at sea resulting from fire. This question received the most careful consideration, and the convention provides for an organized system of patrol for detecting fires, and regulations are provided requiring adequate means for rapidly extinguishing fire and the organization of the crew for emergencies and for boat and fire drill. It also provided that all ships shall have an adequate system of lighting, to enable passengers in an emergency readily to find their way to the exits from the interior of the ship In new ships there must be an independent source of lighting fitted in as high a position as practicable, so that in the event of disaster to the main machinery of the ship by flooding, fire or otherwise, passengers and crew may not find themselves exposed to the additional danger that darkness precipitates.

I think it will be admitted by most of those who have had experience in rough weather at sea that escape under such conditions, from a ship overtaken by disaster, with the aid of the very best life-saving appliances that human ingenuity can devise, is both difficult and dangerous. The recent case of the Volturno goes far to support this view, for it will be remembered that the great loss of life on that occasion occurred among those who managed to escape into the boats while those who did not venture into the boats but preferred to take chances on the ship were eventually saved. I refer to this in order to emphasize the view that in my judgment, a great, if not the greater factor in the safety of life at sea must be found in the construction of the ship. And I have no monopoly of this view, for I find that it is shared very largely by those who have given serious thought to the question and are best qualified to judge. The provisions of the convention respecting the construction of ships in the future are therefore of the utmost interest and importance. These provisions are necessarily technical and complicated and I abstain from any attempt to explain them. They are fully set out in the convention and I doubt not that the judgment of time will be that more than anything else they have contributed to the safety of life at sea. These provisions are to apply to all vessels, the keels of which shall be laid after the date prescribed by the convention. The subdivision of a ship into an adequate number of main water-tight compartments to enable her to remain afloat in the event of damage destroying the integrity of one or more of these compartments is the main purpose of that part of the convention dealing with construction and in this connection I regard it a matter for congratulation that Canadian interests have already taken a forward step in this direction and have to some considerable extent anticipated the findings of the conference. I have reference to the two new Empresses recently placed on the Pacific ocean between British Columbia and the Orient, by the Canadian Pacific railway; to two new steamships about ready for launching for the same company to be placed on the route between Vancouver and Seattle and to the new Alsatian, of the Allan line, whose maiden voyage was made from Liverpool to Halifax only a few days ago. All of these ships are, I am advised, in the matter of construction and water-tight compartments, superior to anything that has yet been accomplished in any country.

Before passing from this phase of the convention, I think it well to direct the

attention of the House to the observations of Admiral Capps on the work of the committee on construction, of which he was chairman. He said:

> It is important to point out that even after the most careful attention to all practicable details of design which increase the safety of a vessel at sea, there still remains the possibility of a serious and even totally destructive accident. Therefore it is imperative that those charged with the management of vessels should never relax their vigilance on the supposition that any vessel is unsinkable. On the contrary, they should strive to add to the safety provided by the vessel itself, that very great increase in safety which results from prudent and skilful management and navigation.

I commend these words of Admiral Capps to the earnest consideration of all those in this country who have to do with the management and navigation of ships.

I now come to another very important feature of the convention—that relating to safety of navigation. It will be unnecessary to recall that the Titanic disaster was caused by collision with what must have been an enormous quantity of ice floating southward crossing the track usually followed by all steamships engaged in the North Atlantic trade. It is equally unnecessary that I should call attention to the extreme importance, from the point of view of safety, as well as from other considerations, of keeping trans-Atlantic steamships advised of the position from day to day of this floating ice. It will be observed that the convention makes provision for the supplying of information to all interested parties as to the location, extent and movement of ice along the North Atlantic steamship routes. The importance of this provision of the convention will be readily appreciated.

It is well known, however, that floating ice does not constitute the only menace to navigation in the North Atlantic. The floating derelict is one of the mariners greatest dreads and there is a general view held that many, if not all, of the disasters of which no information has ever become available have been caused by collision with floating derelicts. The convention provides for a patrol of the North and West Atlantic ocean to locate and destroy all floating derelicts, and there can be no doubt, but that this provision will command universal approval.

The question of ice observation has come to be regarded by many of the nations, more especially by Great Britain, as an important one. Here is a matter upon which Canada has just claims for congratulation. We may properly claim to be the pioneer in the work of ice observation. The members of this House will, I am sure, be familiar with the results achieved by Professor Barnes of McGill University with the assistance of my department in recent years. These results, embodied in the comprehensive reports by Professor Barnes submitted to this House by my department in recent years, have awakened in other nations a growing interest in this subject to such an extent that the convention provides for an International service to continue the work of ice observation.

Towards the maintenance of these three services of ice patrol, ice observation and destruction of derelicts, 13 of the Signatory States have agreed to contribute as follows:

	Per cent.
Austria-Hungary	2
Belgium	4
Canada	2
Denmark	2
France	15
Germany	15
Great Britain	30
Italy	4
Netherlands	4
Norway	3
Russia	2
Sweden	2
United States of America	15

The estimated cost of these services, which will require the exclusive time of two properly built and equipped ships, will be between two hundred thousand and three hundred thousand dollars a year, and, bearing in mind the interest that Canada has in the greater safety of the North Atlantic routes, I venture to hope that the amount that we are called upon to contribute for maintenance will not be considered unreasonable and will be cheerfully approved.

I desire to refer to the fact that the convention does not come into effect until July 1, 1915, and that in the intervening period two ice seasons are to be provided for. I have regarded it as of the utmost importance that, pending the coming into effect of the convention, effective provision should be made for ice patrol and for derelict destruction and on my recommendation the British Government has been advised that Canada would be prepared forthwith to contribute its share for the maintenance of the service. The British Government is at present negotiating with the other interested nations with a view to secure their assent to start these services this season, rather than wait until the coming into effect of the convention. Whilst I

am not prepared to make a definite statement, I am not without hope that an announcement will be made at an early date to the effect that the service will be established at once.

Of scarcely less importance is that portion of the convention that deals with the question of wireless telegraphy. Here again it was found that Canada occupies a foremost position among the nations and it will be noted with pleasure, I am sure, that the terms of the convention follow, in the main, the principles laid down in the Act passed by this Parliament two sessions ago. The principal provision is that all ships of the contracting states when engaged upon international voyages, and having on board fifty persons or more must be equipped with wireless telegraphy apparatus. The provisions of the Radio-telegraphic Convention of 1912 respecting classification of ships that require to be equipped with wireless apparatus are adopted in the present convention. Generally speaking, this classification places the fast passenger steamships in the first category. Other steamships intended to carry twenty-five passengers or more, are placed in the second category, and all other vessels required to be equipped in a third category. The convention provides for continuous watches on all vessels as soon as the Government of the state to which the vessel belongs is satisfied that such watch will be useful for the purpose of saving life at sea. After the period provided for in the convention, the following vessels will be required to keep a continuous watch:

1. Vessels of more than 13 knots carrying 200 or more passengers and which make voyages of more than 500 miles between two consecutive ports;

2. Vessels in the second category during the time they are more than 500 miles from land;

3. Other vessels that are required to be fitted with wireless apparatus which are engaged in the transatlantic trade or whose voyages take them more than 1,000 miles from land.

It is provided that the wireless installation must have a range of at least 100 miles. An emergency apparatus, placed in a position of the greatest safety possible, must also be provided unless the main installation is placed in the highest part of the ship. Another important feature of the convention lays down that the master of any ship in distress shall have the right to call to his assistance from amongst the vessels which have answered his appeal for help, the vessel which he thinks can best render assistance.

The question of the mutual recognition of certificates of inspection is one that has for long engaged the attention of some of the nations. Several of them have been able to conclude arrangements whereby the certificate issued by one, would be recognized as valid by the other. In the past, it frequently happened that the ships of one nation were subjected to harrassing delays in the ports of another state, in order to have an inspection made by the latter. These delays, etc., in addition to being harrassing and vexatious, at times resulted in loss of time and consequently additional expense to shipping, without corresponding advantages. It is satisfactory to note that the convention provides a standard of inspection by which, when adhered to by the ships of any of the contracting states, the certificate to that effect shall be accepted by all the other states as of equal value to their own.

Except where otherwise provided by the convention, the merchant ships of each of the states of the high contracting parties which are mechanically propelled, which carry more than twelve passengers and which proceed from a port of one of the said states to a port situated outside that state, or inversely, are subject to the rules laid down in the present convention. Ports situated in the colonies, possessions or protectorates of the high contracting parties are considered to be ports outside the states of the high contracting parties.

Persons who are on board by reason of force majeure or in consequence of the obligation laid upon the master to carry shipwrecked or other persons, are not deemed to be passengers.

In addition to those ships to which the convention immediately applies, there are in each of the countries affected a large number of ships engaged in the coasting and inland trade, and while the convention proper does not apply to them, there need be no doubt but that the provisions laid down by the conference will guide each nation in dealing with those of its ships not subject to the convention.

The convention proper consists of seventy-four articles, to which there are appended regulations to the number of fifty-one. The summary I have endeavoured to place before the House is necessarily inadequate, but I have deemed it advisable to call attention to its more important and outstanding aspects.

I am afraid it is too much to hope that the work of the conference, as embodied in the terms of the convention, will meet the approval of all. There may be disappointments and criticisms. Some may say that the convention does not go far enough, and others that it goes too far. It is not always easy or even possible to attain results that will command the un-

qualified approval of all. Those who have been in close touch with matters of this kind will readily appreciate that international agreements respecting merchant shipping are beset with difficulties. It was only by the earnest desire of the representatives of all the nations, to place the safety of life at sea on the highest possible plane, that all these difficulties were overcome and unanimous conclusions arrived at. I venture to think that no previous international conference has more widely attracted the attention of the nations. It is well known that Their Majesties, the King and Queen, have taken a personal interest in the work of the conference, and their loyal subjects throughout the empire owe them dutiful thanks. It is also well known that His Majesty the German Emperor and the President of the United States took a keen personal interest in the outcome, and all who are interested in the safety of life at sea will be grateful to them for it.

The London Times, referring to the conference after the convention was concluded, said:

> Its members are to be congratulated alike upon the spirit that has animated them, and upon the effective skill and good sense with which their efforts have been directed to a fruitful end. The nations have never before brought into the common stock, their accumulated knowledge and experience with a view to establishing general standards of safety and enforcing them by international co-operation. The deliberations of the delegates have produced, not a mere report embodying pious opinions and recommendations, but a complete and definite convention applying to ocean-going passenger ships, which it is proposed that the maritime nations of the world shall adopt and enforce as it stands. When this has been done, as there is every hope it will be, a great step will have been taken towards reducing the risks of ocean travel to a minimum.

The Chronicle of the same date observed:

> The success of the International Conference on Saving Life at Sea marks quite an epoch, not only for merchant shipping but for internationalism. Its report, signed yesterday by the plenipotentiaries of twelve sovereign states and three British dominions (which were separately represented) brings, practically, the nations of the world up to a common level in regard to life-saving. The list of signatories does not include one or two powers (we notice Russia and Japan) whose flag flies on ocean-going steamers; but it represents nevertheless so immense a proportion of the world's mercantile marine that we do not believe that they will find it pay to make their ships invidious exceptions. Universality of this kind is too often secured by acquiescence in low standards; the triumph of the conference is that its standard is really a valuable one, and constitutes a conspicuous improvement.

[Mr. Hazen.]

I submit this convention to the House in the full hope and confidence that in the years to come it will go far to prevent a repetition of the sad and all too numerous calamities that we have known in recent years, and in submitting it, Mr. Speaker, I feel I cannot do better than to adopt the language of Lord Mersey, who, in proposing its adoption by the conference, said:

> Our work will no doubt be criticised. So far as the criticism originates with interested parties, we can afford to ignore it; and so far as it originates with disinterested parties, our answer must be that we have done our best, that we have done it with anxious care, and as we believe, in the true interests of those who travel by sea. You have been engaged in perfecting a great work which, I am firmly convinced, will be of lasting benefit to mankind. Much more than this, however, you have perhaps unconsciously, but nevertheless most surely, by the spirit of courtesy and conciliation which has been displayed throughout your deliberations, contributed greatly to the increase of mutual respect and confidence among the nations and thereby to the peace and happiness of the world at large.

I might add that Canada was represented at the conference by the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, assisted by the advice of two technical officers of the department, Mr. Duguid and Mr. McDonnell. It was agreed that this convention should be submitted, on the 16th day of February, to the Parliaments and Legislatures of the different states and nations who were parties to the convention, and it is for that reason I now have the pleasure of laying the convention on the table of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The conference which sat in London last summer certainly attracted the attention of the world, and I believe the encomiums which have been passed upon its work by my hon. friend are well deserved. The regulations, so far as one could follow them in the synopsis given to the House by my hon. friend, seem to be very well considered and, whether they are adopted or not, one thing is certain: it will work for the solidarity of the nations who are parties to the convention. I would like, however, to have more information than my hon. friend has given us; or, if he has given it, I have failed to observe it.

I would like to know whether the regulations have been adopted by the twelve nations there represented as a binding treaty or whether they are simply regulations submitted to the nations for voluntary observance. If it is the intention that these rules are not to be made bind-

ing in the form of a treaty is it to be assumed that they should be enforced, as far as they can be enforced, by legislation? I observe that my hon. friend stated that in one respect he has taken action, and a very proper action, for controlling the North Atlantic ocean with a view to guarding navigation against derelicts and other difficulties. So far so good; this requires no legislation at all, but an appropriation which, I am sure, Parliament will be ready and anxious to vote. But I would like to know in what form the matter now stands. Are these simply regulations laid down for the voluntary observance of the different nations, or is it intended that they shall be made binding upon all by law?

Mr. HAZEN: I think the intention is that the regulations shall be binding on the different nations and countries which are parties to the convention. As to whether any legislative action on the part of this House is necessary, that matter is being considered now between my department and the Department of Justice and I hope to be able to give my right hon. friend a positive answer to-morrow or next day.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. M. J. DEMERS moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 69, to amend the Railway Act. He said:

Mr. Speaker, the object of the Bill I am submitting to the consideration of the House is to further extend the provision of a Bill introduced by me last week, in connection with section 298 of the Railway Act. This Bill, moreover, embodies some special provisions in respect to the prescription of actions arising out of the application of section 298; and lastly, it provides for cases where insurance has been secured on property destroyed by fire through sparks emitted from the smoke-stacks of railway locomotives.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TRUST COMPANIES.

Hon. G. H. PERLEY (for Hon. W. T. White) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 70, respecting Trust Companies. He said:

The intention of this Bill is to do for trust companies what has already been done by legislation for banks and insurance companies. Some trust companies have been incorporated by letters patent, but of late years they have nearly all come to Parliament for a special Act and they have asked for different powers. The question has been discussed in each case before the Banking and Commerce Committee, and the consequence is that no two of these acts of incorporation are exactly alike. The object is to secure uniformity in all trust company legislation in order that when they come to the Parliament of Canada for incorporation, they may be incorporated under a short model Bill which will give them all the powers which are intended to be granted under this Act. The Bill follows very much the model Bill which has been in use by the Banking and Commerce Committee during the last year or two. The Bill will be thoroughly explained by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance himself on the second reading. There are provisions for a compulsory audit of trust companies and also for complete returns to be made each year to the Minister of Finance.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 71, to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting Fisheries and Fishing. He said:

The Bill which I have just introduced, does not contain any very important or drastic changes in the fisheries laws as they exist at the present time. The Fisheries Act has been amended from time to time, and as under section 54 thereof, the Governor General has the power to make regulations which may extend, vary or alter the provisions of the Act in certain respects, many of its provisions are now not effective. The Act is, therefore, in its present form, not very intelligible, and urgently needs consolidation. It has never been revised since it was first enacted in 1867, and several of its clauses, in the light of experience gained, should be somewhat changed.

The Act is considerably shortened by the leaving out of the sections which provided close times for fish, and meshes of nets to be used, all of which have ceased long ago to be law, as they have been superseded by regulations by Order in Council. The following are the only amendments of importance. In section 2 of the Bill, the only change is that the word 'fishery' is defined. It was not defined in the old law and experience has shown this to be necessary.

Subsection 3 of section 5 is new. It gives the minister the authority to appoint, without going to Council, fishery guardians, from time to time as their services are needed. Such has been done for many years past, though under the Act it has not been legal. As a matter of fact, for some years, these guardians have been appointed in a way that is not in accordance with the law. Last year, on that fact being called to my attention, an Order in Council was procured, appointing all the fishery guardians which number over seven hundred.

The next change is section 26 of the Bill, which provides that the manager or proprietor of a lobster cannery shall, on demand, produce his license 'to any person designated by the minister,' as well as to a fishery officer. There are times when officials of the department go down to visit these canneries, and as they are not technically constituted fishery officers they have no right to demand of the manager or proprietor of the lobster cannery the production of his license. This is to cover instances where officers are sent out from headquarters.

Section 29 is probably the most important amendment. It replaces section 44 of the existing Act, which deals with the possession of fish. As the law now stands, before the department can secure a conviction, it is necessary for it to establish as a preliminary fact, that the fish were caught at a time, or in a manner, prohibited by law, thus rendering it necessary for the department to adduce the evidence of some person who has actually seen the fish being caught illegally, before the person possessing the fish can be called upon to show lawful excuse for their possession. If during the close season for lobsters a fisherman comes ashore with a boatload of lobsters, unless we can produce the evidence of some one who saw him illegally taking the lobsters, we cannot proceed against him.

The new section makes possession during the close season in itself an offence, unless the possessor can show lawful excuse for having such fish in his possession during the close season. This is a condition of different game laws, and it is absolutely necessary to enable us to control difficulties, etc., arising, particularly in the lobster fishery.

In section 31, the only important change is that provision is made for making a canal around a dam through which fish may pass, in place of building a fishway through the dam. The former course is frequently found the best, depending on local conditions.

Subsection 6 of section 31 is amended by giving the minister power to remove old dams or obstructions to the ascent of fish without being liable to trespass. It sometimes happens that a dam is deserted, but is not opened, and it is difficult to find the possessor, as he may not want to go to any expense in connection with it, or he may be out of the country, but if we remove the dam under the Act as it at present stands, we would be liable for damages.

Section 35 enables the minister to grant authority for the erection of barriers not only for the retaining of fish for fish breeding purposes, but for commercial purposes. There are a number of carp ponds in Ontario now. The carp are held by grating, and are fed corn, etc., but under the Act it is illegal, though it is a most desirable practice.

Section 37 is the same as subsection 7 of section 47 of the existing Act, except that it leaves out the words 'other than salmon.' Under the present clause it is illegal to catch salmon by means of pound-nets or trap-nets, though the nets used all around New Brunswick have for years been really pounds.

Section 45 is the same as section 54 of the present Act, with the exception that clause (g) is added, which enables the Governor in Council to make regulations prohibiting the sale or export of fish. We have such regulations now in Ontario and British Columbia, but they are really ultra vires.

Section 47 is amended by authorizing a fishery officer or justice of the peace to break open and search any house, etc., in which he has good reason to believe there is illegal fish. At present it is necessary for the officer to go and procure a warrant. While he would be doing so, all traces of illegality would be removed. Indeed, the officers have on different occasions broken into sheds, etc., acting on the assumption that they had the authority to do so.

Section 48 is new. Officers sometimes find masked men and others fishing or preparing to fish. The identity of these men being unknown, they have at present no authority to arrest them. Hence they escape.

Section 50 is new. It is necessary by the fact that fishery officers are sometimes interfered with in the discharge of their duties, and no remedy is provided under the existing Act.

Section 88 is amended by providing that

a conviction shall not be quashed by certiorari. It frequently happens that on account of want of legal knowledge errors are made in convictions which would enable them to be set aside by certiorari.

Section 91 is amended by making it lawful for any person who thinks himself aggrieved by a conviction or order or dismissal, either the prosecutor or complainant, as well as the defendant, to appeal under the provision of part 15 of the Criminal Code. Under the present section the only appeal is to the minister.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. BORDEN: My hon. friend from Kings, Prince Edward Island (Mr. J. J. Hughes) on Thursday last asked me for authority as to certain observations of his to which I had alluded when introducing the Bill respecting representation in the House of Commons. I could not find the reference at first, because it does not seem to have been indexed; but I think my hon. friend will find the remarks in Volume 5 of 'Hansard' of 1903, at page 10909:

PRIVATE BILLS.

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

Futher consideration in Committee of Bill No. 12, respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas. Mr. Blain in the Chair.

On section 2—time for construction extended:

Mr. NESBITT: What is the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: Section 2 as amended reads as follows:

The company may within one year after the passing of this Act commence to construct any of the lines of railway authorized by section 1 of this Act, and may within three years after the passing of this Act, complete any of the said lines of railway, and if within the said periods respectively any such line is not commenced or is not so completed and put in operation the powers of construction conferred upon the company by Parliament shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of that line of railway as then remains uncompleted.

Mr. EMMERSON: Does that change the time limit?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON: To what extent?

The CHAIRMAN: From two years to one year, and from five years to three years.

Mr. EMMERSON: That seems to be making fish of one and flesh of another. I was in the Railway Committee at its last meeting, and while reference was made to changes having been made in certain previous Bills, the time in new charters was still fixed at two and five years. While the Railway Committee is not obliged to adopt any one particular rule, and generally decides each case on its merits, it seems to me that it should be governed by precedent, just as this House is.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Railway Committee came to a different conclusion.

Mr. COCHRANE: Not on this Bill.

Mr. EMMERSON: Whatever decision was arrived at on this Bill, it was reversed by the act of the Railway Committee at its last meeting. I do not know even the name of the Bill and I know nothing whatever about the parties connected with it, but I think it is simple justice that this company should receive the same treatment as was accorded to the company whose Bill was considered and decided upon at the last meeting of the Railway Committee. I beg to move that section 2 stand as it is in the Bill without the amendment.

Mr. COCHRANE: This Bill passed the Railway Committee in its present form. Afterwards a vote was taken on certain Bills; and, as my hon. friend says, the time was changed back to two and five years, but not in this Bill.

Mr. McCRANEY: The minister has favoured us with a statement as to what took place in the Railway Com-
4 p.m. mittee. Will he give his views as to the advisability of reducing the time for commencing to construct from two years to one year, as in this Bill, because we are certainly making precedents at present?

Mr. COCHRANE: What led me to make these changes was the number of petitions, letters and deputations which came from the West, where the people are suffering from lack of railway facilities. On charters that are renewed several times, I do not think it is any hardship to cut down the time for the commencement of the road to one year. A new charter is a different matter. If any of the hon. members were to receive the same petitions, letters and complaints that I receive from year to year, they would try to do some-

thing to hurry along the building of branch lines throughout the West.

Mr. NESBITT: Will the change hurry the building of the road?

Mr. COCHRANE: I think it will.

Mr. NESBITT: I am sorry to say I cannot agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. EMMERSON: I remember one occasion when the committee reduced the time in the first instance, I think from three years to two. The change did not have the slightest effect. I care nothing about the matter one way or the other, except that I think we shall accomplish no good; that we shall in no way expedite the construction of the railway as it is intended to be constructed, and the only practical result will be that these companies will come to Parliament for renewals year after year.

Mr. NESBITT: Better for the lawyers.

Mr. EMMERSON: It will be better for the lawyers, for the parliamentary agents at Ottawa. I have no objection to that. If in one Bill we insist on limiting the time for commencement to one year, we should do it in every Bill. If there were some way of penalizing companies that come here year after year or every two or three years, that might be a spur to induce them to go on with the construction of the road. These railway companies can build only so many miles yearly. They make their arrangements with that end in view; and in the case of special branch lines, if you were to limit the time for commencement of construction to six months, it would make no difference; you would not expedite the construction of the road. The companies will commence construction just when they have the means and when conditions will permit, and not one hour sooner. We are having the form without the substance by having this amendment inserted in the Bill; it is a hollow mockery, and will prove so to be. I feel that we should not change now, but if we do Parliament should insist that in every Bill of that nature the company should be restricted, with regard to the commencement of the construction of the road, to a period of one year.

Mr. MACDONALD: Have subsidies been paid for the construction of any of the branch lines mentioned in this Bill?

Mr. COCHRANE: Not in connection with this one, I think.

[Mr. Cochrane.]

Mr. BORDEN: How long has this company been renewing its charter?

Mr. COCHRANE: It was first granted in 1890.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The circumstances in connection with this matter are very simple. Application is made to Parliament for an amendment of the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Act permitting the company to construct branch lines west of the main line of the Calgary and Edmonton railway into the coal and oil districts. The lines in question are very short, and the committee, by a vote of 22 to 10, concluded that it was not unreasonable that this work should be commenced within a year and completed within three years, if the intentions of the company were at all serious. Parliament has the power to supervise these Acts; either it is going to do it, or it is not going to do it. If the views just urged by the hon. member for Westmorland be correct, then this Parliament is not exercising supervision over railway charters. A line a thousand miles in length would receive just the same attention as a line ten miles in length, which is absurd. The next Bill that was considered by the committee dealt with a line some 750 miles in length, and the committee, in the exercise of its discretion, gave that company five years within which to complete its undertaking, and two years within which to commence it. The General Railway Act makes provisions in that regard, and the General Railway Act was followed. In connection with the renewal of charters, what the hon. Minister of Railways has just stated was the attitude taken by a number of the members of the committee. Unfortunately, it was not the view which latterly commended itself to the committee, the evidence being that subsequently a majority of reactionaries were present. Every special friend of the corporations, every foe of common rights, and every solicitor of railway companies in the House, was there, and they were all voting against this provision. There was not a solicitor for the Grand Trunk Pacific railway who was not there and voting against the interests of the common people, so far as I could see.

Mr. CARVELL: Farmer members.

Mr. BENNETT: Farmer members like myself, believing that the powers of the committee had been given to them for the purpose of exercising them, desired that there should be a limitation placed upon the extension of these charters. I do not

pretend to have any special knowledge in this matter, but I do say this: that in western Canada there is a very widespread idea that the time is coming when Parliament should limit the time within which extensions of old lines should be commenced. There are upon the statute books now a very large number of enactments which have been renewed every two years for the purpose of making the people believe that railways are going to be built where they are not built. The first reason that induces me to try to limit the time of commencement to one year is to prevent the possibility of settlers going into a certain territory on the assumption that a railway is going to be built there, when in fact it is not. If you limit this time to one year, at least the people cannot be misled for two years, as formerly. I could cite to the committee many instances where settlers have gone year after year into these new districts, possibly 40, 50 or 60 miles away from a railway line, being compelled to haul their own grain, who have been led to believe that railways are about to be built there because a charter has been granted. In the United States the obtaining of a railway charter by putting up a certain sum of money usually means business; it means that the railway is going to be built, but that does not apply in this country at all. I therefore say that to limit the time to one year will do much towards preventing the settlers from going into these districts unless there are railway facilities. The hon. member for Westmorland says that by limiting the time of commencement to one year you are going to bring these people to Parliament once every year instead of once every two years. If I read aright the history of legislation in the United States in connection with trusts, monopolies, transportation and public service corporations, the one thing that will bring about a cure of many evils is publicity. No railway company is going to continue to come here year after year and to invite the hostile criticism of the committee to the extension of a charter upon which the moss has grown, unless the company really means to do something. I therefore think that the criticism and the publicity they would receive will have some effect in inducing them to mean business when they come again to this Parliament. I merely ask this question: why should we grant charters to railway companies year after year if we have no reliable evidence that they intend to do that for which they were created? Any gentleman who has lived in western Canada will agree with me that the West is covered with railway charters, and the time has come to weed them out and to try and insure that charters granted shall be granted for some purpose. If the period of renewal is limited to one year, we may get from the companies some evidence of their willingness to do something where transportation facilities are so greatly in demand.

So far as uniformity in legislation is concerned, I think it would be idle to extend the same sort of treatment to a road a thousand miles long as would be extended to a road ten miles long. This committee should exercise its judgment upon the facts of each individual case. Certainly in the Bill in which the periods were extended to two years and five, there can be no possible complaint of lack of uniformity, because it is the same company that controls both charters, and if they obtain more favourable consideration from the committee with respect to branch lines three or four hundred miles in length than they obtain with respect to lines 25, 30 or 40 miles in length, so much the better for them. But surely it cannot be said that Parliament should hamper itself in dealing with the first case upon its merits because the committee saw fit on another occasion, where the length of the line in question was more than four times as great, to reverse its position. I hope the Railway Committee will exercise its discretion in each case, regardless of any fixed rule. To lay down the rule suggested by the hon. member for Westmorland—that of naming two years and five as the periods of time, regardless of the length of the line—would be to make a hollow mockery of the proceedings before the committee.

Mr. MACDONALD: Would my hon. friend, who comes from the West, relate the circumstances in connection with this Bill which warrant his taking this position?

Mr. BENNETT: Had the hon. gentleman been present at the meetings of the committee, he would have heard the statements made there; but it was only when he was called in suddenly on the second day as the friend of the corporations—

Mr. MACDONALD: That assertion is entirely untrue, and I ask my hon. friend to withdraw it.

Mr. BENNETT: There has never been a corporation in need of a friend which lacked the support of the hon. member for Pictou.

Mr. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman has made a statement reflecting on myself which I say is untrue, and which I ask him to withdraw.

Mr. BENNETT: I have never observed, in any committee I have attended, any lack of support on the part of the hon. member for Pictou of any corporation in need of support, and I am bound to say I cannot withdraw what I have said, because it is a statement of fact.

Mr. MACDONALD: Order.

Mr. BENNETT: I cannot withdraw it, it is a statement of fact.

Mr. MACDONALD: The statement of my hon. friend was this: that I was not present at the first meeting of the committee, and that if I had not waited to be called upon to vote on the second day, I would have had the information I asked for. I have said that the statement made by him that I was called on the second day to vote is absolutely untrue, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say that the hon. gentleman had been called to vote; I did not know that. I assume that is not true.

Mr. MACDONALD: What do you know?

Mr. BENNETT: I only know that the distress signal was flown to the friends of the corporations to be gathered together on the second day; that is all I know.

Mr. MACDONALD: I ask my hon. friend to withdraw that statement.

Mr. BENNETT: We all know that, and the special circumstances which the hon. gentleman from Pictou asked for are these.

Mr. MACDONALD: I ask my hon. friend to withdraw the imputation which he made upon me, that I was called to attend the second meeting of this committee on account of some special interest in the Bill. I said that statement is untrue.

The CHAIRMAN: My hon. friend from Calgary will correct that.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the statement?

Mr. MACDONALD: Do you not know what you said yourself?

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. BENNETT: I do.

Mr. MACDONALD: You had better take it back.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not make any statement that the hon. gentleman was called to vote. I said that the friends of corporations belonging to that committee, owing to the fact that the amendment to the previous Bill had been carried by 22 to 10, had been gathered together. That was a patent fact that he who looked might know, and the other gentlemen of the committee saw it as well.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is not the statement at all.

Mr. BENNETT: I have no objection to my hon. friend being a friend of corporations at all, not the remotest if that is—

Mr. NESBITT: Withdraw it like a man.

Mr. BENNETT: I have nothing to withdraw. The statement I have made is the fact, and the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) is an exemplification of it.

Mr. NESBITT: As far as I am concerned, that insinuation makes no difference, because everybody that knows me knows that it is an absolute falsehood.

Mr. MACDONALD: I insist on this hon. gentleman, whose lifelong record has been that of being a creature of the corporations, coming into this House and insulting men who are here as independent men, and I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to make him withdraw the imputation which he made.

Mr. BENNETT: I made no imputation.

Mr. BORDEN: I think the hon. gentleman for Calgary has already explained that he did not intend to make any such statement as the hon. member understood.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The hon. member for Calgary cannot deny that he stated that if my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) had not waited until he was called the second day, he would have known the reason why this Bill was amended as it was. Everybody heard that statement. That statement is challenged, and it is for my hon. friend from Calgary now to withdraw that statement.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not catch the last observation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I heard my hon. friend from Calgary say that if the hon. member for Pictou had not waited

until he was called the second day, then he would have known what was the reason why this Bill was, I think, amended.

Mr. BENNETT: I certainly made an observation of that character, but not the observation that the hon. member for Pictou complains of, that he had been called to vote. I made no observation of that character.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is what you meant.

Mr. BENNETT: I said he had been called to that committee, that there was a vote of 22 to 10 on the one day and a vote of 12 to 15 the other way on the other day. These are the facts.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is what I want you to withdraw.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. and learned friend has no more right to say one is a creature of corporations, as he has done—

Mr. MACDONALD: I ask my hon. friend to withdraw that statement without proceeding to make any further remarks on the subject.

Mr. BENNETT: If the hon. member for Pictou regards the statement that he and others came there to see that similar legislation was not enacted on the second day, as was done on the first, well and good: I withdraw that statement. But I do say that the facts speak for themselves, and they are the records of the committee, and, as I have already said, every solicitor of railway corporations and every friend of railway corporations was there to see that the vote was as it was.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The record will speak for itself.

Mr. EMMERSON: My motion is that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again on this Bill. I think that an explanation is due, owing to the remarks of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett). It happens that, with respect to the Bill considered at the last meeting of the committee, I was present and opposed the motion to have it limited to one year. I do not think that, after a record of some fifteen years in the committee and in this Parliament, it will be charged against me that I have been the friend, in any way, either of the railway corporations or of any corporations. The opposition came from me. I did not even know the Bill, I had never heard of it and did not know who was interested in or behind the Bill.

I opposed the Bill and made the motion I did on principle. I never sent out for anybody to come and support it, I never spoke to anybody and, as far as I know, no effort was made to have anybody come in and support the contention which I was putting forth before the committee. Those are the facts; and the vote on that occasion, the attitude which I took, was opposed by the hon. member for Calgary. It so happened that the majority of the committee concurred in the view held by me, and, although I am informed that on a previous occasion a different view was held, I was not there when the vote was taken at the previous meeting. It seems to me that the attitude taken by my hon. friend in imputing motives is not one that is to be commended in this House; much less is it to be commended in the committee. My motion is that the committee rise in order that an opportunity may be had to have the principle thoroughly discussed in the Railway Committee, because we have the acknowledgment that on one day one view was held and the very next day an entirely different view was held. Let that committee have an opportunity of determining the principle upon which it should act as it has always followed a certain principle. If it wants to reverse the policy, well and good; but it is right that the majority of the committee should decide what principle will be followed.

Mr. NESBITT: In so far as the insinuation of the hon. member for Calgary against me is concerned, I treat that with the indifference with which it should be treated. I am responsible here only to my constituents, and I am perfectly willing to be responsible to them. It is for them to determine whether they think I am supporting the corporations or the ordinary people, and it is to their view I have to look and to that of nobody else. I care nothing about the views of the hon. member for Calgary, no more than I do for a June bug in the air.

In the committee I opposed changing the Bill because we have no means of forcing the railway to build either in one year or in two years. It has been our policy to renew these Bills for two years. I saw no reason why the policy should be changed. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) said that the farmers had settled forty or fifty miles from a railway and required it. There are many places

in Ontario where the farmers require railways and have been requiring them for a number of years. My experience indicates that the people in the West are inclined to go a long way off from the railway, and if we have to build a railway to every man's door, simply because he goes there and settles down, it will keep us very busy. We have no way of forcing the railways we charter to build. If the Government were building the railway, then they could say whether they would build in one year or in two years. The hon. member for Calgary says that if you make it only one year the people will only have one year in suspense. Taking it the opposite way, if our giving a charter for two years induces people to go in, I think giving a charter for one year would induce them all the more, because they would think we were in a greater hurry. I had no intention of opposing this Bill in the House Committee because it passed the Railway Committee and I had been defeated on the vote. I was perfectly willing to abide by that vote, because it made no earthly difference to me.

Mr. OLIVER: I think now is the proper time to discuss the Bill and to decide whether we are going to give an extension or not. When the Bill was up for consideration on Friday night, there was a very slim House, and in view of the statement that was made that the promoters of the Bill would withdraw it if the decision of the committee was adhered to, I expressed the opinion that instead of such a slim House undertaking to deal with the matter, it should be held over until to-day, when there would be a full House and the Bill could be dealt with on the responsibility of the whole House.

The CHAIRMAN: By Rule No. 112, the committee would not have the power to amend this Bill without giving one day's notice. I regard this as an important amendment, and no notice having been given I do not think we can discuss it.

Mr. OLIVER: Do I understand that the committee cannot deal with the Bill as it is reported ?

The CHAIRMAN: Not to-day.

Mr. OLIVER: If I may be permitted to express my views in regard to it, I would say, first of all, that I cannot understand what the purpose of the Railway Committee is unless it is to take cognizance of the special conditions surrounding each application that comes before it; and while it is perfectly right and proper that there should be a general rule, it is not the less right and proper that the committee should decide, on the evidence that is brought before it from time to time, as to whether there should be an exception to that rule. In my judgment, this is an application that should be under an exception to the rule. It is an application for the building of a very short line of railway—some 20 or 30 miles. It is in the hands of a company that is perfectly able to build the line, and so far as I can see, the purpose of the charter and the application for two years in which to build, is to enable this company to hold the ground until the expenditure made by other people in the development of oil bearing properties has shown whether there is value in the district or not. In my opinion, if the company wants to build to-day and take a chance on the successful development of these oil-bearing properties, by all means it should be allowed to do so; but, if it merely wants to hold the ground and to wait until other people's money has developed these properties, and then build if it likes, and not build if it does not like, I do not think that is our business here; and I say that we are more than justified in maintaining the decision of the committee to limit the period to one year. This is not an ordinary case of building a railway for the benefit of settlers. One of those branches, I understand, is especially with a view of development of an oil-bearing property in the vicinity, and I say that the people who are boring for oil are certainly entitled to every consideration at our hands. If we cannot give them a railroad within the present season, we should hold the ground open until somebody comes along who will build a railway within a reasonable time. If the company decides to withdraw the Bill, that is their privilege, and there is no objection to their doing so. But with the experience we have had throughout the West, we should not allow this or any other company to hold beyond a reasonable period, ground that they are not actually engaged in developing. Two years is a reasonable time in some cases, but in my humble judgment one year is a reasonable time in this case. And I am therefore in favour of the Bill as amended.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: The statement of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) that I was not present at the meeting of the committee when this Bill first came before it, is correct. At the second meeting I came in late and found

the Committee were discussing Bill No. 20, and I knew nothing whatever about the discussion the previous day. Discussion was proceeding on the point as to whether or not an absolute rule should be laid down by the committee that hereafter no extension should be granted to any railway company, except on the terms that they must begin operations within a period of one year and complete construction within a period of three years. I ventured then to take the ground, and I venture now to maintain it, that I do not think it is wise for the Railway Committee, or for this House, to lay down as an absolute rule, from which we should not depart in any particular case, that no extension should be granted except for that limited period. I pointed out that last year Parliament was called upon to grant assistance to one of the great railway corporations of this country. What an anomaly it would be to grant an extension to a company like that, and then to say to the same company when it comes along: 'Crippled financially as you may be, and in such a position that you have to come to Parliament for an extension of favours, we are going to tie you up absolutely, and will not allow you the right to begin operations except within a period of one year. You lose your corporate rights unless you make a beginning within that time.' I pointed out that to lay down any such rule as that would be an absurdity, and, from a legislative standpoint, ought not to have any recognition or sanction by this House. I further urged that if a particular case arose in which it could be shown to the satisfaction of the Railway Committee, or of this committee, or Parliament, that a company was unnecessarily delaying its operations in dealing with an important project for which it had the corporate rights, Parliament could then exercise its right of limiting the extension of its powers, or deal with that company in some other way so as to compel the immediate construction of the railway, if it should be constructed. And when I asked for information upon that point, we had the little difficulty which occurred a few moments ago. I obtained from the Minister of Railways the fact that this was not a railway of sufficient importance to warrant a Government subsidy, and I was proceeding to ask the minister the question as to what complaints he had received from the people living in this particular section of the country in regard to the delay that had taken place in the construction of this road. This proposition, being an Act respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, is an Act which relates to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as it now owns the former road. The committee below may have had information before them; I did not have the opportunity of appearing there, and therefore I cannot speak, but here in this committee I think one has a right to know as to whether or not the facts were such as would lead the members of this committee to regard this as an exceptional case—a case in which the time should be limited within which construction must begin. Has my hon. friend the Minister of Railways any documents, data or complaints from the people who are interested in the particular tract of country affected, which warrant him in saying that Parliament will be acting wisely in attaching this special limitation to this particular Bill? If he has, then I say the committee below and the committee here would be acting properly in dealing with it, but if he has no such information, and if the case is one which is to appear within the general category of Bills coming here without any special representations being made, then this committee should consider whether we are going to lay down what is going to be known as a general rule in future.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it would be difficult to lay down an absolute rule from which you could not depart. The Railway Act now provides that they must commence in two years and complete in five. Of course, the Railway Act is to be consolidated and we may have some change, but that does not mean at all that you cannot deviate from that in a special Act such as this is. I think it is incumbent upon those who wish a deviation to give the reason and prove their case as to why there should be a departure from the Railway Act. If that is done I think there is no trouble in having the wishes of those who are so anxious for railway construction carried out. I have wondered at the limiting of the time allowed a railway company to construct a railway. It may be an incentive and a help. But there is a difference in dealing with some large, strong company and dealing with some adventurer in railway construction. You cannot discuss the two situations from the same angle, or the same point of view. If it is only a comparatively short line and if the Canadian Pacific railway means business it can start building it this year as well as next year. If, on the other

hand, a company was being organized to build a railway in a new section of country and the company was not in a position to finance the enterprise and it required some time to look around, I can see a reason why it should be allowed a little longer time. Or, if it were a long line that was to be constructed it might be necessary that greater consideration should be given to the project. But if the committee, after full consideration, has decided that it is such a short line and the Canadian Pacific railway is such a strong company that it can build the line at once if it desires to do so, I see no reason why an exception should not be made in this case. What I wanted to point out was that the Railway Act says that the work must be done in two years and completed in five years but that any special provision can be made in reference to any special case.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I beg to correct the hon. gentleman in reference to the fifteen per cent provision; this is only a branch line and not a line to which the main provision of the Act would apply.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I only arrived in the Railway Committtee at the end of the time when this particular Bill was under discussion, and I heard so little of the discussion that I did not think it wise to vote. I have very strong views upon the wisdom or the course of procedure that is recommended in this amendment. I have asked in the Railway Committee what practical advantage will result from a departure from what has been the usual custom of the Railway Committee. I would like to urge that question here. We are all anxious for railroad building and no one more so than the railway companies themselves. It is their business to build railways. They succeed if they build them properly and well and they fail if they do not. We are all anxious for railway building; there is no difference of opinion in this House, or in Canada, on that subject. The question comes to be one of method and of precedent. I got no answer in the Railway Committee and since I have been listening to this debate I have heard no answer to the question as to what practical advantage will come from tying this particular line down to building in one year or not building. What practical advantage will come to anyone if this amendment carries?

It appears to me that the effect of carrying the amendment, in view of the attitude that is taken by this particular company, will be the prevention of railway building because the company are going to withdraw the Bill altogether. As far as this particular line goes there will be no very great disadvantage. We will stop railway building as far as that company is concerned unless any one in this committee can tell us that some other company will immediately come forward and apply for a charter and take up the building of this road. But, suppose the Bill is not withdrawn, suppose the company had not threatened to withdraw the Bill and we carry this amendment, what then, as a matter of practical experience, Mr. Chairman, happens? The railway comes back and it is a case of granting an extension for two years. This and every other railway company can come back again and again to the Railway Committee, and the reason is a very simple one. This is only one of a hundred cases that come before the Railway Committee of Parliament. Suppose we added a provision here to compel the railway to build this particular line within twelve months, what would be the result? We would help those who are interested in this particular branch, we would help those who are interested in speculation in oil fields and as any given railway can only get over so much ground in a given time, it follows that we would hurt somebody else. We would help this particular territory, and hurt the homesteaders who perhaps have been waiting much longer in another district for another railway, who have been waiting patiently and who cannot get a railway as the result of compulsion supposing we could apply compulsion. I have the utmost sympathy for the homesteaders who have gone into certain districts and I ought to have. I know their life. I have been living twelve years in Canada and I have never been nearer to a railway than fifteen miles. Yet, I recognize the obstacles that stand in the way of railway development. I hope I am big enough and broad enough, as a citizen of this big land, to recognize that while the homesteaders have their difficulties, the railway companies and capitalists have their difficulties too. I believe in fairness and justice to every class of the community. I, for one, have not heard anything here, or in the Railway Committee, to alter my attitude upon this subject and my attitude would be one of supporting what has been found in the years immediately behind us to have been, on the whole, the wisest course and the one which has been invariably followed, irrespective of party, by the Railway Committee.

Mr. BORDEN: As a matter of fact, this motion is not debatable. I did not raise any question about it because some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House desired to make some personal explanation. But it is really not debatable.

Amendment negatived; yeas, 17; nays, 59; and section agreed to.

On section 2—time for construction extended:

Mr. NEELY: That clause has the amendment as it came from the committee?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. NEELY: I am going to take this particular opportunity—

The CHAIRMAN: I have already declared the clause carried, but I do not wish to cut off discussion.

Mr. NEELY: You just called the clause, I understand, and I thought a moment would be given for its consideration. I was not in the committee when this Bill was under consideration, but I understand the amendment changes the wording from 'two years' in the first line to 'one year' and that 'five years' in the third line is changed to 'three years.' Is that the wording of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. NEELY: As I understand it, the branch lines to be authorized by this Bill, are, according to the side-note in the Bill, new lines. I want to tell this committee that if this clause 2 is to pass in its present form, some of us who have voted that the committee rise and report progress, are going to ask, not once but many times, at future sittings of the Railway Committee, that similar treatment be accorded other Bills which come before that committee. We are in this peculiar condition in the Railway Committee; that when we want the responsible minister to give us some idea as to what the policy of the Government, or his own policy is, with reference to the renewal of charters as to time extension, we never can get from that hon. gentleman a frank statement as to whether or not he has a policy in this regard. There may be some reason why special restrictions in the matter of time limits should be added to charters which have been held by companies for a great number of years. For example, at present the committee is considering an extension of time to the Manitoba and North Western, a charter for which has been held by the present company for at least twenty years. But, here is the case of a number of branch lines, which according to the Bill itself are new lines, now being authorized, and the Minister of Railways sits in his seat and listens to the discussion wthout giving this committee any shadow of a reason why he thinks special treatment should be meted out to this particular charter, as compared with any other charter for new lines of railway. Will the Minister of Railways tell us why he thinks that these new lines, which will be authorized by this Bill if it passes, should be restricted to one year and three years, when the other new lines hitherto authorized by Parliament have been given two years and five years respectively.

I am not speaking in the interests of any railroad company; I have not one bit of sentiment of any sort or description towards any railroad company; but I do object to the member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) coming before this committee and, for the sake of some local influence or benefit he may derive from the amendment which he proposes to this particular clause, undertaking to introduce a principle into railway legislation which has hitherto not been recognized by the Railway Committee or by this House, and which I feel sure in this case is an absolute injustice to those asking for the charter. It looks to me very much like a case of obtaining some cheap notoriety, and some very cheap notoriety at that, by somebody, if we are going to make a special case of this particular Bill, without there being given to the committee more definite reasons why these new lines of railway should be treated in a manner absolutely contrary to the practice that has prevailed for a number of years in this House and in the Railway Committee. I am not going to be posted by the member for Calgary, or by any other member of this House, as having voted to shorten the time, as having voted against the interests of the people who need railways in the West, because I have voted against the amendment placed in the original Bill by the Railway Committee at one of its sittings some days ago. I think it is only fair that we should have some statement from the Minister of Railways as to why he thinks special treatment ought to be meted out to this particular Bill.

I can tell the Minister of Railways that while this Bill belongs to a railroad company which does its own financing, there is another railroad company that gets

renewals of charters, and which does not finance its own lines on its own responsibility. I will instance the case of a railroad in my own constituency, or rather a railroad charter in my own constituency, part of which line has been built, and the great part of which has not been built, although the Dominion Government guaranteed the bonds of that railway and financed the road. Notwithstanding that this Government financed the road by guaranteeing the bonds, that railroad company can come here session after session and get all the renewals it likes and all the time conditions it wants to. I refer to the Thunder Hill extension of the Canadian Northern. In the summer of 1911 I had a definite statement from the President of the Canadian Northern that they proposed to proceed immediately with the construction of that road; in fact that they were letting a contract that year for the carrying out of the work. And yet, so far as I know, not a single tap of work has been done there from the summer of 1911 to the present time. The Minister of Railways—we know what he is charged with outside of the House; we know where people say his sympathies are—the Minister of Railways can sit complacently in the Railway Committee and he can allow these charters to be renewed, without any qualms of conscience apparently, and without placing any special restrictions upon them. But, to suit his friend the member for Calgary, apparently he can sit complacently by here just as well, and, with respect to this Bill chartering new lines, he can see violated every rule and every principle that for years past has governed railroad legislation in the Railway Committee and in this House, without giving the House any sufficient explanation for such complacency.

Mr. DOUGLAS: As this Bill stands in my name, I wish to tell the committee why I voted as I did. In the Railway Committee I was in favour of having the time for commencement reduced to one year. On consulting with the promoters afterwards, I was informed that if that clause went through this committee the company would withdraw the Bill and would not build the railway at all. In view of the fact that the settlers in that country are very anxious for railway facilities, I am in hopes that this committee will allow this Bill to stand until some more light is thrown on the subject and the policy of the department more clearly outlined than it is at present. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be allowed to stand.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

CENTRAL WESTERN CANADA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Further consideration in Committee of Bill No. 13, to incorporate the Central Western Canada Railway Company.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe. Mr. Blain in the Chair.

On section 3—capital stock:

Mr. NESBITT: Was not that changed?

The CHAIRMAN: The capital stock of the company shall be $7,000,000, instead of $5,000,000.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 10—telegraphs and
5 p.m. telephones:

Mr. BUCHANAN: In the Railway Committee, the matter was brought to the attention of the Minister of Railways and of the Chairman as to the powers given to this railway to operate a commercial telephone line. I am advised that in the past in Bills of this character, such powers have not been granted to railroads. In the province of Alberta we have a government-owned telephone system operating throughout the province, and operating in sections where there are no railroads. We are not anxious that any railroad or other company shall be given federal powers to operate a commercial telephone line. If the powers were limited simply to the use of the telephone service by the railroad on its own system for its own purposes, the matter would be different; but as I understand it, this company are asking for powers to operate a telephone system along their line of railroad and also to do a commercial business. In our provincial charters no powers of this character are granted. The Prime Minister of the province of Alberta informs me that in the past such powers have not been given to railroads. The explanation given in the committee the other day was not quite clear to me, and I would be glad if the minister would make a statement in regard to this clause.

Mr. COCHRANE: I received a letter from the Prime Minister, Mr. Sifton, on this very point, and I had the matter looked into. I find that every year powers are granted similar to those in this clause.

On section 8—railway authorized:

Mr. OLIVER: When this Bill was up in the Railway Committee on Friday, it was

pointed out, by mention of the principal points, that the route of the proposed railroad between Winnipeg and Edmonton, closely paralleled the Canadian Pacific railway, which also parallels the Grand Trunk railway and the Canadian Northern railway. The question was raised as to what the policy of the Government was in such a case. Some statement was made to the effect that the minister in committee had stated that, should the railway company undertake to build and come to him for approval of its plans, he would not approve of plans that would allow the line to pass within some certain distance of the lines already existing, except where it passed through important points. I am sure the committee would be glad if the minister would make a statement as to the policy of the Government with regard to that rather important matter.

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not think I made a statement in the committee, but the solicitor acting on behalf of this company made that statement, that the policy of the department in approving of locations was that, except at central points where the railways had to come in, they would have to keep twenty miles apart. I think I explained to the House a year ago that I had adopted a policy that on branch lines—of course this may be considered a trunk line—we would insist on their being twenty miles apart. If this is considered as a trunk line, then of course it would be dealt with in the same manner as the three great transcontinental roads, that is, it would have the right to the shortest route. If it is considered as a branch line, it would come under the branch line policy.

Mr. OLIVER: I merely want to know what the policy of the Government is. The hon. minister quotes what a solicitor of the railway company has said. What we are anxious to have is a statement of the Government treating this railway as a trunk line, which it is.

Mr. COCHRANE: If it is a trunk line, the company will get the same consideration as the others and will not be dealt with under our policy as to branch lines.

Mr. OLIVER: That is, they would be entitled to the shortest line between important points?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: In other words, they might parallel already existing lines?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: No doubt circumstances sometimes occur that render it right and proper that railway lines should parallel each other, but I think that the Government would be well advised to take into consideration the conditions of the western country before being committed to the declaration as my hon. friend has made it. There are three trunk lines already in existence between Winnipeg and Edmonton at varying distances from each other. At Saskatoon the three are within a distance of sixteen miles.

For a very large part of the distance two, and in some cases three of the lines are comparatively close together. The building of a fourth line along that route means a vast expenditure of capital, and such a line, in order to compete, would have to be built according to the very highest standard or it would not compete at all. It is a matter of very great doubt whether the Government is wise in committing itself to this policy, when we consider the vast areas in the prairie provinces that still remain absolutely without railway communication, where people are 70, 80 or 90 miles from a railroad. Capital must be found to give the railway accommodation that will benefit these settlers, and render possible the development of the country. Where there is such a great need for capital for railroad construction, in order that present settlers may be accommodated and the proper development of the country obtained, I say that the Government should be very cautious about sanctioning a project of unnecessary duplication. I am strongly in favour of railroad competition. As I have pointed out, throughout a great part of the distance between Winnipeg and Edmonton three railways are now in active competition. It seems to me that these ought to afford measurably sufficient accommodation for that section of the country, and that those sections which are suffering serious hardships because of the lack of railway communication, and where the country at large is subject to the direct loss resulting from the lack of development that would accrue from railroad construction, should be given consideration. It seems to me to be a doubtful policy on the part of the Government to sanction this fourth line simply as a competing line when competition already exists, and when there is so much need for railway communication in other directions.

Mr. NEELY: I suppose it is useless to try to get the minister to say anything further on this subject. This Bill was held over, I understand, for consideration in the presence of the minister, and in order that he might have an opportunity of giving his opinion on certain matters which have just been brought before the committee by the hon. member for Edmonton. The minister tells us that the solicitor for this company stated what the policy of the company would be. That is surely very useful information; the solicitor surely speaks with a great deal of authority. When he comes before the Railway Committee he may tell the members of the committee practically anything that comes into his head. He is not responsible for carrying the project out, and the company he represents are not bound by any assertions he may make. Here is a line that practically parallels the present line of the Canadian Pacific railway; that is, the Manitoba and North Western line, and its extension. If this company goes ahead and finances this proposition, and if they come down here to have their plans approved by the minister, will he sanction plans permitting the construction of a road paralleling, within half a mile or a mile, the Canadian Pacific railway, from Winnipeg right through to Edmonton, a distance of over 800 miles, when there is such an enormous demand for railroad communication and transportation facilities in many other portions of western Canada? That is what we want to know; I wish the minister would talk and tell us what his policy is. Never having visited Egypt, I have not had the privilege of looking at the Sphynx, which, it is said, although made of stone, looks very wise. The minister may have a splendid policy in his mind, but we would like to know whether his seeming wisdom is real, or whether it is of a character similar to that massive work of art which may be found in that ancient country known as Egypt. If the minister will state frankly whether he will or not permit the construction of this line paralleling the Canadian Pacific railway from Winnipeg to Edmonton, then we will know whether the country is to be served by this enormous expenditure of capital. We want competition, but not the kind of competition that spells ruin to the railways and no benefit to the people. We want competition that will mean transportation facilities for the people who have not the benefit of such facilities now. Does the minister propose to put that policy into effect, or does he not?

Mr. BRADBURY: I cannot help observing the change that has come over the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition during the last two or three years. It is only two or three years since hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House had a good deal more to do with the legislation that passes through the House than they have at the present time. I have listened for hours in the Railway Committee, and sometimes in the House, to some of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side against granting this charter. These gentlemen urged at that time free trade in charters—let everybody come along and get a charter. But a change has come over the attitude taken by hon. gentlemen in this respect—I do not know just why. The hon. member who has just taken his seat spoke about the need of competition. The gentlemen asking for this charter are not, I understand, one of the great corporations that already have a line right through to Edmonton, and if the charter were granted the hon. gentleman might naturally expect that there would be some competition. I cannot see any good reason why a Bill of this kind should not be passed by the committee, and why these men should not be given a chance to build this road if they want to. Four or five years ago the policy urged very strongly by hon. gentlemen opposite was that any man who asked for a charter should be given one. These people are not asking for a subsidy.

Mr. NEELY: We are not opposing this charter.

Mr. BRADBURY: I understood from the remarks of the hon. gentleman that he was opposing it. So far as paralleling the lines is concerned, I am not sure that hon. gentlemen opposite have always adhered very strictly to the doctrines which they now put forward. In connection with the construction of the Transcontinental, it was contended very strongly by hon. gentlemen now on this side of the House that the route on the Transcontinental west of Winnipeg was not going to serve the country in the manner which was intended when the charter was first brought before this House. It was intended to run farther north, but it was brought down south, going around the bottom of lake Manitoba, and, as every-

body knows, it parallels the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern railway. I believe that the gentlemen who are asking for this charter are asking for it in good faith. There is a large territory lying north of those lines not now served by any railway.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Let them go north.

Mr. BRADBURY: They could go north and may go north, but I cannot see any good reason for the opposition given to the Bill. I think the Bill should go through and that we should give these gentlemen an opportunity of constructing this road if they want to.

Mr. COCHRANE: I thought I had made myself clear to the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). I said that if this was a trunk line I should not interfere, that they would be entitled, like all trunk lines, to get the shortest and best line they could; but that if it was a branch line, I had laid down a policy in my department a year ago that I would not approve of lines within twenty miles of one another. I have heard that this is an extension of a line that is being built into the Peace river now and the promoters want to get an outlet. That I am not sure of, it is all hearsay. As to my not saying much, I often think if a lot of people said less they would get on better.

Mr. OLIVER: It makes very little difference whether or not this charter, or in fact almost any other charter, is granted if no subsidy or Government assistance goes with it. Free trade in charters is practically all right, although I do not see why there is a Railway Committee at all, or why the time of this House is taken up in discussing railway charters, if there is to be absolute free trade in them. However, it makes no difference whether charters such as this are granted by Parliament, the question is as to the granting of aid. It is not the approval of plans upon which we are so anxious to have the Government's policy.

Mr. COCHRANE: No subsidy is being asked for.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend knows perfectly well that this road will not be built without a Government subsidy or assistance of some kind.

Mr. COCHRANE: That will be time enough to discuss it.

Mr. OLIVER: I think we are entitled to know now what the policy of the Government is or will be in regard to a charter absolutely paralleling three other lines.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES: How far apart will the two lines be?

Mr. OLIVER: Touching Yorkton and Saskatoon the road, if it is at all a straight one, must necessarily parallel the Canadian Pacific railway within a very few miles in part of its course and in many places it must parallel the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Northern railway. It would not parallel the three within a few miles but throughout its course it must parallel two of them. I think it would be fair and right that the Government should declare here and now whether their policy is and will be to grant assistance to a new line built under such conditions. I ask this for the reasons I placed before the House a few minutes ago—the urgent requirements in many sections of the country which are at present without railroad communication. I think that makes it reasonable that we should ask for an announcement of the policy of the Government in regard to this road. I said that I knew a settlement 90 miles from the railroad. I was very far within the mark. I have in mind a settlement now of sixteen townships in which nearly every acre is under homestead or bounty warrant entries. It is 250 miles from the nearest possible railway point. That is at Grand Prairie, Peace river.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE: There are roads building in there at the present time.

Mr. OLIVER: There is a road being built in there, but it is being built at such a rate that it will be a number of years before it gets there and it is not being built on any aid or assistance from this Parliament, it is being built on provincial aid. There is not only this Grand Prairie settlement in the Peace river country but there are other settled sections of the Peace river that are from 230 to 350 miles from railroads. These people have gone in there expecting railroad communication. It is true that the provincial government is trying to meet the case, but it seems to me to be a duty which lies on the Dominion Government to meet the case rather than the provincial; and when demands are being made or are in prospect for aid for 800 miles of line that will absolutely parallel three other lines, we would like to know what the position of the Government is in regard to aiding such a line when aid is so

greatly needed for other lines in other sections of the country where there is not only no competition but no railroad communication at all.

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not think any fixed policy should be laid down as to what roads should get aid and what should not. The facts of the whole case should be put before the Government and before the House even, before we could lay down any rule. I endorse what the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) said on the other Bill, that applications of this kind should be treated on their merits as they come. From the case the hon. member makes out of the line building in there now, I think that is a road that should be aided. I believe in opening and developing the country, and I would say that if aid is being given to any road this seems one that should receive assistance. I do not know whether this road is going to be a trunk line or not. If it was up for approval of plans I would know something about it, I could ask questions; but the promoters are not here, and I do not want to prejudge their case.

On the preamble:

Mr. OLIVER: Does section 10 authorize the company to establish telephone lines and do a telephone business throughout the country at large, or can the company build only along the line of railway? There can be no objection to the company doing this latter.

Mr. COCHRANE: The clause has always been inserted. It is pretty clear:

The company may, subject to the provisions of the Railway Act, construct and operate telegraph and telephone lines upon its railway and establish offices for and undertake the transmission of messages for the public and collect tolls therefor, etc.

Mr. BORDEN: It seems to restrict the operation to the railway line.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it is pretty well covered by the first two lines, 'subject to the Railway Act.' I would just like to say a word in reference to free trade in charters. It might be that what we call free trade in charters was all right a few years ago, but is not all right now. We cannot lay down an absolute rule for all time. Where there are no transportation facilities, I have always maintained that any company applying for a charter should have it, but it is a little different where there are already several lines of railway. Too many lines of railway are almost as serious as not having enough. Where capital is locked up in three or four lines covering the same territory, I am not sure that competition is very keen. Either the railways must lose money, or their patrons are helping to pay dividends on three railways instead of on one. So long as the Board of Railway Commissioners has the right to control rates, that largely overcomes the objection to no competition, but there is this other point: in discussing the decision as to rates in the West, hon. members will have noticed in the press certain references to the effect that if rates were reduced beyond a certain point, some companies might be able to stand it, and other companies might not be able to stand it. You might give a charter to a weak company to build 700 to 800 miles of railway where already three lines are operating, and then the argument could be put up a little later on, you cannot reduce the freight rates because while the three large companies can stand it, the poor company cannot.

Mr. COCHRANE: Would you refuse them a charter?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know that I would. I would put them far enough apart. It is a difficult question to discuss, and it is hard to lay down a rule from which you cannot deviate. I see no reason why this company should not receive its charter if it is a sufficient distance away from the other line to get enough traffic to support it, but if it go very close to the other lines it is questionable whether it ought to be allowed to lock up that much more money. Instead of being a factor in reducing rates, it might be an argument for keeping rates up.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 63, respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Company.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 64, respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—Mr. Beattie.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

ORIENTALS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA COAL MINES.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

How many Orientals are actually employed under ground in the mines of the Canadian Collieries, British Columbia?

Mr. CROTHERS: No information later than May, 1913, when the number was reported at 432.

PICTOU PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Were any tenders called for the painting of the public building at Pictou, Nova Scotia?
2. If so, who were the tenderers, and the amount of each tender?
3. What was the total cost of the work?

Mr. ROGERS: Mr. John Brown was asked to quote a price to do the work, and he agreed to accept $650, which was paid. The clerk of works having certified that the price was fair and just.

EXPENDITURE AT SKINNER'S COVE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. How much money was spent by the Department of Public Works at Skinner's Cove, Pictou county, in the year 1913?
2. Who was the foreman of the work?

Mr. ROGERS: $620 paid to Skinner Brothers for right of way and damages; no expenditure made, during the year, on repairs.

PORT ARTHUR GOVERNMENT ELEVATOR.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Is the Government elevator at Port Arthur, Ontario, insured?
2. If so, in what amounts and companies, and in what proportions, as between fire and employers' liability?
3. Through whom was the said insurance placed, and what amount was paid for commission?
4. Did the Government try to place the said insurance through any of the insurance agencies at Port Arthur? If not, why not?

Mr. FOSTER:

1. No, though insurance against fire on grain stored therein and employers' liability insurance have been taken out.

2. Grain fire insurance has been taken out in the following companies and placed through the firms stated: The Sun Insurance, $150,000; Liverpool-Manitoba, $250,000; Hartford Fire Insurance, $80,000; Fidelity-Phœnix, $230,000; Atlas Insurance, $190,000; Western Assurance, $250,000; British America, $100,000; placed through Young & Lillie, Fort William, Ont. Royal Exchange Assurance, $100,000, placed through R. Lawson & Co., Winnipeg, Man. Home Assurance, $100,000; Norwich-Union Insurance, $100,000; placed through Ray, Street & Co., Port Arthur, Ont. Protector Underwriters, $50,000, placed through W. H. Laverty, Fort William, Ont.

The following employers' liability has been taken out: London Guarantee and Accident Company, placed through Port Arthur Insurance and Vessel Agency.

Maximum liability in case of any one person of $10,000 and the basis of the insurance is an estimated pay roll of $25,000 per annum.

3. Answered by No. 2; though with regard to commission the department has no information. That is a matter entirely between the insurance company and the agent who places the risk.

4. Distribution of insurance is shown in No. 2.

ST. ROMUALD POST OFFICE.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Has the Government been offered the sale of one or several immovables intended for the erection of a post office at St. Romuald, county of Levis?
2. If so, what are the names of the parties who have offered such immovables for sale?
3. In what division of St. Romuald are situated these immovables so offered, and what are the prices asked for them?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to erect a post office at St. Romuald?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. First by L. G. Gravel; second by G. A. Marois; third by Henri Legueux.

3. All on Main street near the centre of the town. First offered for $3,500; second for $4,500, north of the town hall; third for $11,500 with building erected thereon.

4. Under consideration.

AID TO AGRICULTURE.

*Mr. BOYER:

1. Is the Minister of Agriculture aware of certain statements which the newspaper Le Devoir mentions in its issue of the 5th of February, 1914, as having been made by the Hon. Mr. Caron, Minister of Agriculture in the Quebec Government at a sitting of that Legislature, and which is as follows:

'If the minister does not go too far, a great many of the dairy herds are affected with tuberculosis, and it is the same with half of the pork we eat. That is what Mr. Caron has stated twice. And he, Mr. Caron, has even added that it would not surprise him should the medical corps come to the conclusion that the cause of tuberculosis affecting human beings is mostly to be found there.

Mr. Caron holds the federal Government responsible for that because it refused to appropriate a part of the special grant intended for agricultural purposes to inspecting the herds. Ottawa told us, says the minister, that it was so important a matter that it would itself deal with it. That delighted me, further said Mr. Caron but Ottawa has done nothing so far'.

That most serious statement was uttered during a debate on the federal subsidy towards agriculture. The minister unceasingly complains that the conditions of the grant prevent him from following a definite programme; that

there is a discrimination between the way of dealing with the province of Quebec and the others, because it has not been, at first, consulted, and in the second place, because a guardian is imposed upon it to supervise the spending of the moneys in question. Is it because it is ruled by a Liberal Government or because its population is French-Canadian, asks Mr. Caron.

Mr. Caron protests anew against the way the province of Quebec is dealt with. It is an insult. Mr. Burrell is well meaning, but he cannot be so well informed as are the local people, and that may be the reason why he forbids us to do one year what he has allowed the preceding year. For instance, he forbade us this year to give any money towards the cultivation of clover, and we had, consequently, to stop, although it is a good policy.

2. Has the federal Minister of Agriculture sent to the other provincial Ministers of Agriculture a list mentioning special ways according to which the money had to be spent, as instruction is said to have been given to that effect to the provincial Minister of Agriculture of Quebec?

3. If so, at what dates have such instructions been forwarded to the provincial Ministers of Agriculture and what are the items and the amounts of money appropriated to each, any of those ministers was authorized to spend in the manner prescribed?

4. What total amount has each of the provinces received from that special grant voted by Parliament, and called 'Aid to Agriculture'?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. The minister's attention has been directed to the statements said to have been made by the Hon. Mr. Caron, although the minister has not seen any official report of such utterances. Assuming that the report of these statements is substantially correct, the minister desires to point out that the Agricultural Aid Act of 1912 authorized expenditure along all lines of agricultural work, whereas by the terms of the Agricultural Instruction Act of 1913 the authorization was limited to agricultural education work.

The expenditure of moneys for the inspection of cattle, for the purpose of eradicating bovine tuberculosis would not, in the minister's opinion, come within the meaning of the Act. The minister observes that, while the federal Department of Agriculture has administered the 'Animal Contagious Diseases Act', it has never undertaken to inspect all the herds of Canada for bovine tuberculosis and it is within the power of any province to deal with this disease in the herds of such province by inspection, destruction of infected animals, and compensation therefor. Action of this kind has been taken by the province of British Columbia and a similar line of action is open to every province, including the province of Quebec.

The minister further observes that in the programme of expenditure under the Agricultural Instruction Act all provinces have been dealt with on the same basis, the Quebec Government in common with the other provincial governments being fully consulted as to the lines of expenditure within the meaning of the Act, and Mr. Chapais, whose knowledge of French and long experience of agricultural conditions of Quebec specially fitted him for the office, was appointed under section 6 of the Act, to assist in the work of carrying out its provisions.

2. The federal Minister of Agriculture did not send to provincial Ministers of Agriculture a list containing special ways according to which the moneys had to be spent, but on the 2nd June, 1913, Dr. C. C. James, Commissioner of Agriculture, wrote to all the provincial Ministers of Agriculture mentioning general lines on which they might frame their proposals for expenditure under the provisions of the Act. On the 19th June, 1913, the Hon. Mr. Caron answered as follows:

Hon. Mr. Burrell,
Minister of Agriculture,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir: In a lettre dated the 2nd June, instant, Mr. C. C. James wrote to me that you would be prepared within a few days to consider my proposals as to the lines of expenditure of the grant promised to the province of Quebec in virtue of the Agricultural Bill. Would you be kind enough to tell me when and where I could meet with respect to my proposals as to the above grant?

Yours very truly,
J. E. Caron,
Minister of Agriculture.

3. Proposed details of expenditure were submitted by all provinces. By several of the provinces certain items were included which were considered not to come within the meaning of the Act. Correspondence and interviews with provincial representatives followed, and, as a result, the agreements were duly entered into, all provinces being treated alike. The items embodied in the respective agreements and mutually agreed on by the respective parties are as follows:

(Statements filed with the Clerk of the House.)

4. Total amount received by each province:

Ontario	$175,733 32
Quebec	139,482 40
Nova Scotia	34,288 45
New Brunswick	24,509 93
Prince Edward Island	6,529 85
British Columbia	27,334 76
Manitoba	31,730 05

Saskatchewan..	$34,296 29
Alberta..	26,094 95
	$500,000

THE DREDGE CANADA.

Mr. LAW:

1. Were tenders asked by the Department of Public Works for a boiler for the dredge Canada?

2. If so, how many were received, what were the names of the tenderers and amount of each tender?

3. To whom was the contract awarded, and what was the amount?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. Arthur Cox & Company, Halifax, $3,350; Brown Machine Company, New Glasgow, $3,350; Thompson Bros., Liverpool, $4,000; Union Foundry and Machine Company, St. John, $3,175; J. W. Cummings & Son, New Glasgow, $3,274.50; Polson Iron Works, Toronto, $3,650; John Inglis Company, Toronto, $3,250.

3. John Inglis Company, Toronto, $3,250; this firm being the only one which would guarantee delivery of boiler in the required period, namely, twelve weeks.

NATIONAL ART GALLERY.

*Mr. MURPHY:

How many persons have visited the National Art Gallery on each Sunday afternoon since it has been open to the public?

Mr. ROGERS: First Sunday, 769; second Sunday, 1,500; third Sunday, 1,100; and since then the average is 1,000 to 1,100. No daily record having been kept after the first three Sundays, the attendance is included in the weekly record.

OTTAWA CUSTOM HOUSE.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. What portion of the work on the new custom house at Ottawa is being done by the Foundation Company?

2. Did the said company obtain the said work by tender in public competition? If so, who were the other tenderers?

3. If public tenders were not invited, what arrangements as to prices, etc., were made with the Foundation Company?

4. How much has been paid the said company to date? What further amount is to be paid the company on the completion of its work?

5. Who are the members of the said company, and where are its headquarters in the United States?

6. What is the total cost to date of all work done on the said custom house?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Completing the pier foundation.

2. No.

3. A fee of 12 per cent of the cost of the work, said cost to include all costs of whatsoever nature (except rental paid by the minister for plant, equipment and tools on the work when taken over).

4. Paid to 27th November, 1913, $29,452.01.

5. (a) Members not known; (b) headquarters American firm, New York; headquarters Canadian firm, Montreal.

6. $521,585.52.

EAST RIVER IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who were the tenderers, and what was the amount of each tender, for the improvements at East river, county of Pictou?

2. When are the said improvements to be completed?

1. McDougall Bros., based on unit prices, $390,701.35; the Halifax Dredging Company, $483,332.90; Brown and Aylmer, $516,372.40.

2. April 3, 1915.

STEAMSHIP KARLUK.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. What are the names of the officers and men on board the Karluk when last heard from?

2. Does the Government intend to take steps to get into communication with the Karluk?

3. If so, when, and by what means?

4. Has the Government received a copy of the communication reported in the press to have been addressed by Mr. Stefansson to Mr. R. F. Stupart?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Scientists: Messrs. Beuchat, McKay, Mamen, McKinlay, Murray and Malloch.

Officers and men of ship: R. A. Bartlett, captain; A. Anderson, 1st officer; John Munro, 1st engineer; Charles Baker, 2nd officer; R. J. Williamson, 2nd engineer, F. W. Maurer, fireman; G. Breddy, fireman; John Brady, A.B.; Stanley F. Morris, A.B.; A. King, A.B.; H. Williams, A.B.; R. Templeman, steward; Ernest F. Chafe, cook; J. Hadley, utility man.

2 and 3. A mail was forwarded to the expedition by means of a party of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, leaving Dawson City in January; this party will bring back a mail from the expedition. Another mail left Edmonton on the 28th January for Fort Good Hope, arrangements having been made with the Hudson Bay Company to forward it to Fort McPherson, from which point the Royal Northwest Mounted Police or the Hudson Bay Company will forward it to the Southern party. Arrangements are also in progress to forward mails, supplies, etc., by the regular routes during the summer.

4. Mr. Stupart, director of the Meteorological Service, received a letter from Mr. Stefansson, asking to be supplied with certain scientific instruments.

ESQUIMALT DRY DOCK.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has the Government acquired a site for the proposed dry dock at Esquimalt, B.C.?
2. If so, where is the site?
3. From whom was the said site acquired?
4. How much land is comprised in said site, and what is the price?
5. Has the price been paid, and to whom?

Mr. ROGERS: No site yet acquired.

TORONTO HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. PARDEE:

1. When were tenders called for the Toronto harbour works?
2. Who were the tenderers, and what was the amount of each?
3. On what date were the tenders received?
4. On what date were the tenders awarded?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. July 12, 1913.

2.

	Approximately, unit prices.
1st. Canadian Stewart Co., Ltd.	$5,371,372 17
2nd. Quinlan & Robertson	5,735,567 17
3rd. Laurin, Leitch & Co.	5,998,459 23
4th. Anglo-Canadian Contractors Limited..	7,895,121 66

3. 1st, August 25, 1913; 2nd, August 25, 1913; 3rd, August 25, 1913; 4th, August 26, 1913.

4. Contract awarded by Order in Council, September 15, 1913.

EMPLOYMENT OF H. T. SMITH.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Is there a man by the name of H. T. Smith working at the Printing Bureau?
2. If so, what are his duties, and what is his salary?
3. Is he allowed any time during the year for vacation? If so, how many days per year?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Yes.

2. His duties are to see that the electoral voters' lists are printed in accordance with the copies received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Blank ballot papers are also distributed as required. His salary is $2,000 per annum.

3. He is allowed three weeks' vacation as per section 101, chapter 16, an Act respecting the Civil Service of Canada.

PENITENTIARY INVESTIGATION COMMISSION.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Who are the members of the Penitentiary Investigation Commission?
2. When were they appointed?
3. What was the wording of the instructions given to the commission?
4. Has a copy of the evidence in regard to charges preferred against Deputy Warden O'Leary, Dr. Phalen and H. W. Wilson, been sent to the Minister of Justice?
5. Has the commission reported to the minister in regard to said charges?
6. When does the minister expect to receive the final report of the commission?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1 and 2. Answered by No. 3.

The following is a copy of the commission. No other instructions were given the commissioners:

Know you that under and by virtue of Part II of the Inquiries Act, chapter 104, Revised Statutes, 1906, and under the authority of an order of His Excellency, the Administrator of the Government of Canada in Council made in pursuance of said part II and bearing date the twenty-fifth day of August, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirteen (a copy of which is hereto annexed), and by virtue of all and every other power in that behalf vested in me, I the Honourable Charles Doherty, Minister of Justice of Canada, do hereby nominate, constitute and appoint you, the said George Milnes Macdonnell, you the said Frederick Etherington, and you the said Joseph Patrick Downey, to be commissioners to investigate and report upon the following matters:

(a) The state and management of Kingston penitentiary.

(b) The conduct of the officers and employees of said penitentiary so far as the same relates to their official duties, and

(c) Generally the subject of the conduct and administration of penitentiaries, including such methods as may conduce to the permanent reformation of the convicts and, without prejudice to the punishment which convicts should properly undergo and without undue burden upon the public funds, tend to mitigate as far as may be found possible the sufferings entailed by their confinement upon those dependent upon them.

Provided that the inquiries under which paragraphs (a) and (b) shall not extend back over a longer period than five years, except in so far as the commissioners may deem it desirable in the public interest to inquire into any particular matters antecedent to such period.

And we do further nominate, constitute and appoint you, the said George Milnes Macdonnell to be chairman of the said commission.

To have, hold, exercise and enjoy the office of commissioners as aforesaid unto you the said George Milnes Macdonnell, you the said Frederick Etherington, and

you the said Joseph Patrick Downey, together with all and every the powers, rights, authority, privileges, emoluments and advantages by virtue of said part 11 and otherwise unto the said office of right and by law appertaining.

And I do hereby require you as such commissioners to report to me at my office at Ottawa the result of your investigation.

Dated at the Department of Justice at Ottawa this twenty-fifth day of August, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirteen.

4. A copy of the evidence before the commission has been received by the minister.

5. Report not yet received.

6. About the 15th of March next.

FRONTENAC RURAL MAIL.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. When was the first rural mail delivery route established in the county of Frontenac?

2. How many such routes have been established in the county of Frontenac?

3. What is the total mileage of such routes?

4. How many post offices have been closed in said county in consequence of the establishing of such rural routes?

5. What is the total number of box holders on rural routes in Frontenac county?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. 1st June, 1909.

2. 27.

3. 372½ miles.

4. 17.

5. 875.

DEPARTMENT OF MILITIA EMPLOYEES.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Referring to the answers given by the Minister of Militia and Defence to questions reported on page 466 of unrevised 'Hansard,' what are the names of the persons who accompanied the Minister of Militia and Defence on his visits to inspect the German, Belgian and Dutch manœuvres in the summer of 1913?

2. If such persons were at the time of the minister's said visits, or are now, employed in the Government service, what are their occupations and grades in the Civil Service?

3. What are the names of the private secretary and assistant private secretary of the Minister of Militia and Defence, when were they appointed and what are their respective salaries?

4. Is Clifford McAdam employed by the Department of Militia and Defence? If so, in what capacity and when was he appointed?

5. Did he pass the open competitive Civil Service examination?

6. What was his occupation just prior to being placed in the department, and what is his present salary?

7. Was a man named Allan O. Healey employed by or on behalf of the Department of Militia and Defence at the new rifle range in Carleton county, Ontario?

8. If so, when was he appointed and what were his duties and salary?

9. In what occupation was he engaged just prior to his being so employed?

10. Is the said Allan O. Healey still in the employ of the department? If not, when was he dismissed and what was the reason for his dismissal?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES:

1. Miss E. McAdam, private secretary, appointed 1st January, 1913, Subdivision A, Third Division; salary $900 per annum, plus $300 (private secretary's allowance), and her sister, Miss Isobel McAdam, acting assistant private secretary, appointed temporary clerk 6th February, 1913, salary $500 per annum, and Orderly Weghorne, Canadian Permanent Army Service Corps.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Yes. Appointed inspector of hardware December 13, 1913.

5. Passed Civil Service examination prescribed for technical appointment under provisions of section 21, Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908, and was granted a certificate by the Civil Service Commission.

6. (a) Purchasing partner in Mulhall and Co., hardware, Ottawa. (b) Present salary $1,200 a year.

7. Yes.

8. Appointed February 10, 1913. Duties, checking cement and other materials. Salary, $3 a day on appointment; subsequently raised to $4 a day April 1, 1913.

9. It is understood that he was cement inspector on Ottawa city works.

10. No. Discharged December 13, 1913, for improperly disposing of about fifty barrels of cement, which was subsequently returned.

PAYMENTS TO TRUDEL & McADAM.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. What amounts, if any, were paid by the Government or any department thereof, between November 7, 1911, and February 9, 1913, to the firm of Trudel & McAdam, of Ottawa, or either of the members of the said firm?

2. Between the said dates what services, if any, were rendered the Government by the said firm or either member thereof?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES:

1. Trudel & McAdam, $15. 2. Repairs to private car.

MILITIA DEPARTMENT AUTOMOBILES.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. In connection with the visit of the Minister of Militia and Defence and party to Europe in 1913, were automobiles engaged in England

for the use of the party or some of its members? If so, how many, from whom, and at what rate per day?

2. Were the said automobiles sent from England to meet the party at some point on the continent? If so, to what point on the continent were the said automobiles sent?

3. To what places on the continent were the members of the party conveyed by the said automobiles?

4. How long were the said automobiles used by the Minister of Militia or his party?

5. What was the total amount paid for the use of the said automobiles?

6. What was the total cost of the said trip from the time the minister and party left Canada until their return thereto?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES:

1. Yes; average seven cars per day; Wolseley Motor Car Co., Ltd. Varied rates according to capacity of car and miles travelled, including driver's pay and expenses.

2. Yes, to Boulogne.

3. All over northern and north-eastern France, where manoeuvres were being carried on, and to Switzerland, and also in England to the manoeuvres.

4. From 3rd September to 17th October.

5. $6,904.26.

6. Answered on the 4th instant.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. How many automobiles were bought by the Department of Militia and Defence during the year 1913, and what did each cost?

2. Were they bought by public tender or by private sale?

3. How many of the said automobiles are used in Ottawa, and at what place or places are they kept or stored when not in use?

4. How much is paid per month for the storage of each?

5. What are the names of the chauffeurs employed to run the said automobiles, and what wages does each chauffeur receive per month?

6. What amount was paid by the Department of Militia and Defence in the years 1912 and 1913 for the repairs, furnishings and upkeep of its automobiles?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES:

1. None.

2, 3, 4 and 5. Answered by No. 1.

6. $8,644.92, for all Canada.

MILITIA DEPARTMENT SPECIAL TRAIN.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Was a special train provided for the inspection of the Minister of Militia and Defence and General Sir Ian Hamilton in the summer of 1913?

2. If so, what was the cost of the said train?

3. What was the total cost of the inspection trip?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES:

1. Yes.

2. $10,000.

3. $20,740.

[Mr. Proulx.]

GENERAL SIR IAN HAMILTON.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Did the Minister of Militia and Defence, the Honourable Colonel Sam Hughes, or any person or persons with his knowledge and approval, send as a present to General Sir Ian Hamilton the horse which was provided for the latter's use while he was inspecting the Canadian Militia in the summer of 1913?

2. If so, on what date was the horse sent to Sir Ian Hamilton?

3. Was the horse shipped prior to the receipt by the Government of Sir Ian Hamilton's report?

4. What was the purchase price of the horse, and to what vote, fund, appropriation, or estimate was the said purchase price charged?

5. Did Sir Ian Hamilton acknowledge the receipt or delivery of the horse? If so, what is the date of his acknowledgment?

Mr. SAM HUGHES:

1. Yes.

2. On August 3, 1913.

3. No.

4. Purchase price, $175. Paid with all other costs on behalf of self and others.

5. Yes. August 19, 1913.

MILITARY TOUR.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Has the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence been drawn to an item in the Ottawa Citizen of November 7, 1913, in the following terms:

'Military tour—Scene of battle will be laid at Green's creek.

Arrangements have been made for a staff tour to be held under the command of Col. Hemming, of the 3rd Military division, for the staff officers of the Ottawa garrison today and Saturday. Motor cars will leave with the officers from the drill hall at noon today going to the locality around Green's creek.

2. By whose orders do Militia officers go on staff tours in motor cars?

3. Are private soldiers allowed the use of motor cars in the same way as officers? If not, why not?

4. Has any order or regulation been passed whereby officers in the Canadian Militia are prohibited from marching on foot?

Mr. SAM HUGHES:

1. No.

2. Militia headquarters. (Pay and allowance regulations, Art. 513a.)

3. Yes, when they take part in staff tours.

4. No.

MILITIA SHAM BATTLE.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Is the Minister of Militia and Defence aware that the following despatch was published in the Canadian press on October 21, 1913:

'Fairweather soldiers kept out of the rain—Thanksgiving sham battle postponed for fear defenders of Toronto would catch cold. Toronto, Oct. 20.—The usual sham battle which takes place on Thanksgiving did not come off

today. The military authorities of Toronto did not wish to have any brave defenders run the risk of contracting colds, so when day broke dark with a drizzling rain falling, they decided that the fight would not be pulled off. A great deal of fun is being made locally of the regiments who would not defend the city in a rainstorm.'

2. Did the minister inquire into the fact alleged in the said despatch? If so, what action did he take? If not, will he hold an inquiry?

3. Has any regulation been passed exempting the Militia, in case of wet or cold weather, from performing duties similar to those performed prior to Thanksgiving day, 1913?

Mr. SAM HUGHES:

1. No.

2. No.

3. No.

INVERNESS POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM:

Referring to the answer given by the Postmaster General, that on October 17 last, boxes for collecting letters were placed in the village of Chesley, South Bruce, having a population of 1,710, does the department intend to give like accommodation to the town of Inverness, Inverness county, N.S., which has a population of 3,500

Mr. PELLETIER: The population of Inverness at the last census was 2,719. The postal revenue for the last fiscal year was $2,821.61. The postal revenue of Chesley in South Bruce for the last fiscal year was $5,346.93. In the answer referred to, the population of Chesley was given as 1,734. As already stated in this connection, the Post Office Department does not take into account, when considering applications for street letter box services, the population so much as the amount of postal business transacted and the necessity for such accommodation in the public interest.

PETAWAWA CAMP.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Was a sum of money expended by the Department of Militia and Defence in the year ending March 31, 1913, for a detective service at Petawawa

2. If so, what was the gross expenditure in connection with this service?

3. What was the purpose of employing said detectives?

4. How many were employed?

5. Were any detectives employed at the Militia camps during the season of 1913? If so, where?

Mr. SAM HUGHES:

1. Yes, in connection with provincial and other services.

2. $572.85.

3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Two.

5. No.

LOBSTER POUNDS LICENSES.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Were any licenses granted during 1913, to persons, firms or corporate bodies to operate lobster pounds for the retention of lobsters caught during the legal season to be sold during the close season?

2. If so, what is the name and post office address of each such licensees?

Hr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. E. L. Conley, Leonardville, N.B.; L. C. Watt, North Head, N.B.; Gardiner & Doon, St. Andrews, N.B.

SEAMAN JOSEPH LEBLANC.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Referring to the answers given on February 11 instant, to the questions relating to the death of the sailor Joseph LeBlanc, of D.G.S. Canada, did the Right Honourable Prime Minister reply to the request of Mrs. Margaret Richard that the body of said sailor be sent to Port Felix, N.S., for interment at the expense of the Government? If so, what was his reply?

Mr. HAZEN:

The letter in question was transferred to the Department of the Naval Service, and was answered by the deputy minister of that department on the 12th September, 1913, to the effect that Mrs. Richard's brother had already been buried in the Roman Catholic cemetery of Cote des Neiges, Montreal.

ST. LAWRENCE PILOTAGE.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Has the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries been called to the following, which appeared in the last annual report of the Liverpool Underwriters' Association:

'The committee are now glad to be able to state that in consequence of reiterated complaints, the whole question of St. Lawrence Pilotage has been under investigation by a Royal Commission. It is earnestly hoped that in the interest of the increasing number and size of vessels frequenting the river, the recommendation of the commission for the better organizing and administering of the pilotage will bring about material reduction of the risks of navigation in this important waterway'.

2. Does the Government intend putting into force the Royal Commission's recommendation?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. In so far as the department is competent to do so, all of the recommendations submitted by the Royal Commission on Pilotage, material to the administration of the service, have been approved and put into force. Certain of the recommendations cannot be enforced without amending the Canada Shipping Act, chapter 113, R.S.C. The necessary amendments will be considered in the Bill for the revision and con-

solidation of the Canada Shipping Act, which I intend submitting to Parliament at an early date.

DUNVEGAN TELEGRAPH OFFICE.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. On what land is the Government telegraph office at Dunvegan situated?
2. How far is it from Hudson Bay post and ferry?
3. What is the difference in elevation between the telegraph office and the Hudson Bay post?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. North Dunvegan subdivision on southeast quarter section 20, township 80, range 4, west of 6th meridian.
2. 1½ miles.
3. 650 feet above Hudson's Bay post.

EXPENDITURE ON MILITARY WORKS.

Mr. LAW:

What is the total proposed expenditure in the Estimates for 1914-1915, under the heading of Public Works, for barracks, drill sheds, armouries, ordnance buildings, and public works of all kinds which, when completed, are to be devoted to military service?

Mr. ROGERS: $2,530,000.

YARMOUTH NORTH POST OFFICE.

Mr. LAW:

1. What was the revenue and sources of same, from the Yarmouth North post office for the year ending June 30, 1911?
2. What was the revenue and sources of same, from the Yarmouth North post office for the year ending June 30, 1913?

Mr. PELLETIER: Source of revenue, sale of postage stamps and commission on issued money orders. Revenue for year ended 30th June, 1911, $1,592.20; 1913, $1,252.18.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY AND MONTREAL.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the attention of the Government been called to the following resolution, adopted by the Montreal Board of Trade, on February 11:

'Resolved—That the council of the Montreal Board of Trade is greatly concerned that no action is being taken to provide a direct connection between the National Transcontinental railway and Montreal, although such connection is necessary in the interests of the country in general, and the district of Montreal in particular;

'That the construction of such connecting line will greatly benefit the business community of Montreal, and the neighbouring districts, and will further develop an immense tract of valuable territory between the main line of the National Transcontinental railway and the northern part of the Montreal district:

[Mr. Hazen.]

'That the council, therefore, prays the Dominion Government to forthwith secure legislation providing for the construction of a branch line affording connection between Montreal and the National Transcontinental railway, said branch to start at a suitable point on the main line and to follow in a southeasterly direction the shortest practicable route to Montreal, the conditions of the construction of such branch line to be those specified in the Acts respecting the National Transcontinental Railway for the construction of the eastern division thereof'.

2. What action does the Government intend to take on the above question?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. Yes.
2. The action of the Government will be announced in due course.

SEED LOBSTERS.

Mr. LAW:

1. How many seed lobsters have been placed in the lobster pond at Long Beach, St. Mary's, Digby county?
2. What was cost of said seed lobsters for each year?
3. What amount has the Department of Marine and Fisheries expended on said lobster pond since its purchase?
4. How many lobsters have been liberated from said pond?
5. Where were the lobsters so liberated distributed?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. 196, but the pond not being completed was only in partial operation.
2. 1913, 25 cents each.
3. $10,089.85.
4. 169.
5. Central Cove, 31; Cape St. Mary, 12; Whale Cove, 4; East Ferry, 3; Free Port, 17; Victoria Beach, 30; Church Point, 2; Meteghan, 3; Parker's Cove, 37; Gulliver's, 10; Mink Cove, 6; Tommies Beach, 4; White's Cove, 7; Little River, 3; total, 169.

TOBIQUE INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. What persons or firms have been allowed by the Department of Indian Affairs, to cut lumber off Tobique Indian reserve?
2. What quantity has been cut by such person or firm?
3. What amount has been paid by each as royalty or stumpage, or both?
4. Have these persons been allowed to cut green or dead trees, or both?
5. Have the rights to cut as aforesaid been given after public tender?
6. If not, what method has been adopted?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. During the last fiscal year Mr. B. F. Smith, has been allowed to cut burnt timber on the south side of the Tobique river.
2. The quantity cut is unknown, as the returns have not yet been received from the Indian agent.

3. No stumpage has as yet been paid.

4. No permission to cut green or partly green trees has been given.

5. Tenders were asked for by the local Indian agent.

6. Answered by No. 5.

CASE OF F. PEDLEY.

Mr. BOULAY:

Has F. Pedley, Superintendent of Indian Affairs been dismissed from office? If not, why did he leave, for what reasons and was his case investigated?

Mr. ROCHE:

No. Mr. Pedley resigned after an investigation had been held.

HANTS COUNTY ELECTORAL LISTS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Is the Department of Marine and Fisheries aware that Jas. D. Dennison, of Mount Douson, lightkeeper, is said to be reviser of the electoral lists in one of the rural districts of Hants county?

2. If not, will the department verify this statement?

3. What is the rule and practice of the department in regards to its officials acting in such capacity?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has no knowledge of a light-station named Mount Douson, nor of a lightkeeper named Jas. D. Dennison.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

BRANTFORD PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. NESBITT:

1. What stone was specified to be used in the Brantford public building by the architect?

2. Was it to be Canadian?

3. What was the estimated value?

4. From whom was it purchased?

5. From where was it purchased?

6. Who was the contractor for cutting the stone?

7. Where was his home when contract was made?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Georgetown, Ontario, was specified.

2. Yes.

3. No detailed estimate was made for the stone.

4. The stone used was Berea, Ohio, sandstone, as the price quoted by the contractor in his tender was considerably lower than the price for Georgetown stone and this tender was accepted.

5. Berea, Ohio.

6 and 7. The cutting of the stone was included in the contract awarded to P. H. Secord and Sons, Limited, Brantford.

SESSIONAL INDEMNITIES.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Is the Government aware that the Hon. Frederic Debartzch Monk, member for the county of Jacques Cartier, has been absent from this House during the whole of last session of Parliament?

2. Is the Government aware that the Hon. Frederic Debartzch Monk, in spite of his absence from this House during last session, is said to have been paid his sessional indemnity for the last session?

Mr. BORDEN: The following item is contained in the Estimates for the present fiscal year:

To provide for making good the full sessional indemnity of members of the House of Commons—days lost through absence caused by illness or public business during the present session—notwithstanding anything in chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes, An Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons, or any amendments thereto, $17,965.

Under this Estimate, which was passed by Parliament, a number of gentlemen on both sides of the House received indemnities to which they would not be entitled under the strict terms of the Act. There were cases of death, cases of illness, cases of absence on public business. The gentlemen mentioned are Mr. Bickerdike, Mr. Cash, Mr. Chabot, Mr. Clare, Mr. Elson, Mr. Foster (North Toronto), Mr. Fowler, Mr. Haggart, Mr. Monk, Mr. Thompson, (Yukon), Mr. Tobin, and Mr. Lamarche. The Hon. Federic Debartzch Monk was detained by illness during the entire session, and he received his indemnity under the terms of the statute to which I have alluded.

ALBERTA RURAL MAIL.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. How many rural mail delivery routes have been established in Alberta?

2. Where are they located?

3. Are any of the routes provided with a daily service?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. 37.

2. Bittern Lake No. 1, (via Halley); Bremner No. 1, (via East Clover Bar); Brightview No. 1, (via Scottdale); Calgary No. 1, (via Millarville); Calgary No. 2, (via Jumping Pond); Calgary No. 3, (via Freshfield); Calgary No. 4, (via Simons Valley); Clive No. 1, (via Fountainstown); Clover Bar No. 1, (via West Salisbury); Crossfield No. 1, (via Rumworth); Delburne No. 1, (via Balermo); DeWinton No. 1, (via Gladys); Dunstable No. 1, (via Manola); Dunstable No. 2, (via Rich Valley); Edgerton Station No. 1, (via Prospect

Valley); Edmonton No. 1, (via Namao); Edmonton No. 2, (via New Lunnon); Fishburn No. 1, (via Yarrow Bridge); Halkirk No. 1, (via Foreman); High River No. 1, (via Tongue Creek); Innisfail No. 1, (via Markerville); Lacombe No. 1, (via Rimbey); Lacombe No. 2, (via Brooksley); Lacombe No. 3, (via Lochinvar); Leduc No. 1, (via Conjuring Creek); Leduc No. 2, (via Beaumont); MacLeod No. 1, (via Standoff); New Norway No. 1, (via Highland Park); Okotoks No. 1, (via Lineham); Penhold No. 1, (via Pine Lake); Red Deer No. 1, (via Pitcox); Red Deer No. 2, (via Coal Banks); Rivière qui Barre No. 1, (via Belvedere); Sedgewick No. 1, (via Leopoldville); St. Albert No. 1, (via Villeneuve); Tees No. 1, (via Crooksley); Wetaskiwin No. 1, (via Yeoford).

3. Yes. Innisfail No. 1; Lacombe No. 1.

AVIGNON POSTMASTER.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Was any action taken by the Postmaster General in the case of the postmaster of Avignon, Quebec, and his assistant, for the course followed by them, as revealed in the following document, brought down to the House by the minister on January 22nd last, in answer to an order:

Conservative committee of the parish of St. Alexis, county of Bonaventure.

At a meeting of the members of the Conservative Committee of this parish, called for to-day, were present: Thomas Levesque, mayor; Octave Martin, postmaster; Joseph Arsenault, assistant postmaster; Ludger Gallant, merchant; Johnny O. Martin, Joseph O. Martin, Gregoire Dumas, Jerome L. Pitre, Thomas Doucet and Thomas C. Gallant.

Moved by Thomas Levesque and resolved unanimously, that thanks be tendered to Mr. David Champoux, of Restigouche, county of Bonaventure, P.Q., for the interest he has taken in the change he has obtained from the Postmaster General, Ottawa, in connection with the post office of Avignon, P.Q.

Moved by Ludger Gallant, seconded by Jerome L. Pitre, that the members of this committee are of opinion that, in the interest of the party, it is necessary that the post office of St. Benoit, Bonaventure county, be transferred to George Roy, the present postmaster, Mr. Edward LeGresley, having interfered with politics during the last federal election, and that a copy of the resolutions passed by this committee, bearing date the 6th of February and 4th of March, 1912, be forwarded to Mr. David Champoux.

Mathias Blanquière,
President.
Joseph Arsenault,
Secretary.

A true copy.
February 3, 1913.

2. If no action was taken, why not?

3. Who is the postmaster at Avignon, and is he still president or secretary of the said Conservative Committee?

[Mr. Pelletier.]

Mr. PELLETIER:

1 and 2. Mr. Mathias Blaquière was not appointed postmaster of Avignon until the 12th March, 1913.

3. Mr. Mathias Blaquière is postmaster of Avignon. The department has no information as to whether he is president of a Conservative committee.

THREE RIVERS DISMISSALS.

Mr. BUREAU:

At whose request, and for what reasons were George Frigon and Auguste Cooke dismissed from the Three Rivers post office staff?

Mr. PELLETIER: George Frigon and Auguste Cooke were employed as clerks in the Three Rivers post office during the pleasure of the Postmaster General. They were not appointed under the Civil Service Act, and in consequence could be removed from office at any time by order of the Postmaster General. These employees were dispensed with on the 6th and the 10th January, 1914, respectively, their services being no longer required.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

UNOPPOSED AND UNDISCUSSED MOTIONS.

Mr. A. H. Clarke.—For a copy of all letters, petitions, telegrams, complaints, evidence, reports and other papers and documents in the possession of the Customs Department relating to the dismissal of Frederick Forster, sub-collector of customs at Kingsville, Ont., and if there was an investigation, the names of all the witnesses, and a copy of the evidence; and also of all the papers connected with the appointment of his successor.

Mr. A. H. Clarke.—For a copy of all letters, petitions, telegrams, complaints, evidence, reports and other papers and documents in the possession of the Department of the Postmaster General, relating to the dismissal of James H. Smart, postmaster at Kingsville, Ont., and if there was an investigation, the names of all witnesses and a copy of the evidence; and also of all papers connected with the appointment of his successor.

Mr. A. H. Clarke.—For a copy of all letters, petitions, telegrams, complaints, evidence, reports and other papers and documents in the possession of the Customs Department, relating to the dismissal of Ralph Harris, sub-collector of customs at Pelee island, Ont., and if there was an investigation, the names of all witnesses, and a copy of the evidence; and also of all the papers connected with the appointment of his successor.

Mr. A. H. Clarke.—For a copy of all letters, petitions, telegrams, complaints, evidence, reports and other papers and documents in the possession of the Customs Department, relating to the dismissal of Aylmer Orton, customs officer at Windsor, Ont., and if there was an investigation, the names of all witnesses, and a copy of the evidence; and also of all the papers

connected with the appointment of his successor.

Mr. A. H. Clarke.—For a copy of all letters, petitions, telegrams, complaints, evidence, reports and other papers and documents in the possession of the Interior Department, relating to the dismissal of Andrew Darragh, immigration officer at Windsor, Ont., and if there was an investigation, the names of all witnesses, and a copy of the evidence; and also of all the papers connected with the appointment of his successor.

Mr. A. H. Clarke.—For a copy of all letters, petitions, telegrams, complaints, evidence, reports and other papers and documents in the possession of the Interior Department, relating to the dismissal of John Halstead, immigration officer at Windsor, Ont., and if there was an investigation, the names of all the witnesses, and a copy of the evidence; and also of all the papers connected with the appointment of his successor.

Mr. Oliver.—For a copy of all papers necessary to convey full information as to the charter, outfit and instructions of the Karluk and auxiliary vessels; the names, rank, pay and terms of engagement of their officers and crews; and of all communications received from Mr. V. Stefansson, or any other person who has received such communication, written after the expedition sailed for the Arctic ocean.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence, pay-rolls, vouchers and documents of all kinds connected in any way with repairs or extension of wharf at Finlay Point, Mabou, Inverness county, during the year 1910-1911.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, tenders and documents connected in any way with the supplying of coal to the lobster hatchery at Margaree during the years 1910-1911, 1911-1912, 1912-1913, and 1913-1914.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all telegrams, correspondence, petitions and documents of all kinds in any way referring to a drill shed or armoury to be built at the town of Inverness, Inverness county, Nova Scotia.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all telegrams, correspondence and documents of all kinds in any way relating to the dismissal or suspension from duty of Dan. Cormier, an officer of the lifesaving station at Eastern harbour, Inverness county, Nova Scotia.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and documents of all kinds in any way relating to a lighthouse to be built at Red Cape, Margaree harbour, Inverness county.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams and correspondence of all kinds in any way relating to repairs required on the pier at Margaree harbour, Inverness county, received in 1912-1913 and 1913-1914.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence of all kinds, pay-rolls, vouchers, in any way referring to the expenditure of moneys on sheer dams on the Margaree river, at Margaree and Northeast Margaree, during 1911-1912 and 1912-1913.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and petitions in any way advocating the expenditure of money on the following works, received during the years 1911-1912, 1912-1913 and 1913-1914: Closing of the northern entrance of Port Hood harbour; Reconstruction of the public wharf at Port Hood; extension of wharf at Judique; opening of an artificial harbour at Troy Pond; the opening of a channel at Loch Ban, lake Ainslie; the opening of a channel at Inverness harbour; the repairs to the breakwater at Margaree harbour and the construction of breakwater or breakwaters to the west of the channel of the said harbour; the construction of a wharf at Dunvegan; the building of a wharf at Chimney Corner; the repairs to the boat harbour at Friar's Head; repairs and extension of the pier at St. Josephs; dredging of Grand Etang harbour; the construction of a pier at Cheticamp Point, and the extension of the pier at Cap Rouge.

Mr. Gauvreau.—For a copy of the pay-list, including the names and residences, of the men who have worked on the wharf to the west of Rivière-Verte, Témiscouata; the number of days' work of each of them; the amount of money received by each of them; who has or have signed the receipt or receipts for said amounts on said pay-list or otherwise, the whole for, (1o) 1912; (2o) 1913.

Mr. Gauvreau.—For a copy of the pay list, including the name and residences, of all those who have worked at the wharf of L'ile Verte, county of Temiscouata; the number of days of employment of each of them; the amount received by each of them; who has or have signed the receipt or receipts for said amounts, in connection with the works which have been going on during the summer of 1912 and during the summer of 1913.

Mr. Gauvreau.—For a copy of the pay list, of all soldiers who were connected with the Levis camp last summer, 1913; the names and residences of all the officers and soldiers who took part in that encampment; the number of days of camping of each of them; the amount received by each of them; the names of those who signed receipts on the pays lists for each of such amounts; and the amount of money paid for each military drill day for the soldiers, the lieutenants, the captains and the majors, respectively.

Mr. Marcil.—For a copy of any complaints made against John A. Campbell, postmaster of New Richmond, Quebec, and of all correspondence bearing on any change called for in that office.

Mr. Marcil.—For a copy of all documents bearing on the appointment and dismissal of Len V. Willett, as light keeper at Point Duthie, Quebec, and of the appointment of James Doddridge as his successor, as well as of those bearing on the contemplated removal of that light to main wharf.

Mr. Marcil.—For a copy of the charges made against Mrs. Marguerite Fair, postmistress of Black Cape, Quebec, on which Mr. Louis Tache, of Rimouski, was authorized to hold an investigation, together with the report of said investigation, if any was held.

Mr. Marcil.—For a copy of all documents bearing on the repairing and improvement of the Matapedia Road in the counties of Rimouski and Bonaventure.

Mr. Marcil.—For a copy of all documents bearing on the dismissal of the officer in charge of the Port Daniel West, Quebec, lobster hatchery, Edward Dea, and on the appointment of his successor.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all tenders, contracts, memoranda, pay rolls, accounts, vouchers, correspondence, papers and documents, etc., in connection with work performed

upon the Government wharf at Croft's Cove, Lunenburg county, in 1912.

Mr. Knowles.—For a copy of all papers in connection with the sub-lands agency in Gravelburg, Saskatchewan.

Mr. Knowles.—For a copy of all papers in connection with the Public Building at Gravelburg, from and since January 1, 1912.

Mr. Knowles.—For a copy of all papers in connection with the employment of Arthur Dubisson as immigration agent at Gravelburg, Sask., and all papers in connection with the said Dubisson, showing the moneys paid to him and the work performed by him.

Mr. Knowles.—For a copy of all papers in connection with the Immigration Hall at Gravelburg, Sask., from and since the 1st January, 1912.

Mr. Knowles.—For a copy of all papers in connection with the S.W. ¼, 23-16-12 W. 3 M.

Mr. Knowles.—For a copy of all papers in connection with the N.E. ¼, 22-11-5-W. 3 M.

Mr. Seguin.—For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, petitions and other documents relating to the dismissal of Jos. Serguin Archambault, as postmaster of the town of Terrebonne, and to the appointment of George Beausoleil, as his successor.

Mr. Gauvreau.—For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, reports, deeds, fees paid to lawyers, and other documents relative to the purchasing of land from Mrs. C. F. Bertrand and Arthemise Dionne, in connection with the works on the southwest side of Rivière Verte, l'Islet, county of Temiscouata.

Mr. Lemieux.—For a copy of all papers, correspondence, etc., in connection with the survey of Indian holding No. 130 A., situate on the Caughnawaga Indian Reserve, Quebec.

Mr. Bourassa.—For a return showing the name of the postmaster of the parish of St. Romuald, county of Lévis, who, it is said, was dismissed from office since September, 1911, the reasons for such dismissal, the nature of the complaints made against him, the names of the parties who made those complaints, together with a copy of all correspondence and telegrams relating thereto, the name of the inquiring commissioner, and report of investigation, if any, and of all evidence taken at the investigation, the names of those who recommended the successor, names of the parties by whom the Government was represented at such investigation, with a detailed statement of all the accounts paid or to be paid by any department in connection with the aforesaid dismissal and investigation, the names of the parties who received any money or filed their accounts in connection with said investigation and the amount awarded to or claimed by each of them.

Mr. Bourassa.—For a return showing the name of the postmaster of the parish of Notre Dame de Charny, county of Lévis, who, it is stated, was dismissed from office since September, 1911, the reasons for such dismissal, the nature of the complaints made against him, the names of the parties who made those complaints, together with a copy of all correspondence and telegrams relating thereto, the name of the inquiring commissioner, and report of investigation, if any, and of all evidence taken at the investigation, the names of those who recommended the successor, names of the parties by whom the Government was represented at such investigation, with a detailed statement of all the accounts paid or to be paid by any department in connection with the aforesaid dismissal and investigation, the names of the parties who received any money or filed their accounts in connection with said investigation, and the amount awarded to or claimed by each of them.

Mr. Bourassa.—For a return showing the name of the postmaster of the parish of St. Henri de Lauzon, county of Lévis, who, it is said, was dismissed from office since September, 1911, the reasons for such dismissal, the nature of the complaints made against him, the names of the parties who made those complaints, together with a copy of all correspondence and telegrams relating thereto, the name of the inquiring commissioner, and report of investigation, if any, and of all evidence taken at the investigation, the names of those who recommended the successor, names of the parties by whom the Government was represented at such investigation, with a detailed statement or all the accounts paid or to be paid by any department in connection with the aforesaid dismissal and investigation, the names of the parties who received any money or filed their accounts in connection with said investigation, and the amount awarded to or claimed by each of them.

Mr. Bourassa.—For a return showing the name of the postmaster of the parish of Lambert, county of Lévis, who, it is stated, was dismissed from office since September, 1911, the reasons for such dismissal, the nature of the complaints made against him, the names of the parties who made those complaints, together with a copy of all correspondence and telegrams relating thereto, the name of the inquiring commissioner, and report of investigation, if any, and of all evidence taken at the investigation, the names of those who recommended the successor, names of the parties by whom the Government was represented at such investigation, with a detailed statement of all accounts paid or to be paid by any department in connection with the aforesaid dismissal and investigation, the names of the parties who received any money or filed their accounts in connection with said investigation, and the amount awarded to or claimed by each of them.

Mr. Graham.—For a copy of all papers in any way relating to the tender, original contract, and amended contract of Mr. Joseph Gosselin for the locomotive and car shops at St. Malo, Quebec, together with a copy of the advertisements for tenders, the specifications, the contract, the amended contract, reports of engineers, recommendations to Council, Orders in Council, letters, telegrams, minutes or reports of interviews, and of all other documents referring in any way to the said contract or the amendment thereof.

Mr. Emmerson.—For a copy of all reports, requests, petitions, memorials, letters, telegrams and other correspondence and documents relating to the removal, suspension or dismissal, by the management of the Intercolonial railway, of Warren Carter and Frederick Avard, employees in the freight department of the Intercolonial railway at Sackville, N.B.; and of all letters, telegrams and other correspondence in the Department of Railways and Canals, or in the railway offices at Moncton, or in any department of Government, addressed to the Minister of Railways and Canals, or to any other member of the Government, or to any official of the Department of Railways and Canals, or of the Intercolonial railway, by any person or persons

in the county of Westmorland, N.B., in any manner relating to said employees and to the dispensing with their services, particularly of any letters sent to F. P. Brady, general superintendent of the Intercolonial, by any party or parties in Sackville, N.B., or elsewhere, and of all replies to any such letters, correspondence or documents.

Mr. Bourassa.—For a copy of all documents, letters, petitions, telegrams and evidence heard, reports, etc., in connection with the claims of Eugene Demers and Joseph Olivier, of the parish of St. Nicholas, county of Lévis, for damages arising out of fires caused by the Intercolonial railway's locomotives; and, if investigations have been held, a copy of all evidence and documents relating thereto.

Mr. Murphy.—For return showing the names, salaries and grades of the private secretaries of the members of the Liberal Government on October 1, 1911; the names of the private secretaries employed from time to time by the members of the present government, and the salary and grade of each.

Mr. Kyte.—For a return showing the increase in freight rates on live stock, including horses, carried over the Intercolonial railway, by the tariff effective May 1, 1913, as compared with the tariff effective April 15, 1909, for the following distances, respectively:

Over 5	and not over	10	miles.
" 10	"	15	"
" 15	"	20	"
" 20	"	25	"
" 25	"	30	"
" 30	"	40	
" 40	"	50	"
" 50	"	60	"
" 60	"	70	"
" 70	"	80	"
" 80	"	90	"
" 90	"	100	"
" 100	"	110	"
" 110	"	120	"
" 120	"	130	"
" 130	"	140	"
" 140	"	150	"
" 150	"	160	"

DIVORCE REFORM.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the procedure under which divorces are granted by Parliament and the consequent unreasonable expense thereof are so unsatisfactory, besides being prohibitive to the great majority of the people of Canada, that the same should be taken into immediate consideration by the Government with a view to reform, during the present session.

He said: In connection with the subject of divorce, there are two separate and distinct questions which might engage the attention of the House. On the one hand, this House might be asked by an Act to extend the grounds on which divorce may be granted. The most careless perusal of this resolution will show that it has no reference whatever to anything of that kind. There is another course that might be taken by this House in connection with divorce, and that is to consider whether or not the procedure under which divorces are granted is the most satisfactory procedure to all classes of the community, and the least expensive to those who can least afford to bear that expense. We all know that in our Dominion four provinces, namely, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and British Columbia, have jurisdiction over divorce. In the other five provinces, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, and Quebec, the courts have not jurisdiction; so that for the whole Dominion, other than the first named four provinces, any divorces that have been granted in this country since Confederation have been granted by this House.

It being conceded, as the fact certainly is, that divorces are granted by Parliament, it must also be conceded that they are granted either as a right or as a favour. If divorces are granted by this Parliament as a right, then certainly every man in this country should have an equal right to secure a divorce. If, on the other hand,—and I hardly imagine that any one would maintain this—divorces by this Parliament are to be granted as a favour, then certainly they should be granted to those who need the favour most, instead of, as at present, to those who need it the least. One has only to consider the experience of every one in this House to come to a speedy conclusion as to whether or not our present procedure is satisfactory. I will deal with that later on, but in the meantime I would like to point out that of all the civilized countries in the world there is but one that rivals us in our procedure, and that is poor old Ireland. Most of us have some suspicion, from items we have occasionally seen in the newspapers of late, that there is a little difference of opinion as to how Ireland should be governed in the future; but I venture to say there is no difference of opinion whatever, anywhere in the civilized world, as to whether or not Ireland has been the model government with the wisest legislation for 800 or 900 years. And yet Ireland is the only country which at all approaches our method of granting divorces.

To really understand the position we occupy and—if I may be pardoned for saying it—the utterly absurd and grotesque procedure we have, perhaps it may not be out of place to remind the House of the procedure in other countries, and in other times. Up to the time of the Reformation, it is well known, there was no such thing as divorce in the western church as we understand divorce to-day. We read of

divorces being granted, a mensa et thoro, or, as we would say, a judicial separation without any right given to the parties to marry again. There was also introduced into the western church the right to have marriages, that had been validly celebrated, set aside on the ground of nullity.

I do not intend to occupy any time in discussing that question; but merely in order that we may understand what the practice has been, I will call the attention of the House to the important evidence given by Monseigneur Moyes before the Royal Commission on Divorce and Matrimonial Causes, vol. 2, page 426. Monseigneur Moyes saying that he was a canon of the archdiocese of Westminster, a prelate of the Roman Court, and that he had attended on behalf of the Catholic Church at the request of the Archbishop of Westminster. I think I can hardly be said to introduce anything contentious when, merely to give the historical reasons for it, I point out that prior to the Reformation and up to the present time, while divorce in our sense is absolutely unknown, there are a number of grounds, fifteen in all, on which marriages are liable to be declared null and void. Mgr. Moyes in his evidence says:

> The impediments which are held by the Catholic church to be diriment or nullifying are the following: 1. Error, as to person. 2. Condition (if A marries B, a slave, believing B to be free). 3. Solemn vow of chastity or entering religious order, made before consummation of marriage. 4. Consanguinity to third degree. 5. Crime (if A during a former marriage with B has committed adultery with C, with promise of marriage after death of B, and if A or C has attempted the life of B, the marriage of A and C is null). 6. Disparity of worship, viz., marriage of a Christian with a non-Christian. 7. Duress or violence affecting liberty of consort. 8 Holy order to which is attached obligation of chastity. 9. The bond of preceding marriage (if either party have a husband or wife still alive). 10. Public decorum (if one of the parties is solemnly or publicly betrothed to another person). 11. Madness or amentiá (viz, imbecility precluding reasonable consent). 12. Affinity. 13. Clandestinity. 14. Impotency. 15. Rape.

So that we find that in the Western Church, up to the time of the Reformation, while there were no divorces a vinculo matrimonii, there were fifteen different grounds upon which the ecclesiastical courts did declare marriages to be null and void. If there were children as a result of these marriages, inasmuch as the marriages were liable to be declared null and void, the inevitable result was the bastardizing of the children.

In the Eastern Church, which was the Greek church, divorce was always allowed. Prior to the Reformation the church court had claimed the right to deal exclusively with matrimonial causes, and the state throughout western Europe allowed this claim, so that all causes having to do with matrimonial disputes were tried before the ecclesiastical courts. After the Reformation in England it became impossible that the old procedure or trial in ecclesiastical courts should be continued, and there was no procedure open to the people of England in order to obtain divorce. After a time it was seen that Parliament might deal with this question, as with any other subject, and it became the custom in England, and continued until the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857 was passed, that divorces could be obtained by Act of Parliament. Subsequently rules were passed by which it was necessary, first, to obtain a divorce a mensa et thoro, a judicial separation from the offending partner, and then to issue a writ and obtain a verdict for damages against the co-respondent, or to satisfy Parliament that there were good and sufficient reasons why that course had not been taken. At last, in 1857, it became evident that the course of procedure up to that time was unsatisfactory. Many attempts had been made to change that course, but although practically everybody agreed that the course was absurd and abominably expensive, yet, with that English unreadiness to move, it was as hard to cause a change in the law in that respect as it was to cause a change in the law under which people were hanged for over one hundred various offences. At last Mr. Justice Maule gave his famous sentence for bigamy at Warwick, which, having convulsed the nation, led to the law as they have it in England to-day. I will take the liberty of reading this sentence pronounced by Mr. Justice Maule, inasmuch as it had such a tremendous effect upon the public sentiment of England.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What year?

Mr. NORTHRUP: 1845, I think.

Mr. CARVELL: What is the case.

Mr. NORTHRUP: A man had been convicted of bigamy, and this was the sentence pronounced by the judge upon the prisoner:

> Prisoner, you have been convicted upon clear evidence; you have intermarried with another woman, your lawful wife being still alive. You have committed the crime of bigamy. You tell

me, and indeed the evidence has shown, that your first wife left her home and her young children to live in adultery with another man. You say this prosecution is an instrument of extortion on the part of the adulterer. Be it so. I am bound to tell you that these are circumstances which the law does not in your case take notice of. You had no right to take the law into your own hands. Every Englishman is bound to know that when a wrong is done, the law, or perhaps I should rather say the constitution, affords a remedy. Now, listen to me, and I will tell you what you ought to have done. Immediately you heard of your wife's adultery you should have gone to an attorney and directed him to bring an action against the seducer of your wife. You should have prepared your evidence, instructed counsel, and proved the case in court; and recollect that it was imperative that you should recover, I do not mean actually obtain, substantial damages. Having proceeded thus far, you should have employed a proctor and instituted a suit in the ecclesiastical courts for a divorce a mensa et thoro. Your case is a very clear one, and I doubt not you would have obtained your divorce. After this step your course was quite plain; you had only to obtain a private Act of Parliament to dissolve your marriage. This you would get as a matter of course upon payment of the proper fees and proof of the facts; you might then have lawfully married again. I perceive, prisoner, that you appear scarcely to understand what I am saying to you, but let me assure you these steps are constantly taken by persons who are desirous to dissolve an unhappy marriage; it is true, for the wise man has said it, that 'A hated woman, when she is married, is a thing that the earth cannot bear,' and that a 'bad wife is to her husband as rottenness to his bones.' You, however, must bear this great evil, or must adopt the remedy prescribed by the constitution of your country. I see that you would tell me that these proceedings would cost you £1,000, and that all your small stock in trade is not worth £100. Perhaps it may so be. The law has nothing to say to that; if you had taken these proceedings you would have been free from your present wife, and the woman whom you have secondly married would have been a respectable matron. As you have not done so, you stand there a convicted culprit, and it is my duty to pass sentence upon you. You will be imprisoned for one day.

The report in the London Times gives this additional sentence:

And as you have now been in jail since the commencement of the assizes, your term is more than expired; you are free.

You can see that a judgment such as this, pronounced by one of the ablest, if the most caustic, judges on the bench naturally would produce a result, and the result was that a commission was appointed in 1850, which eventually reported in 1857, and the Matrimonial Causes Act of that year was the result. The commissioners, in 1857, in bringing in their report, used this language:

By these means the right to obtain a divorce à vinculo was definitely established. It was established, however, in the rudest and most inconvenient manner; for the proceeding was a judicial one by a legislative process, and it had all the inconveniences which necessarily result from the discussion of such a question in a mixed and popular assembly.

Lord Campbell, chairman of the commission, said to the House of Lords:

The object of the commissioners was not to alter the law but the procedure by which the law was carried into effect.

That is precisely the object of my resolution here to-night. The description given by the commissioners, as to this judicial proceeding by legislative process being the rudest and most inconvenient, is exactly the proceeding we have in Canada to-day.

What is the course in other civilized countries? Looking over the report of the Royal Commission, and that is presumably sufficient authority, I find there are but two nations that have no divorce of any kind: Italy and Spain. It is immaterial from my standpoint to-night, in arguing in support of the resolution I have moved, whether they have divorce courts or any other system, because I am merely seeking to try to improve the procedure and cheapen the expense. I find that Scotland, Cape Colony, Natal, New South Wales, New Zealand, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, Victoria, Western Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Roumania, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland, United States, all grant divorces through means of the courts. As I have said, there are only two civilized countries that are still left with this cumbersome legislative procedure—Ireland and Canada. It was pointed out by witnesses before this commission, that in Ireland a man not coming under the operation of the 1857 Act, is left to the old law, so that he has first to obtain his divorce a mensa et thoro, then to sue the adulterer if a man, and obtain judgment for damages, if he can, and, as the evidence shows, the minimum expense of proceeding in this way was £450 or £500, and having spent that £450 and £500, the man was then in a position to apply to parliament for a divorce.

In Canada we have a procedure founded on the ordinary procedure with regard to private Bills, and, while I am not trying in any way to extend the grounds on which divorce is granted, the House will, I think, agree with me when I say that at the present time there is no limit to the grounds on which divorces can be given in Canada. As a matter of practice—though it has not, I am afraid, always been carefully carried

out, for I remember a divorce not very long ago passed by this Parliament without the shadow or tittle of evidence of adultery—but theoretically the assumption is that divorce can only be granted by this Parliament on the ground of adultery. Still, being a matter of legislation in Canada, if a writer were describing the grounds on which divorce could be granted by this Parliament, he would have to admit that, whatever we might do practically, however we may find ourselves bound by the rules in that respect, legally and constitutionally we can grant a divorce on any grounds, no matter how trifling. That, in itself, I submit, is rather an objectionable feature.

In the province of Ontario, and I believe in all the provinces, if the husband has suddenly disappeared and has not been heard of for seven years, there is a legal presumption of death. After seven years, his wife, or children if he has not a wife, can apply to the courts and they divide the property he left among those who would be entitled to it in case he was actually dead. If his wife, relying on that presumption of death, and having obtained her share of the property as his widow, should see fit to marry again, originally she would be liable to bigamy if the husband turned up, no matter how honestly she may have believed that he had been dead. Seeing the utter absurdity and injustice of that, our Criminal Code has been amended, so that now, after seven years' absence of the husband, the wife, having good reason to think the husband dead, if she should marry again, would not be liable under the Criminal Code for bigamy. But see the position the unfortunate woman is placed in. It is said here that the judge will take judicial notice of the husband's death, and will divide his property, and that his wife can marry again, and be perfectly free from any penalty under the criminal law; but yet if the husband should turn up, or if evidence should be given to show that he had been alive after her second marriage, we would condemn that poor woman to the shame of being the mistress of the man who she thought was her husband. And what have you done to her unfortunate children, if there are any, of the marriage? Speaking as Canadians, and claiming to be among the freest and greatest liberty-loving people in the world, can any Canadian say, that is right? If a woman such as that in good faith marries again, after the courts of the land have said her husband was dead, can any man in this House say that it is fair that she should be treated as the mistress of the man whom she married, and that her unfortunate children, born within the second marriage, should be bastardized by the law of the land?

I heard of a case recently from the province of British Columbia, which illustrates one of the absurdities of our law. A lady married a man who was the manager of a bank; she lived with him as his wife, and they had three children. He induced her father, who was a wealthy man, to endorse for him, and one day he disappeared apparently from the face of the earth. He was away for seven years, and then the lady consulted a lawyer in British Columbia to ask him if she could have a divorce. He was obliged to advise her that she could not. In British Columbia they have a divorce court, and, so far as the expense went, she might have applied there. Here we have judicial proceedings, and she might have applied here, but the difficulty was that the man had simply disappeared, and there was no evidence that he was dead. A friend suspecting that the man might have returned to the place in England whence he came, spent some money engaging detectives to trace him, and they found he was living in England with another woman whom he represented to be his wife. What could be done in British Columbia for the unfortunate legal wife? Under the laws of British Columbia she could only obtain a divorce on certain grounds, such as were provided in England under the original 1857 Act. Under that Act the husband could obtain a divorce on the ground of adultery alone, but the wife could not obtain a divorce unless there was adultery coupled with cruelty. That was the law introduced in the province of British Columbia. Some years later, owing to the hardships that arose in England from that law, an amendment was brought in so that desertion for two years would take the place of cruelty, and if the adultery could be proved, together with desertion for two years, the unfortunate woman could obtain relief. But that did not apply in British Columbia. Therefore, the position of this woman was, that although she could get the evidence to show that her husband was living in England with another woman, she could not apply before the courts of British Columbia because she had not the proof of cruelty to help her out. And she could not come to this Parliament, because a poor woman with three children, earning her own living, and supporting her children in British Columbia, was not in a position to file a petition

with this House; to pay detectives in the old country, to bring them out here to prove her case, and go to the expense that would be necessary to satisfy a committee of this Parliament that she was entitled to a divorce. There are many cases such as that.

I have had, in my own experience, cases which show the injustice of the present procedure. One man from my own part of the country came to me saying that his wife had eloped with another man and was living with him in a town in the United States, and he asked me what he could do. I had to tell him frankly that the only thing I could see for him to do was to get rich, in the first place, because this country did not recognize any right on the part of a poor man to have a divorce. This unfortunate husband was left with four or five little children, from eight to twelve years of age, and what possible justification could there be for imposing the penalty we do impose on these little children, by practically forbidding the father to obtain a divorce. In circumstances such as these, with a man earning a couple of dollars a day and living in a little house, it is perfectly evident that he cannot afford to hire a housekeeper to look after his house and his children. If he does bring in a woman for that purpose, the latter end may be worse than the first. On the other hand, if he does not do so, these little children, left to grow up without a mother's protecting care, stand a bad chance in the world.

I think the members of this House will appreciate the fact that we have a duty to perform. We are really trustees for the people; and if we allow a state of affairs to continue which is felt to be an injustice by any portion of the people, we are contributing something to increase the unfortunate unrest which at present is so rife throughout the whole world. It is idle to ignore the fact that the world has never been so beset by perplexing problems as it is at the present time, and among them the social and the industrial problems are perhaps among the greatest and most perplexing.

Putting the case on no other ground, leaving out of sight for the moment the unfortunate victim of an unhappy matrimonial alliance, leaving out of sight the little children who are certainly in no way to blame, but who must to a certain extent pay the penalty, looking at the question from the standpoint of the state, is it in the interest of a young country like Canada, with a population rapidly increasing by outsiders coming in from other lands, that a feeling of dissatisfaction, of injustice should pervade the minds of a large portion of the people who feel that others can have what they cannot have? I believe that it would really be better and fairer either to forbid all divorces or to make the procedure such that all would be able to obtain advantage of what, as I said a few moments ago, is either a right or a favour.

If a man or a woman desires a divorce from this Parliament, the first step is to advertise for six months in the Canada Gazette. Can anybody imagine anything more absolutely absurd than that? What conceivable benefit is to be derived by advertising for six months in the Canada Gazette? Of course, a divorce Bill is a Private Bill, and in the majority of Private Bills for charters of railway companies and corporations, one can quite understand how it would be proper that notice be given to all parties interested. In a divorce case, inasmuch as you have to serve the party interested with a notice of procedure, and the man or woman who has run away with somebody else is not very apt to while away the long hours of a dreary winter in another land by reading the Canada Gazette, that seems an absurd step.

The party has then to advertise in two papers in the county in which he or she resides. Again I ask for what purpose?

9 p.m.

The proceedings here are so expensive—$210 is the first item to be paid—that a poor person practically cannot obtain a divorce.

Then there is another matter that is known to every hon. member. Could there possibly be a greater scandal, could there by anything more calculated to bring our proceedings and ourselves under contempt, than the amount of lobbying that every member knows goes on in connection with divorce Bills? Is it not a fact that the senators and the members of this House are beset by those who are interested in the decisions to be given under divorce petitions? Only last session—and this perhaps brought the question to my mind more closely than it had been brought before—I happened, in room 16, to speak of a certain divorce which was before the House. I spoke rather unfavourably as to the prospects of one party to the divorce. When I arrived home on the following Sunday, I found that the fair petitioner was in my parlour to interview me. We are supposed to be sitting here as judges. Can one conceive of a state of judicial procedure in

which it is considered the proper thing for the litigant, particularly if she is young and pretty, to intercede for justice with the judge between the sitttings of the court?

After the petition is brought into the Senate, it is referred to a committee of nine members, three of whom are lawyers. While the procedure, as I have said before, is most absurd and grotesque, I think it is only fair to say a word in commendation of the Chairman who for so many years has so faithfully, so energetically and so well presided over the Senate Committee. I believe that Senator Kirchhoffer, who this session has been obliged, through what I hope is only temporary indisposition, to allow another gentleman to take his place, has presided over the committee for seventeen years. During that period I believe that only one Bill, that came from the Senate Committee to the Senate, eventually did not pass, and I believe that one Bill that come to this House last session did not pass.

The work of that committee has been onerous even if it has been rather absurd. We all know that the Senate has frequent and lengthy adjournments. A divorce petition is set down for hearing, and when the witnesses arrive from Winnipeg, Vancouver or Halifax—not from Halifax, because Nova Scotia has a divorce court of its own—it is found that the Senate has adjourned and will not sit for a couple of weeks. Then the Chairman has to hunt around and get a quorum to save the people the extra expense that might be incurred. Thus the committee has to sit not only while the House is in session, but while the House is adjourned, in order to carry on its business. If it had not been for the care, the wise legal ability of the Chairman of the Senate, the abuses that would naturally flow, and that to a certain extent have flowed from our system, would have become so intolerable long ago that the present state of the law would have been entirely changed.

I do not desire to occupy the time of the House longer, because it is not my object to lay down a remedy. I am asking the Government of the day, asking the House, asking any members who take an interest in this most important question, to endeavour to solve a difficulty which certainly exists at the present time. Perhaps I may be laughed at for saying this, but it seems to me that, if I am right in the views that I have expressed, this is a subject which members on both sides of the House might fairly and honestly discuss and for which they might try to work out a remedy that not only would be just to many of our fellow citizens, but would save a great many heart burnings through those feeings of injustice which certainly exist at the present time. I hope the Government will take the matter into consideration. If the Government and the House are perfectly satisfied that the present system of procedure is the best that can be devised, and that in no way can a simpler or cheaper procedure be discovered, then by all means let us cling to our present procedure. But if there is any way in which the procedure can be simplified and the expense lessened, I beg of the Government and of the House to do their best to attain that end.

In conclusion, I would like to say that in the line which I am taking in this case, I am following exactly the line taken by one of the commissioners appointed under this Royal Commission in 1910—' our trusty and entirely beloved counsellor Cosmo Gordon, Archbishop of York, Primate of England and Meropolitan.' When I take the view expressed by the Archbishop of York, the Primate of England, I at all events cannot be accused of trying to stir up strife. On the contrary, I am trying to obtain justice if possible. Let me point out—because the matter may be referred to later on and may not be represented as it should be—that this Matrimonal Causes Commission was appointed in 1909, and I am sure it would be instructive to look for a moment at some of the reasons why it was appointed. I read the following from the warrant of their appointment:

> Whereas we have deemed it expedient that a commission should forthwith issue to inquire into the present state of the law and the adminstration thereof in divorce or matrimonial causes and applications for separation orders, especially with regard to the position of the poorer classes in relation thereto.

Then it goes on:

> And we do hereby empower you to make an interim report with a view to making such suggestions as you may recommend of enabling such steps as you may recommend to be taken for the redress of any hardship from which, in your opinion, the poorer classes may suffer under the existing law and administration.

The object of this commission was twofold. In the first place it was to ascertain whether or not additional or further ground for divorce should be allowed. With that I have nothing whatever to do; it has no part or lot in my motion. The other object of the commission was to ascertain what relief could be given to the poorer classes, and it is this phase of the matter with which I wish particularly to deal. Majority and minority reports were

made by this commission, the Archbishop of York, Sir William R. Anson and Sir Lewis T. Dibdin signing the minority report. The differences of opinion between these gentlemen and the gentlemen of the majority was based exclusively on the question as to whether or not the grounds for divorce should be added to or increased. The Archbishop of York, Sir William Anson and Sir Lewis T. Dibdin dissented, making a minority report as to increasing the grounds. On the other point, the propriety of lessening the expense to the poorer classes, they were entirely in accord with the majority of the commission. So that, although both majority and minority reports were submitted, the whole commission, including the former judge of the Divorce Court and the Archbishop of York, the Primate of England, were heartily in accord with the terms of the resolution I have moved to-night. I should like to read briefly from page 172 of the minority report the views of the Archbishop of York, which I consider to be very appropriate in this connection:

The question submitted to the present Royal Commission is, in effect, whether the statute law made by Parliament in 1857 needs reconsideration either as to the grounds of divorce, or as to courts. The nation more emphatically than in 1857 now includes persons of every variety of creed and of no creed, all of whom have a right to be considered by Parliament in any amendment of the English divorce law, and it seems to us to follow that in framing our report we are bound to treat the question on the broad grounds of the real interests of the whole community and with reference to the actual conditions of our day. We do not therefore express an opinion as to whether the action of the legislature in 1857—

That is, in establishing the court.

—was wise or unwise, or as to whether the welfare of the nation has been promoted by the divorce statute of that year. The repeal of the existing divorce act, even if desirable, is not practicable.

The Archbishop, therefore, takes exactly the view which I take. Personally, he was opposed to divorce, but, realizing that legislation permitting divorce was in existence, and finding it practically impossible to repeal it, he took what I contend to be the sensible view, and said: Whilst I should not have approved it originally, since the Act is there and cannot be repealed, let us make it as near perfect as possible. I wish to quote again from the minority report:

With regard to the question as to whether greater facilities are necessary to enable persons of slender means living at considerable distance from London to exercise their statutory rights under the divorce acts, it is of course absolutely incontestable that no one ought to be deprived of his legal rights merely by poverty. Further, the evidence has in our opinion established that the centralization of all divorce business in London and the cost of divorce proceedings have in fact prevented a considerable number of poor persons and persons of small means from bringing suits in the divorce court, which, but for the expense they might have brought successfully.

For any one who wishes to take the trouble to read it, there are here heart-rending accounts of the effects of the law upon poorer families. The deserted husband or wife, as the case might be, being unable to marry again, the usual results, the children of course paying the penalty, came about.

I shall not further occupy the attention of the House, but will conclude by urging the Government to take this matter into their serious and speedy consideration. I desire also to urge upon the members of this House the fact that this is not a political question; it is a subject which, to my mind, should appeal to every representative of the people. We must not forget that every member of this House, no matter whence he comes, does not represent only the people who elected him, for that is not the principle of our constitution. According to our constitution, theoretically every voter in Canada comes to Ottawa to make the laws, but inasmuch as practically that is impossible, the country has been divided into constituencies, each of which is allowed to send one or more representatives to Ottawa to represent all the people of this country. Therefore, every member sitting in this House, I care not on which side of the House he sits, is a representative of the injured poor of this country who are deprived of the right of redress which their wealthier neighbours have. I plead with the Government and I plead with hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, not only for the sake of the injured persons; not only for the sake of the unfortunate little children who pay the heaviest penalty of all, but for the sake of society in Canada, that we may give one proof at least of the fact that the members of this House are prepared to do what is right and fair and just by the people of Canada, irrespective of their financial position.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): As a very unwilling member of the Divorce Committee, I should like to say a word or two with regard to this resolution. It seems to me—and I think

I am a fairly impartial observer, being an unmarried man—that it is very hard to reason sensibly about this matter, because we regard marriage as a contract, and if it be a legal contract it should be dissoluble as other contracts are; and therefore really not a marriage at all; by mutual consent the parties could go their way. But of course the contract means something more than this. There are two ways, it seems, of solving the situation. One is by divorce. Up to the time of the divorce the people are married; but where there is nullification of the marriage, it is found that they have never been married at all, and the woman is declared to have been a common prostitute from the beginning. That is what nullification means, and you can put me down as against nullification. And what is divorce? Suing for the privilege of marrying again, if you please. The parties concerned are at liberty to get an order of protection or separation from the courts; simply because they want to get married again they appeal in this heartrending way to the people of this country. Therefore I say there is no justification for divorce, and put me down as against divorce. My experience on the Divorce Committee, which reminds me of what I would call scavenging proceedings, has been unhappy in the extreme, and I would like to be liberated therefrom, and at once, if possible. I can see no justification for the perpetuation of any such mockeries of the marriage ceremony.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville): I have listened with great attention to my hon. friend the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup), who, as usual, has presented his case with that ability and legal acumen which is well known to members of this House. I would not, under ordinary circumstances, have thought it proper to address the House on this subject because it is well known that, with other members of this House, I belong to a church which does not consider divorce and remarriage as a result of divorce as permissible. You, Sir, will have noticed that when a Bill granting a divorce, comes from the Senate to this House, the members who belong to my church do not take part in the debate and do not vote. I do not care to present to the House any religious plea on this question, and I hasten to say that I do not intend to preach or to dogmatize. Certainly the Roman Catholic church, to which I have the honour to belong, is not the only one to take the stand which it takes; the Anglican church in this country is opposed to the consequence of divorce, namely remarriage. My hon. friend, however, has made a strong case from his point of view, and he has urged upon the Government the necessity of bringing about reform. He stated that this country was rapidly filling up with foreigners, immigrants coming from all lands, and that the time had come when equal justice should be handed to the poor as well as to the rich. I agree with my hon. friend that immigrants are pouring into this country from all parts of the world. We are in the process of building up our young country. But may I be permitted to say that there is more than the material aspect to that process of building up Canada, there is a moral aspect to it which must not be disregarded? In my humble judgment, speaking for a large number of Canadians, I believe, of both races and of diverse creeds, we should not enlarge the facilities to grant divorces and in this respect I beg to radically differ with my able and genial friend from Hastings. We boast that this is a white man's country. Why not proclaim that this is also a Christian country? Should we not on a question of this nature, profit by the experience of other peoples, of other nations, not too far from our own borders?

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has made an historical survey of the subject. He has expounded very ably the custom which was followed before the Reformation in the Western church and in the Eastern church; and he has explained how it came that in English Canonical Courts, divorce decrees were granted, then later on by Act of Parliament, and, since 1857, if I mistake not, by regular divorce courts. May I be permitted to go also to fundamentals and to express the views held by not only the members of my church, but by the members of various Christian churches? Sir, in the marriage ceremony no mention is made of possible divorce. Each party swears solemnly to the other, 'for better, for worse, till death do us part.' If adultery be held to dissolve marriage it would lead to relative promiscuity since either party might remarry many times. The knowledge that they are not allowed to divorce and remarry will always tend to induce husbands and wives to minimize differences which they otherwise might magnify into occasions for separation. The risk of an agreement between the two that each should allow full liberty to the other is not one of which the law can take account, but against which

public opinion may be expected to express itself very strongly. Nothing can be worse for children, for homes and for country, than the knowledge that divorce can be easily granted. Divorce—and I come back to the point which I made a moment ago that we should profit by the experience of our near-by neighbours—divorce has been most disastrous in the United States, where each concession has led to another worse concession. Now, I have said on other occasions that on political questions we were often asked to ignore what we could learn from the United States and sometimes that, on the contrary, we were asked to follow what the United States were teaching us. The example of the United States in matters of divorce is one which we should not follow, as it is simply appalling in its consequences. Far be it from my mind to attempt to libel the American republic. I think it is Edmund Burke who once said that you could not libel a whole people. But divorce in the United States has become not only a scandal but a curse. This is admitted by all churches and by all creeds in the United States. It is agreed and it is admitted by all good law-abiding citizens. I have under my hand some statistics which were published not very long ago, in December, 1911, upon this subject. I had the census reports of the United States but I left them in my library and have here now only this clipping from the Chicago Tribune. This shows that, according to the census of the United States, there has been in that country between the years 1887 and 1906, a total of 1,045,625 divorces. During the same period 12,832,000 marriage licenses were issued. That is to say, you have to-day in the United States one divorce for each twelve. Am I not right in saying that this facility to obtain divorce decrees has become a curse with our near neighbours the Americans? So much so, that not later than the last session of Congress, Senator Ransdell, of Louisiana, introduced a Bill to prevent divorced persons from marrying again. When introducing his Bill, Senator Ransdell said that there were twice as many divorces in the United States as in the rest of Christendom. He said that the remedy he proposed would appear very radical indeed, but that the disease was deep-seated. It had reached an acute stage and affected all classes. Let me remind my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) that the divorce courts of the United States are accessible to the poorer classes as well as to the rich, and with what result—one divorce out of every twelve marriages, as I said a moment ago. Senator Ransdell gives the following figures: In 1867 there were 9,937 divorces or 27 per 100,000 of population; in 1906, forty years later, there were 72,062 divorces or 86 per 100,000 of population. That meant that there were seven times more divorces in 1906 than in 1867, or 319 per cent, and the rate has been increasing since 1906. I read in the last census report of the United States the following:

> The divorce rate, like the velocity of a falling body, is constantly increasing. The enormous increase in divorce revealed by these statistics naturally raises the question: How far this increase is to be attributed to growth in population? The rate of increase in divorce is far greater than the rate of increase in population.

President Roosevelt made the following comment on the census statistics:

> This is one of the most unpleasant and dangerous features of our American life: the loosening of the marital tie among the old native American families.

My hon. friend has given a list of civilized countries which have established special divorce courts after having promulgated divorce laws. Among those countries he mentioned France. I do not pretend to know much about the other countries mentioned by my hon. friend, except those which are a part of the British Empire, but I have some knowledge of what is taking place in France through the reading of books on history, economics and social questions. The number of divorces in France is, at the present time, causing grave alarm and apprehension. As my hon. friend well knows, there is no state church in France. The Government does not pretend to be friendly even to the church, which for centuries was the dominant church in that country. The statesmen of France—many of them indifferent in matters religious, many of them free thinkers, some of them belonging to a different faith than that of the majority of the French people—these statesmen, actually, are perturbed over the consequences of the law in regard to divorce which was adopted in 1884. In France, as in England, the opinions on the question of divorce were during the last century quite chaotic. Before the revolutionary period around 1789, we find that the ecclesiastical court, as in England before the Reformation, was the only one to take cognizance of matrimonial cases, but after the revolution the question of divorce was dealt with as it was in England at the time of the Reformation. Divorce decrees were granted during the

revolution. Then the legislature abolished divorce and France reverted for a time to the old system, but it was again established. But later on, and even under the third republic, the simple law of separation prevailed, a mensa et thoro, that is, the parties after separation had not the right of remarrying. But in 1884 the Act introduced by Mr. Naquet came into force and has remained up to the present time. What has been the result? The statesmen of France to-day view with alarm the results of that law. There has been actual depopulation in France, which is largely attributable to the existence of that law. In France, divorce may be obtained for adultery, violence endangering life, cruelty, penal servitude or grave indignity. This last ground is of elastic definition and includes desertion and habitual drunkenness. Statistics covering the period from 1886 to 1905 show that divorces in France have increased from 2,950 to 10,573 per annum, and since 1906 this number has materially increased. I say it again, the ease with which divorce may be obtained in France is one of the causes of depopulation in that country. My hon. friend has made a very able survey of the report of the commission appointed in 1909-10 in England to consider this question of divorce. He has referred to the majority report and also to the minority report. My hon. friend says that the great question involved in the evidence heard before that commission was whether or not there should be more grounds for granting divorce. He is quite right in that. He has stated truly that His Grace the Archbishop of York Right Hon. Sir William R. Anson, Bart., M.P., and Sir Lewis T. Dibdin, Dean of the Arches, had made a minority report in which they partially disagree with the commission, and in which they make some comment on the granting of new grounds for divorce. It is from that very able minority report that I wish to quote at the present time, because I find that my separate brethren have on this question the same feeling as those who belong to the Roman Catholic Church. It says:

> It is obvious that this commission is not so composed as to be competent to speak with authority on such questions.

Referring to questions of scriptural interpretation:

> But what is far more important, and indeed exceedingly impressive, is the absolute unanimity of these witnesses upon the fact and the nature of our Lord's teaching to the world on marriage and divorce. All agreed that Christ intended to proclaim the great principle that marriage ought to be indissoluble. There is wide divergence as to whether the ideal thus held up by our Lord was or was not intended by Him to exclude any exceptions, but there is no doubt in the minds of any of the theological witnesses as to that ideal itself. To quote one of them (Dr Inge): 'It seems clear that Christ in the words so variously reported by the Evangelists intended to inculcate a higher view of the sacredness of marriage than was held by the Rabbis of either school. Divorce had been allowed by Moses for the hardness of your hearts', but 'from the beginning', that is to say, according to God's intention, marriage is essentially an inviolable contract terminable only by death.' When we compare the principle thus enunciated and vouched for by this remarkable consensus of authority as truly representing our Lord's teaching, with the principle, if there be any, which underlies the recommendation of the Majority Report, we find them irreconciliable. If the one is calculated to promote the public good, the other cannot be so. That marriage should be normally lifelong and indissoluble and that marriage should be dissoluble on grounds which lend themselves to the easiest collusion, and which seem necessarily to involve the right of either partner to put an end to it at will, are contradictory propositions. If the nation desires, as we believe it does, to maintain the ideal of lifelong obligation, it cannot permit Parliament to lay down a long and increasing list of statutory exceptions, some of them dependent for their effect upon the construction of terms, which do not admit of precise definition, by judges who may well vary in their intellectual and moral attitude towards these questions of divorce.

So we see that the minority report goes much further than my hon. friend stated a moment ago. It seems clearly established from what I have read that this very important minority report differs essentially from the attitude taken by the majority as to the initial right to grant divorce. But, Mr. Speaker, there is more than that. If we look to the best minds in England—in Protestant England—to-day what do we see? Let me quote, for instance, the opinion of the great Gladstone himself, that eminent churchman, so highly respected by all. What does he say about the passing of the Divorce Act of 1857 quoted by hon. friend? (Reading):

> A time may come when society cannot bear the strictness of the Christian law, and will reject the drill that is necessary to make the soldier. It will then doubtless largely fall back upon that lower conception of marriage, which treats it as a purely civil contract between individuals. If we are not strong enough to hold the lower portion of society up to Christianity, let us not be mad enough to drag the very rites of Christianity down to the lowered and lowering level of society. Let the salt of the earth still keep its savour, and the darkness of the body be illumined, as far as it may, by the eye that still wakes within it.

I might multiply quotations of that nature, but it is unnecessary to do so.

I come now to Canada. Let us see what the situation is with the Canadian Parliament and with the Canadian people as regards this very important question. Some years ago the late Sir Richard Scott, once a member of the Government and Secretary of State for Canada, published a very interesting letter which I found in the Library yesterday. I do not intend to quote the whole of the letter, but simply to give in a more elaborate way than I could by using the statistics published in the Canadian Year Book, an idea of the growth of divorce in Canada. Sir Richard Scott in this letter says:

In a return of all divorces granted since Confederation moved for in the Senate last session the following facts were disclosed: In the first ten years after Confederation seven divorces were granted; in the next ten years sixteen were granted; in the following ten years thirty-six divorce bills were passed; in the next ten years, ending in 1907, fifty-nine divorces were granted; and in the last three sessions forty-four were granted. If the yearly increasing average is kept up, the current ten year term will show over two hundred and fifty divorces. And it must be remembered that there are divorce courts in four of the provinces. Up to the year 1906 Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia had granted one hundred and forty-five divorces, British Columbia leading with seventy-two. These figures do not, of course, include the many wife desertions that are constantly occurring, chiefly in the cities and towns. If the records of the Children's Aid Societies and other relief organizations were examined they would show a long list of families left in distress by fathers who have abandoned wives and dchildren, to be cared for by the public, and, ignoring the divorce court, have picked up another mate, and found a clergyman ready for a couple of dollars to perform the marriage ceremony.

In proof of that statement let me refer to the last published report of Criminal Statistics. It will be found in No. 9 Sessional papers, 1910, pages 18 to 22. The total number of indictments for bigamy in the year were fifty-nine, acquittals twelve.

Of the convictions, there were two in Nova Scotia, two in Quebec, four in Manitoba, and thirty-five in Ontario. Fourteen of the latter were in the county of York (Toronto), with twelve convictions. The residences of nearly all those charged were in the cities and towns. The actual number of those who committed bigamy in that year would probably be three times the number of those charged, as it is usually only those who remain in localities near where they previously lived who are prosecuted. Those who removed to distant points or who leave the country are not again heard of, and often the deserted wife is glad to be rid of a worthless spouse.

I have stated the doctrine of the church to which I have the honour to belong, and I have also said that the Roman Catholic church does not stand isolated on this question. Some years ago I had as my professor in McGill university, my esteemed friend and confrere at the Bar of Montreal, Dr. L. H. Davidson, K.C., who is chancellor of the diocese of Montreal. I wrote to Dr. Davidson the other day on this subject, and from him I learned that the Anglican church in Canada stands with the Roman Catholic church on the question of divorce. With your permission, Sir, I shall read the letter I received from that distinguished lawyer and churchman:

Montreal, 23rd January, 1914.

The Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, K.C.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

My Dear Mr. Lemieux,

I have to apologize for delay in answering your letter in regard to the question of divorce.

The Church of England in Canada, whilst recognizing the separation of married parties a mensa et thoro—upon the authority of Our Lord for fornication or adultery, does not admit of divorce in the sense of dissolving the marriage tie and enabling thereby the parties to remarry. The matter was very fully discussed in our General Synod of Canada—the general legislative body of the Church of England, from the Atlantic to the Pacific—in 1905, and at the Triennial Session then held, the Canon, copy of which I enclose to you herewith, was enacted, the same having been remitted to the Lower House upon its adoption by the Upper House (of Bishops) and concurred in by the Lower House. It is now the Law of the Church of England in Canada.

You will notice that by the Canon, Priests of the Church of England are forbidden to solemnize a marriage between persons either of whom have been divorced, during the lifetime of the other; that is, the marriage bond is indissoluble according to the law of the church.

I am satisfied that if it were impossible under the civil law for divorced persons to remarry there would be few if any applications to the Parliament of Canada for divorce.

The law of the province of Quebec permitting separation from bed and board is a good law, but as you know not very often invoked. Facilities for divorce induce facilities for difficulties between married people and it has become a gross evil and a scandal of the worst sort as you well know throughout the United States, and wherever divorce is easy and remarriage of divorced parties is by the law of the state allowed.

I feel very strongly that no law of the State should be in contradiction of the law of God applicable to all mankind and that the result is invariably injurious to the best interests of the nation and the individual, where such a contradiction exists, as it does in this matter of divorce.

I am, my dear Mr. Lemieux,
your old professor,
(Sgd.) L. H. Davidson.

P.S. I omitted to say that the discussion in our Synod turned almost entirely upon granting permission to the innocent party—so called— in case of divorce to remarry, but the final decision as above stated excludes marriage even by the innocent party—if such a party there be as a general rule in divorce proceedings.

Canon V, Marriage and Divorce.

(Passed Session IV, Journal pp. 25, 28, 1905)

No clergymen within the jurisdiction of the Church of England in Canada shall solemnize a marriage between persons, either of whom shall have been divorced from one who is living at the time.

I am sure I will hurt the feelings of no one body in this House when I say that not only as a Roman Catholic but as a Canadian, I, together with many others belonging to different churches, oppose any widened facilities to our existing divorce procedure. If I had my own way I would restrict separation as it is granted in the province of Quebec; that is to say, without any faculty of remarriage.

The State is deeply concerned in this question; the state protects family life, defines and defends the authority of parents over their children, the rights of children to the care of their parents, the obligation of husband and wife towards each other. The State, therefore, has a concern of its own in the peace of the community, the welfare of the family, the rearing of healthy children and the training of them to be good citizens. In my humble judgment, divorce and remarriage as a consequence, endanger all that. We like—especially my imperialist friends, and I have many friends amongst the imperialists—we like, to cite the example of ancient Rome. Indeed, we all admire the splendours of Rome and the genius of the Romans, but we must not forget that Rome was pagan, and that in pagan Rome repudiation and divorce were rampant. We know from the most illustrious historian of Rome, Gibbon, that the decay of the Roman Empire can be traced to the laxity of its morals. Marriage, in Rome, had become a bond which could be broken with such deplorable facility that it is said this inscription was found on a tombstone: 'Conjugi piae, inclytae univirae,' which, freely translated, means: 'Remarkable fact: here lies a pious wife who had but one husband.'

It seems to me that the granting of any further facilities to obtain divorce would be to revert to pagan Rome; to revert to paganism itself. I would rather follow the teaching of my church and the teaching of the Anglican church in Canada, which is comprised in the precept of Our Lord: 'What, therefore, God hath joined together let not man put asunder.'

Speaking of old Roman Imperialism, I might be permitted to quote what John Bright said about this mania of always borrowing from old pagan Rome. Speaking at Birmingham in 1857, John Bright said:

Now, I do not think that examples taken from pagan, sanguinary Rome, are proper models for the imitation of a Christian country, nor would I limit my hopes of the greatness of England even to the long duration of eight hundred years. But what is Rome now? The great city is dead. A poet has described her as the 'lone mother of dead empires.' Her language even, is dead. Her very tombs are empty; the ashes of her most illustrious citizens are dispersed.

The Scipios' tomb contains no ashes now. Yet, am I asked, I, who am one of the legislators of a Christian country, to measure my policy by the policy of ancient and pagan Rome!

I believe there is no permanent greatness to a nation except it be based upon morality.

In conclusion, I think that the duty of Parliament at the present hour is not to increase the facilities for obtaining divorce decrees, but the duty of Parliament, the duty of the legislators, in the best interest of Canada and her sons, is to surround with greater safeguards the sanctity of marriage. The example which has been set by the United States on this vexed question is one rather to be dreaded than imitated by a British country, nay, by a Christian country.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.): It is not my intention to follow the line of argument of my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), because I do not think the motion of the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup) raises the question of whether divorces should be granted in Canada or not.

Were I at liberty to make a law as I would like to see it made, I am rather of the opinion that I would be entirely in harmony with my hon. friend from Rouville. I have had some experience in divorce cases, and I must say that they have always seemed repugnant to me. I believe that they are repugnant to every solicitor or counsel who is unfortunate enough to have anything to do with them. I am rather inclined to take the opinion referred to by my hon. friend from Hastings a short time ago, which was voiced by the Archbishop of York, in a report which he made to the British Parliament, while deprecating the granting of divorces, yet he was afraid that the system had obtained such a foothold in the country that it would be impossible to repeal the law.

We might as well face conditions as they are in Canada at the present time. I do not believe that it is possible to pass a law entirely abolishing the granting of divorces in Canada. I do not mean to say

that we have not the legal right to do so, but I am rather of the opinion that the Archbishop of York was voicing the sentiment in England which has a pretty strong hold in Canada to-day. Certainly, however, were I given the right to frame a law for the whole of Canada, I should not extend the well known grounds for divorce which are supposed to exist in the Senate, and which we know are carried into effect in the four provinces in which there are divorce courts. As I apprehend the matter, the real object of the hon. member for Hastings is that this Parliament should divest itself not of the right but of the fact of granting divorces and should constitute courts in the several provinces to take charge of them, the same as there are in the three Maritime provinces and in the province of British Columbia.

My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has quoted some statistics in order to show that in the provinces where divorces are granted, there is a greater number than there is in the rest of Canada. That is true to some extent, but when you look into the statistics, you will be surprised to see how few divorces are granted in the Maritime provinces as compared with the rest of Canada. I have before me to-night the Canada Year Book of 1912. I do not think there are any later statistics upon this question. I find in the province of New Brunswick, which lies just alongside of the State of Maine, a state in which I believe the question of granting divorces without law or reason has been carried to as great an extreme as it has been in the State of Nevada, a state in which divorces are granted simply for incompatibility of temperament, for any fanciful device which any man or woman may put forward in order to obtain a divorce—in the province of New Brunswick lying for one hundred miles along the border of the state of Maine, and in a province in which one would think that the people might to some extent be influenced by the social conditions existing among their neighbours across the boundary line, only 115 divorces have been granted since 1868, or in 44 years an average of about 2·6 divorces per year. It is true that during the years 1908, 1909, 1910 and 1911 there were a few more than the average. In 1908, there were 5; in 1909, 6; in 1910, 5; and in 1911, 6. In 1912 the number dropped to 4. If you take the list right up to 1868, you will find that it runs for a few years 'no divorces granted,' then it increases 1, 2, 3, 4, and then it decreases back to one again. In other words, the number of divorces granted during all this period of time has not increased to any appreciable extent. The increases have been no greater than the natural increase in population. Yet this is in a province lying for a hundred miles along the boundary line of a state in which divorces are granted for any reason which two people might put forward who wanted a dissolution of the bonds of matrimony.

10 p.m.

I do not think that these statistics will bear out the fears entertained by hon. members who are opposed to regulating the granting of these divorces to a provincial court. I am afraid that any members who entertain those fears do not realize the difference between the method of granting divorces in our courts of law and the method in the Senate of Canada. I mention the Senate, because we know that, as a matter of fact, the whole question as to whether or not a divorce shall be granted is decided in the Senate Committee, although pro forma it has to go through this House. I think my hon. friend from Hastings stated that only one case that was favourably reported upon by the Senate Committee was refused by the Senate, and only one case that was passed by the Senate was refused by this House.

I do not wish to say anything against the hon. members of the Senate who act as judges in these matters. When you consider what a great majority of the members of that committee are not even professional men but men drawn from the ordinary walks of life, it is somewhat wonderful that they arrive at as true a conception of the evidence as they do. No doubt a large proportion of the justice of these decisions is due to the excellent judgment of the Chairman, who has occupied that position for so many years. Those hon. gentlemen of the House of the legal profession who have taken the trouble to read the evidence taken in the divorce cases which come before the Upper House—and I personally have read nearly every case that has come up during my experience as a member of the House—will agree with me that many divorces are granted on evidence which would not be entertained for a moment in the divorce courts of the Maritime provinces or, perhaps, of the province of British Columbia. In the divorce court the hardest case to win is the undefended case, for the simple reason that it is the duty of the divorce judge to take the position of protector of the rights of the Crown. In such a case the judge al-

most intuitively takes the ground that there is collusion, and that it is his duty to see that no injustice is done.

Mr. BORDEN: Is there a King's Proctor in New Brunswick?

Mr. CARVELL: There is not, but the judge assumes the duties of King's Proctor, and it is the duty of the judge to see that no divorce is granted except on the strongest evidence. Knowing the law to be as it is, solicitors naturally inform their clients that there is only one ground upon which they can obtain divorce, and that they must produce evidence to that effect. Nothing but absolute evidence of adultery will do in these courts, and solicitors naturally advise their clients that it is useless to proceed with the case, and that it is a costly experiment, even in the Maritime provinces. I do not believe there is a solicitor here from the provinces of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia who has not been approached by many persons every year with requests for the institution of divorce proceedings, and who has been obliged to tell them that there is no use in their putting their money in it. The principle of granting divorces is acknowledged by this Parliament and by every province of Canada to be correct.

An hon. MEMBER: Except in Quebec.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not agree with that; I say that the principle of granting of divorces is accepted in the province of Quebec, as it is in Ontario and New Brunswick. I am free to admit—and I give them credit for it—that the dominant church in the province of Quebec has set its face against divorce, and I am against it practically as much as they are. It must be admitted that all over Canada the law provides for the granting of divorce. Admitting that to be the principle of the law, I say there is no reason why this cumbersome, expensive, unfair and discriminatory method of granting divorce should be continued. Why allow the rich man or the rich woman to come to Parliament and obtain a divorce, and deny the same privilege to the poor man or the poor woman? I have never prosecuted a divorce case through the Parliament of Canada, but I have been told that it practically involves an expenditure of $1,000. In the provinces it can be done for $100 and in many cases, probably for less. If it be right to grant divorces, then I submit that it is unfair and discriminating so to provide that the rich person can take advantage of the law, and that the poor person, because he has not $1,000 to invest in it, cannot do so.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. BORDEN: My hon. friend, of course, does not mean that where it is necessary to obtain witnesses in a foreign country, possibly at a great distance from the place where the proceedings are instituted, divorce can be procured in the Maritime provinces for $100. I have seen divorce cases in the province of Nova Scotia costing, I venture to say, more than any divorce case that ever went through the Senate.

Mr. CARVELL: I am fully aware of that; I think I know enough about the cost of proceedings in the courts to know that you cannot send to foreign countries and get witnesses for $100. But that is not the ordinary class of witnesses usually called upon to testify in the provincial courts. The great majority of witnesses in these cases are drawn from the immediate districts in which the litigants live. I am speaking now not of extraordinary but of ordinary cases. The first divorce case I ever had anything to do with must have cost the parties at least $3,000, and they never got a decision from the judge, as he went off the bench—my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows the case to which I refer. The matter was brought up in another case, and finally the divorce was granted. Strange to say, it was the husband who brought the action in the first instance and the wife in the second. However, I am speaking only of the average case, and contending that if you admit the principle of divorce you ought not to grant it to a rich man and deny it to a poor man—and that is the result of the law as it is administered in Canada to-day, excepting the four provinces in which there are divorce courts.

I realize that this is a somewhat delicate subject. I realize that there are many members of this House who feel that because of their conscientious convictions they ought not to vote for any change in the law. I appeal to those gentlemen and ask them to place themselves in the position of the Archbishop of York, whose very important report was referred to by the hon. member for Hastings. Let hon. gentlemen make judges of themselves to-night, and placing themselves in the position of the reverend Archbishop, they will come to the conclusion that if we are going to maintain this principle, we should put the right to enjoy the operation of the law within the reach of the poorest people of the country as well as of the richest. I think the hon. member for Hastings very properly excluded from his resolution any

word or sentiment which would raise the debatable question whether divorce should be granted; he has tried to include in his motion only such provisions as affect the machinery by which divorce should be granted. He is asking this Parliament to give to the ordinary courts of the country the right to carry on in a proper manner that which I am afraid is, in many instances, being carried on by the Parliament of Canada in an improper way. I do not think we will be doing violence to the conscientious beliefs of any class of people or any religious denomination in Canada by passing the resolution which my hon. friend has proposed to-night. I am satisfied that if this resolution carries, and the members of this House, regardless of politics, apply themselves diligently to the matter, there will be no difficulty in devising a law which will do violence to the principles of no one, and which will do greater justice to the ordinary litigant of this country than is possible under the present system of granting divorces.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I rise principally for the purpose of pointing out something that appears to me to have been overlooked, or at all events not to have been clearly put forward by the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, and with regard to which I think the hon. member who has just taken his seat—I say it with all respect—seems to be under a misapprehension. If I felt called upon to discuss the general question whether there should be a divorce law or whether this Parliament should take steps to facilitate the obtaining of divorce in this country, I think I might very fairly satisfy myself with endorsing what has been said by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux).

My reason for rising is to point out that this motion, while it speaks, in terms, merely of the procedure under which divorces are granted, involves, for the obtaining of the amelioration of the procedure suggested by the hon. gentleman who moves it—and, if I understand him, endorsed and approved by the hon. member who has just taken his seat—the enactment of a substantive law creating in those provinces in which to-day there are no divorce courts, and, more than no divorce courts, no divorce laws, creating by law a right to divorce and prescribing the cause or causes which will entitle persons subjected to that law to divorce.

The hon. gentleman who has just sat down is, as I understand it at all events, mistaken when he says that we recognize the principle of divorce in the law of this country. I understand perfectly that in those provinces which have divorce courts and which have also a substantive law which those courts can administer and apply, prescribing the causes giving the right to divorce, the principle of divorce is recognized by the law. But in the five provinces where those conditions do not exist, not only the courts have not jurisdiction to pronounce divorces but there is no law under which anybody is entitled to a divorce; and if this Parliament confined itself to giving jurisdiction to hear divorce cases to courts in those provinces, those courts would sit with no law to apply. You cannot, to any purpose, confide to the court the procedure —to use the word of the motion—by which divorces are to be obtained, until you have first made a substantive law to which that procedure is going to apply.

Mr. CARVELL: Wherein is the difference between the granting of divorce for specific grounds and giving to another body the right to grant the divorce on the same ground?

Mr. DOHERTY: This Parliament, to use the expression of the hon. member, grants divorce on a particular ground, passes one Act for one individual, and why does it do it? Because that individual has come to it and said: I want to be an exception to the general law. We talk about coming to Parliament to obtain divorces and we talk about the procedure by which divorces are granted; but the whole operation is a legislative Act, and when a man comes to Parliament, on the face of his application he does not ask for a Bill to divorce anybody, but he asks for an Act for the relief of so and so; and relief from what? From an obligation that the general law imposes upon him. In those provinces where there is no divorce court there is equally no divorce law, and the general law of those provinces, I have no hesitation in saying, does not know divorce. Most assuredly in the province I come from the law does not know divorce, and it is because there is no law in force that persons, seeking it require special legislation. Let me speak of my own province—although I have no doubt I shall be borne out by lawyers from the other provinces—the man who comes here, say from the province of Quebec, and asks this Parliament for a divorce, is asking to be made an exception to the law. He comes here because, by law, he has no

right to a divorce. If by law he had a right to a divorce, it would naturally follow that that would be a right enforceable in a court. The reason why people have to come here is not because the courts have not jurisdiction; it is because there is no law which the courts could administer if they had the amplest jurisdiction. So what I want to point out is that this is not a motion involving a question of mere procedure; it is a motion which, in view of the speech of the hon. gentleman who introduced it, involves voting for the creation of a substantive divorce law. I understood the hon. gentleman who just sat down to say that if he were to-day in the position of being called upon to enact a substantive divorce law and had power to do it, he would be disposed to adopt such a law as the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) thinks ought to be adopted. If that is the sort of law that the hon. member would be disposed to adopt, the law had better stay precisely where it is, because, as regards the provinces which have not divorce courts, the law to-day does not recognize the principle of divorce. If there is inequality resulting from the fact that some people come here and get private legislation that makes a law for them and takes them out of the operation of the general law, it is not because the law is unequal. Before the law in these provinces, everybody's marriage is equally indissoluble; but this Parliament, having legislative power, may legislate that people who, by the law of the country, are married, and united in the bonds of an indissoluble marriage, shall be unmarried; that is all.

I understood the hon. member who moved the motion to state that he thought it would be better that there should be no divorces at all than that we should have the present unequal system. I quite agree with him that it would be better that there should be no divorces at all; but when he talks of our having an unequal system, the inequality is not the result of the unequal system; it is the result of our having no system at all, and the result of a fact which we cannot alter, that Parliament, in the exercise of its power, can pass legislation for the individual if Parliament want to. Parliament might, as Parliament can pass a law, if we choose to pass it, in the most emphatic terms, declaring that there shall be no divorce to-day and notwithstanding Parliament, by special legislation, might to-morrow make an exception, just as to-day, inasmuch as the law makes no provision for divorce—I am speaking of the provinces where there are no divorce courts—Parliament does step in occasionally and of its own motion withdraw a man from the operation of the law.

If we should pass an affirmative law saying there shall be no divorces, Parliament could, if Parliament desired, pass an Act for an individual who came and asked for it to take him out of the operation of that law; so that it is not in our power to bring about a condition where we could limit the powers of future parliaments, and say that they shall not, if they want to, pass legislation for the relief of particular individuals in particular cases. That is what is done to-day, and if the hon. member simply desired to alter procedure, then I would understand that the effect of his motion would be to ask this House to consider the present procedure that is adopted with regard to the passing of this particular class of Private Bills. But evidently from the way he supports his motion, he contemplates the suggestion of a remedy consisting in the transferring over of what in this Parliament is a legislative power; and by transferring it, converting it into a judicial power, over to the judges. To do that, and to put the judges into a position to exercise any power in the matter, the first thing that would have to be done is the enactment of a law which those judges could administer. We would have to have a law to prescribe that even adultery itself is, by law, a cause for divorce. We would have to have a law enacted to create a legal right to divorce. So that our position to-day is one that, as I understand it, we cannot possibly modify in the sense of preventing Parliament from enacting particular Acts in particular cases, and we cannot give jurisdiction to judges until we make a law of general application for the judges to administer. I think one has to really face the question whether we are prepared to introduce into the law of those provinces in which divorce does not exist, the institution of divorce, and to make a law as to what shall be sufficient cause to justify the granting of divorce. Then of course you would leave that law, as you leave any other law, to be administered by the courts. But that is the first step in getting the jurisdiction into the hands of the court. It is not a mere matter of transferring a judicial jurisdiction from this House to the courts. The power that Parliament exercises is a legislative power, and to get power into the hands of the judges you would have to

enact a law and confer upon them the judicial power to administer that law. I want to point that out so as to make it perfectly clear that those of us who feel that we ought to vote against this motion are not open to the suggestion that we are not willing to let the procedure in regard to Private Bills be improved.

Speaking for myself, while of course I do not think these Acts should be passed, believing as I do that no man should be granted a divorce, nevertheless, if these rules could be considered with a view to improving them—and their improvement from my point of view would mean with a view to reducing the probabilities of the particular Bills passing into and becoming law—if in the exercise of its legislative power, Parliament intends in the future to enact particular Bills of this kind, I for one, would be glad to see such improvement in the procedure as would ensure the making perfectly clear in each case the existence of the cause for enacting these laws. But, as I say, the proposition that is put before us involves, if the motion stands as at present, a pronouncement upon the question whether or not we should introduce into the law of those provinces which have it not, a law of divorce. I do not propose to go into any argument upon the question of the desirability of divorce. I rose for the purpose of making clear that what is involved in this motion is not a pure question of procedure; but the question whether the time has come when it is proper to adopt a general divorce law applicable within those provinces which have no such law at the present time. I need not say that the introduction of such a law would be a very radical change in the condition which has prevailed in this country up to the present day, and I venture to suggest that we have not had put before us any such public demand for such a radical change as would justify us in adopting it.

The hon. member who made the motion spoke of certain hardships which resulted in particular cases. The very best of laws will cause hardships in particular cases, and that we cannot get away from. But what we have to look at, is whether there exists any such demand among the people of this country based upon evidence going to show that the law as it stands to-day operates in a way to deprive the people, generally, of something which it is advantageous to them, and advantageous to the State, that they should have or whether, on the other hand, we have not reason to congratulate ourselves upon the results that have followed upon the system to which we have been able to adhere up to the present, a system under which the law knows not divorce. When one dwells on inequalities in this regard, one dwells upon an inequality that exists and will continue to exist with regard to all things that may be obtained from Parliament by special or private legislation. It always costs something to pass private legislation. Divorce Bills are private legislation. I do not know that it has been shown that they cost more than other private legislation, and I do not think it can be said that it has been demonstrated here to-night, that even if those things were in the hands of the court that the rich man would not be in a better position to meet the expenses he would have to incur there, than the poor man, nor has it been made very clear that, as a rule at all events, the expense of passing a Bill before this House is greater than the expense of obtaining a judgment before an ordinary court. For my part I am not very much concerned in that. I would be thoroughly glad to see the inequality that exists absolutely disappear. The simplest and shortest way to bring about the disappearance of the inequality is not to put the poor man in the place the rich man is in to-day, but to take the rich man and put him in the place the poor man is in to-day, and leave them both to be governed by what is the common law of the country. Give to neither of them an exceptional law for himself. I think the part of wisdom certainly is for us to adhere to the system that has served us so well up to the present. We should have at the very least an unmistakable demand a demonstration of some measure of widespread wrong resulting from that system in the past, before we seek to alter it in such a very fundamental manner as is involved in the proposal set forth in the motion before us as explained by the hon. gentleman who so eloquently and so ably put the case in support of the motion.

Mr. G. H. BARNARD (Victoria, B.C.): Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from a province which has a divorce court of its own, I desire to say that I listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion which has taken place this evening. I was particularly interested in listening to the reply of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) to the case as stated by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), although it did appear to me that the speech of the

hon. member for Rouville was not altogether a reply to that of the hon. member for East Hastings. The hon. member for Rouville devoted his attention to an argument against the principles of divorce as a whole. The hon. member for East Hastings, on the other hand, commenced with the premise that the condition is with us, that we have divorce. While I can appreciate the argument of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) that there is no law in some of the eastern provinces of this Dominion providing for divorce, and that if we give the machinery to them there will be no law for them to enforce, yet, at the same time, the fact remains that the condition is that any man who can afford to and who comes to this Parliament and can produce evidence of a certain state of facts, can get his divorce. It is somewhat difficult to drive into the head of a man who is applying for a divorce, and who is put to what seems an extraordinary and unnecessary expense, the difference between the fact of a court having jurisdiction and there being no law for it to enforce.

In regard to the law as it is in force in British Columbia, I would like to say that, in my opinion, it works extremely well. It has been in force since Confederation. It has not been abused. The sanctity of the marriage state is as highly regarded there as in any other part of Canada, and I think that so long as we have as good reason as we have in Canada to be proud of the Bench we need have no fears that such a law would be abused. I can quite realize that this is a question on which members of this House should have a very serious difference of opinion. I think that, while I am in sympathy with the idea which my hon. friend from East Hastings wishes to carry into effect, the best way probably would be to have a committee of this House appointed that would go into this question of procedure and the desirability of granting a substantive divorce law so that the House can then deal with the matter in proper form and have the whole of the evidence before it. I would, therefore, beg to move in amendment the following:

That all the words after the word 'that' to the end of the question be omitted, and the following substituted therefor:

A committee of seven members to be appointed to inquire into the existing procedure under which divorces are granted, and to report whether any and what more satisfactory procedure should be provided in such cases.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we have listened with a great deal of interest to the somewhat divergent views which have been expressed in regard to this question; and I may say that those who have had the privilege of being members of this House for fifteen or twenty years, are aware that this is by no means the first time that this subject has been under discussion. My hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) has proposed this motion:

That, in the opinion of this House, the procedure under which divorces are granted by Parliament and the consequent unreasonable expense thereof are so unsatisfactory, besides being prohibitive to the great majority of people of Canada, that the same should be taken into immediate consideration by the Government with a view to reform, during the present session.

I do not take quite the same view of the motion as that which has been entertained by my colleague the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty). It would seem to me that my hon. friend from East Hastings has under consideration more particularly the question of procedure, and is not aiming at the enactment of a general divorce law for the whole of Canada. In so far as the procedure by which these Bills are dealt with in Parliament is concerned, it is, in the first place, almost altogether a procedure which is provided by the rules of the Senate. I have had the opportunity, of which I have availed myself on more than one occasion, of pointing out that the procedure of the Senate in that regard might possibly be improved in a very great measure.

One difficulty which as it has seemed to me very often arises in these proceedings before the Senate Committee is the lack of adequate precaution against collusive arrangement between the parties. In Great Britain and in some of the provinces of Canada, where there is a divorce law and where divorces are granted by the courts, it is the practice either to have the intervention of an officer known as the King's Proctor or, in the absence of the King's Proctor, the judge himself performs the duties which otherwise would be discharged by that officer, and in that way the greatest possible precaution is taken against collusive arrangement. It is also true that there are certain expenses which have to be met by persons who apply to this Parliament for a divorce that would not have to be met if they proceeded in court. It is also true that whether the divorce is applied for by means of a Private Bill in Parliament, or by ordinary judicial procedure where courts have been established

for that purpose, very great expense is sometimes involved.

It would not do for us to be under the impression that the mere enactment of a divorce law, or the establishment of courts in the various provinces of Canada, would altogether remove, in a great many cases, the inequality to which my hon. friend has alluded. The hon. member for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) pointed out that in his own province, and within his own experience, there had been divorce proceedings which had cost the person who had instituted them many thousands of dollars, and that after all that great expense the proceedings had proved ineffective. Members of the bar in those provinces of Canada which have divorce courts, will realize that this is not an over-statement of the situation. There may be of course, cases in these provinces where the witnesses are readily accessible and the case is very plain, in which the expenditure necessary for the purpose of obtaining relief would be very light. At the same time, the expense of proceedings of that kind in the Senate, where witnesses are readily available and where large expenditure for the purpose of bringing them from a foreign country is not necessary, would also be relatively light, except for the cost of advertisement; the exact necessity for which I am unable to appreciate, and in that respect I am very much of the opinion which was expressed by my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup).

One difficulty which has been alluded to, and it is by no means undeserving of consideration, is the fact that members, whether of the Senate or the Commons, sometimes are not liable to realize to the full that in dealing with these cases they are supposed to be acting in a strictly judicial capacity, and to render their judgment strictly upon the evidence which has been adduced.

However, the whole situation, as to divorce in the five provinces is this: that while there is not any general law in these provinces which enables persons who consider themselves entitled to divorce to obtain it, there has been ever since 1867 in this Parliament the virtual constitution of a court which does deal with divorce cases from these provinces. It is equally true that not only the Senate but the House of Commons consider themselves bound in dealing with this question to proceed upon certain well-defined principles which regulate the granting of divorce in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. In fact, rule 152 of the Senate makes this absolutely plain:

> 152. In cases not provided for by these rules, the general principles upon which the Imperial Parliament proceeds in dissolving marriage, and the rules, usages, and forms of the House of Lords in respect of divorce proceedings may, so far as they are applicable, be applied to divorce proceedings before the Senate and before the standing committee on divorce.

The result seems to be that although there is no divorce law, and no divorce tribunal established in the five provinces, Parliament has nevertheless in a certain sense constituted itself into a tribunal for that purpose, and it is to that tribunal that persons desiring this relief come by the procedure of a private Bill.

I am not at all disposed to say that the procedure in the Senate could not be improved. In fact I have expressed the opinion on more than one occasion that it might. It might perhaps be improved by greater safeguards in respect to undefended cases, although I concur absolutely in what has been said as to the very excellent work which has been performed by Senator Kirchhoffer during the many years he has been Chairman of the Senate Committee on Divorce. Possibly some of the useless expense might be done away with to the end that the inequality which has been alluded to by the hon. member (Mr. Northrup) might to a certain extent be relieved in so far as that expense does not provide any safeguards such as are provided in the courts of the land which deal with divorce cases.

I venture to think that the motion proposed by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Barnard) would be a more direct and effective way of ascertaining whether or not the procedure can be improved, than the motion proposed by my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup). It must, of course, be realized by hon. members of this House that so long as the practice which has prevailed for so many years, of instituting these proceedings in the Senate, is followed in the future, the rules of the Senate will be the controlling factor in the situation, and therefore, a motion such as that of my hon. friend from Victoria would probably be more effective if it made provision for an inquiry into this subject by a joint committee of this House and of the Senate. It would seem to me that it might be well for us, before proceeding further with the discussion of the subject, to have that consideration in mind. Possibly some in-

quiry might be made of the members of the Upper House as to whether or not a joint committee, such as I have suggested, could not be appointed before the end of the session. In that view I would not protract the discussion further, and I therefore move that the debate be adjourned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am afraid that in rising to speak on this motion I may go against the rule which was adopted last year when introducing the closure; but perhaps as the subject we are discussing now is not of such a contentious nature as that which we had before us last year, I may be allowed the privilege of saying a few words upon the motion of my right hon. friend. If I have correctly comprehended the whole tenor of the discussion, from the speech of my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) down to the speech of the Prime Minister, there is no disposition to favour the idea of introducing a divorce law, because every hon. gentleman who has spoken in support of the idea of my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) has stated that it is not the intention to further extend the principles upon which divorces are at the present time granted.

My hon. friend, if I apprehend him correctly, rather puts himself behind the minority report of the commission which sat upon the subject some two years ago in England, which minority report said that while they would not favour initiating an improvement of procedure, they would favour an improvement of procedure. This is the spirit in which my hon. friend has approached the subject. I have only this to say to him that, whilst he deprecates the idea of divorce, if his motion means anything at all, it has for its object to make more easy the granting of divorces by this Parliament. In other words, he thinks that divorce is an evil, but he says: The evil exists; we find it here; every year by law we grant this evil one more application; but still by his motion he desires to make it more easy to make applications for divorce and to grant more than we do at present. That does not seem to me to be a logical position at all.

For my part, I rather agree with the statement made by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice that up to this time the law does not know divorce, and that we had better stand by that position. We are in this position in Canada to-day, that there are fewer divorces in this country than in perhaps any other civilized country in the world. It is true that there may be an injustice done to somebody by the procedure that we have at the present time. There is no law that we can make, of any exceptional nature at all, which will not work some injustice upon some individual. On the whole, however, such laws are for the benefit of the State, and I believe that it is for the benefit of the State that we have no divorce law.

The position taken by my hon. friend from Hastings is that we have no law, but we have a practice. The practice is such that it may work injuriously to certain parties and therefore he says that we should make this practice more easy and more accessible to those who have not the benefit of it to-day. This is simply providing for the extension of a thing which is acknowledged to be an evil. The reasoning upon this point of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice seems to be conclusive, and for my part I entirely agree with him.

There is just one point raised by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice on which I am not disposed to agree with him at the moment, but, whether I agree or not, it is merely a matter of speculation. My hon. friend has stated that we have divorce courts in four provinces, and that in the other five provinces we have no divorce court and we have no law. He is quite right that we have no divorce law in the province of Quebec, but I am not quite sure that there is not a divorce law in the province of Ontario. From my reading of the history of the case, I think that a divorce law such as it was then in England was introduced into the province of Upper Canada when it was created in 1791. The English laws were introduced into Upper Canada at that time. There was a divorce law in England at that time, and I think that it is in existence to-day in the province of Ontario. It is, however, a dormant law, whether it was effective or not, and the province of Ontario cannot bring it into force even if it is in existence, because by the Confederation Act the province has been deprived of the privilege of legislating in regard to divorces. Therefore, even if the law exists in Ontario, it is purely in an academic way; the province of Ontario cannot grant divorces, and it must be by this Parliament and this Parliament alone that such divorces are granted. I bring this matter to the attention of my hon. friend merely as a matter of speculation. On the other points which he has brought up, I repeat that I entirely agree with the views of my hon. friend the

Minister of Justice. I believe that we had better remain where we have been for the last forty years in this Confederation, and that the Canadian law should continue to ignore divorce as it has done heretofore.

Motion of Mr. Borden agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Borden, the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Tuesday, February 17, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Bill No. 72, respecting The Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 73, respecting The Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 74, respecting The Central Ontario Railway.—Mr. G. V. White.

Bill No. 75, respecting The Continental Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

Bill No. 76, to incorporate Les Soeurs de la Charitè de l'Hospital Saint Antoine de Le Pas.—Mr. Lavallée.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—THE ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister) presented a message from His Royal Highness the Governor General, signed by his own hand.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message, as follows:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have received with great pleasure the Address that you voted in response to my speech on the occasion of the opening of Parliament.

Arthur.

Government House,
Ottawa, 13th February, 1914.

AMENDMENT TO THE JUDGES' ACT.

Mr. ROCH LANCTOT (Laprairie and Napierville) begs leave to introduce Bill No. 77, amending the Judges' Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, the Act which this Bill is intended to amend provides in its section 19, that a judge after serving fifteen years on the Bench may be pensioned. The Bill which I now submit to the House provides that the word 'fifteen' be struck out and words 'twenty-five' substituted therefor.

Under sections 20 and 24 of the Revised Statutes, and section 25 of the Act of 1908, embodied in the statutes of 1913, it is provided that a judge after reaching seventy-five years of age, or serving during a period of thirty-five years, though less than seventy five years old, may retire, and that in either case he is entitled to a government pension equal to the salary he earned at the time of his retirement. The object of this Bill is to amend that provision, so that instead of drawing his full salary the judge thus retired shall in the future draw a pension equal to only two-thirds of the salary he was drawing at the time of retirement. Should the judge have served for a period of less than five years, the pension shall not exceed one-third of the yearly salary he was drawing, unless such judge has reached the age of seventy-five.

Under the new section 25 which I am moving, county judges having reached the age of seventy-five will be bound to retire.

Besides I am submitting to the consideration of the House a further provision which will come in immediately after section 27 of the Revised Statutes of 1906, which further provision is to the effect that any person drawing a pension under such Act who later on draws a salary in connection with some public office in the gift of the Dominion Government, shall suffer a reduction of such salary equal to the amount of such pension.

To conclude, a last section states that the provisions of the last section shall be applicable to whomsoever is drawing to-day such a pension.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not had an opportunity to look fully into this Bill, but in my judgment it is one which ought to be introduced by resolution. I notice that it provides a pension, which, I take it, would be paid under different circumstances from those specified by the general law on that subject. If so, it could only be introduced by resolution. Before the Bill reaches the second reading I will look fully into the matter.

Mr. LANCTOT: It is not to increase but to reduce the pension.

Mr. SPEAKER: It may be under different circumstances from those under

which a pension may be paid by law to-day.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

POPULATION OF CANADA BY DECADES.

Mr. BORDEN laid on the table of the House a statement of the population of Canada according to provinces and territories in 1871, 1881, 1891, 1901 and 1911, according to the census returns. He said: I observe in this that the population of Alberta and Saskatchewan, within their present limits are now defined, as set out in the census of 1901, according to a compilation that has been made by the Census Department, is to be found in the Canada Year Book of the present year. Of course, they were not constituted as provinces at that time, but the population within their area is set forth.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN moved second reading of Bill No. 62, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons. He said:

I desire to offer just a few words upon the second reading of the Bill. When the Bill was introduced, I stated that it was precisely in the form in which the Bill of 1903 had passed Parliament. That is not precisely correct, because sections 7 and 8 as they appeared in the Bill of that time have been omitted from the present Bill. The reason for that is that those sections were repealed in the following year by a Bill which was introduced by Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick, Minister of Justice at that time, who in introducing the Bill made these observations:

> The object of this Bill is to correct two or three errors which, through inadvertence or oversight, crept into the Representation Act of last session. Sections 7 and 8 of the Representation Act slipped into their present position in the body of the Act through error. They are taken from the Quebec Act, Revised Statutes of Quebec, chapter 2, sections 67 and 68, which define the provincial electoral districts. The intention was to insert these particular sections 6 and 7 where they ought to be, in the Quebec schedule. They have been incorporated in the body of the Act, which would make them applicable to the whole Dominion. Of course, this is absolutely impossible under the system of dividing constituencies as they exist elsewhere.

As the sections had been repealed in the following year and were held to be inapplicable, for that reason they were not included in the Bill which I introduced a week ago to-day.

Upon the introduction of the Bill, my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) raised a question as to the effect of subsection 4 of section 51 of the British North America Act, which is as follows:

> On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards.

And it has been suggested that in giving this section its effect there should be no reduction in the representation of the Maritime provinces and possibly of Ontario, under the results disclosed by the last census. I regret as much as any hon. gentleman in this House the necessity that the provinces mentioned shall lose representation in this House, and, as I assured my hon. friend from Pictou on the occasion alluded to, I would be only too glad if I could find such assistance or aid from this section as would do away with the necessity for reducing the representation as it is proposed in the Bill. I fear, however, that there is no such assistance to be derived; and the question as I understand it may be illustrated by a concrete example. Let us suppose that a certain province in Canada, to which is applied the unit of representation as defined by the population of Quebec, finds itself confronted with the loss of one or more members. It is necessary to consider the effect of subsection 4, to see whether or not there is any sufficient safeguard in its provisions. In order to avoid long and complicated fractions, let us suppose that such province finds itself in this position: that at the last preceding readjustment the proportion which the number of the population of that province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada was one-tenth. And suppose that upon the readjustment under consideration it is found that the proportion which the number of the population of the province bears to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at that readjustment is one-twelfth. The question then is as to the meaning and effect of subsection 4. If you reduce these proportions to a common denominator, you will find that at the preceding readjustment the proportion was six-sixtieths, while at the readjustment under consideration it is

one-twelfth, or five-sixtieths. As I understand the meaning and effect of the section, there is a reduction from six-sixtieths to five-sixtieths in the proportion which the population of that province bears to the aggregate population of Canada. Therefore, I would consider—and this is the view that has been taken on all occasions in the past, as I understand—that the proportion which the population of that province bears to the aggregate population of Canada has been reduced, in the suggested case by one-sixth, that is, from six-sixtieths to five-sixtieths. The argument, as I understand it, which has been put forward in contradistinction to that is this: that inasmuch as the proportion in question at the previous readjustment was six-sixtieths and at the present readjustment is five-sixtieths, the proportion in question has been reduced by only one-sixtieth; but I think that upon the slightest consideration it will be found that that contention cannot be sustained. At the former readjustment the proportion stood at six-sixtieths, at the readjustment in question it stands at five-sixtieths, and therefore the proportion, according to my view, has obviously been reduced by one-sixth or more than one-twentieth, and therefore the province finds no aid or assistance in the provisions of subsection 4 of section 51 of the British North America Act.

I went into the general subject somewhat fully in introducing this Bill; therefore I do not find it necessary to add anything further at this stage.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Ere we come to a final conclusion upon the second reading of this Bill, perhaps it would not be inadvisable if we should endeavour to lay down the principles which should guide the committee which is entrusted with the task of recasting the electoral map of Canada, so as to give each one of the provinces which now are a part of the Dominion the representation to which it is entitled according to its population ascertained at the last census. I shall be pardoned, although the article has been cited more than once, if I call the attention of the House to the provisions of section 51 of the British North America Act which is the basis of all the dispositions which affect representation under our system. The language is somewhat peculiar, and I commend it to the attention of the House:

> On the completion of the census in the year one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, and on each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such a manner, and from such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules.

I need not cite the rules, but I call the attention of the House to these peculiar words:

> The representation . . . shall be adjusted by such authority, in such manner and at such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides.

These words have been a puzzle to many of those who have studied our Constitutional Act. It has been difficult to ascertain from the mere context of the Act what was meant by the fathers of Confederation when they used these words: 'By such authority as Parliament from time to time provides'. The debates of the Legislature of Old Canada, when the basis of the Act was debated at Quebec, fail to give any indication of what was meant by its framers. Nothing that was said or written at the time discloses what was the inner meaning of these words. Although I have read somewhat extensively the history of that period, I have not been able to satisfy myself what was the peculiar object which the framers of the constitution had in their minds. Many have suggested —it has been suggested on the floor of this House more than once—that this clause of the Act meant that Parliament should create an independent body, say a commission of judges, to make after every census the apportionment of the representation between the different provinces. Although this opinion has been expressed more than once on the floor of this House, up to the present time neither one party nor the other has been willing to part with the authority that is vested in this Parliament. Neither one party nor the other has been willing to transfer to any other hands than its own the duty and responsibility which devolve upon Parliament after all to determine what shall be the representation in this House.

We have had, since Confederation, four Redistribution Bills; this is the fifth. The three first were made under the auspices of the Conservative party, and the fourth was made under the regime of the Liberal party. Since my right hon. friend has adopted the principle which we laid down ourselves in 1903, I am anxious, at the present time, to avoid anything contentious; but I think I may say without any recrimination that, as a matter of history the three first redistributions, that of 1872, that of 1882 and

that of 1892, which were carried out by the Conservative party, failed to give satisfaction to the minority, and I think I am justified in saying that in many instances they failed to give satisfaction even to the whole of the Conservative party. The method which was followed was to bring in a Bill which was cut and dried and in the preparation of which the minority, the Opposition in this House, had no voice. They had nothing to do but offer criticism or approval; they were not allowed any voice whatever in the preparation of the measure.

When we came into office it became our duty in 1903, after the census of 1901 to provide for a redistribution of the representation. We thought it preferable to introduce a new system, and we presented a Bill with a schedule in blank, leaving to a Committee of the House the full work of preparing the map which it is the duty of Parliament to prepare. The committee was composed of seven members, and on that occasion, as on the present and similar occasions, of course, the majority must have the deciding voice. No one can object to that; it is a part of our parliamentary system. The system will work well if the majority on the committee will be guided, not by a desire to have an advantage over the minority, but simply by the principles of equity, justice and fair play. I am aware that in the committee which was appointed in 1903, there were sometimes very severe cleavages of opinion and some very hot discussions; but I think I can claim, to the credit of the committee, that when its report was presented to the House it was, after all, in the main, accepted as fair. So far as my recollection serves me, and I think I am right in what I now state, there were only two dispositions of the report which were very severely criticised. One was the disposition which had been made for the representation of the county of Hastings and the other was the disposition which had been made for the representation of the county of Waterloo. There was an animated discussion on the floor of this House. It was then my duty, my privilege and my responsibility to be the Prime Minister, and while I was not perfectly satisfied that the objections were well taken, I thought that it was better to err upon the side of generosity, and we accepted the views of the minority and amended the Bill accordingly. I think I can say—and I am in the judgment of the House in this—that from the day on which His Excellency the Governor General of that time gave his assent to that Bill down to the present, there has been no serious criticism—indeed, no criticism at all—as to the fairness of the redistribution of 1903.

The same duties are now confronting the committee who are going to be appointed. I have every confidence that, following the precedent which was laid down then, they also will be guided by the spirit of fair play, justice and equity as between party and party. I know that upon the members of the majority of the committee there will always be, as there has been in the past, severe pressure, not so much from within this House as from outside of this House, perhaps, to have the scales weighted on the side of the majority rather than on the side of the minority. That is nothing but natural; but, I believe that events have justified our expectations, and that nothing is to be gained except by the application of the principles of justice and fair play in the preparation of a Bill such as that we have now in hand.

In the work which is to be accomplished by the committee, I might say a word as to the principles which should guide it. My right hon. friend, in introducing the Bill, insisted upon the position which I have taken, both in opposition and in office, as to the guiding principle which, in my judgment, should be dominant; that is, the equalization of population as between constituency and constituency. My right hon. friend quoted some words which I uttered in 1892, when the Bill of that year was before Parliament, as follows:

> But I fully recognize that in such a measure the guiding principle should be as far as possible to equalize the population in all the constituencies.

I have nothing to retract of those words. Nay, more, I am sorry that my right hon. friend did not quote to the House what I said further on that occasion, because I reproached the Administration that whilst laying down a principle they were not acting in accordance with that principle. This is what I said:

> The hon. gentleman stated, also speaking in answer to myself, that he could not accept the proposal we had made for a conference, because he said I had laid down a principle which was an obnoxious one, and to which he could not agree; the principle, as he stated, I think, that the redistribution should take place so as not to disturb the equilibrium of parties. It may be, Sir, that my language was not sufficiently guarded; but I certainly meant to say that in a redistribution measure the equilibrium of parties should not be disturbed at the expense of one party by giving an unfair advantage to the other. So far I meant to express myself, and no further. But I fully recognize that in such a measure, the guiding principle should be as

far as possible to equalize the population in all the constituencies. This is the principle that was stated as the guiding principle of this measure in the speech in which the hon. member introduced it; yet this principle is not to be found anywhere in the four corners of the Bill.

I have nothing to retract from what I said there. That was the principle, which, when afterwards loaded with the responsibility of office, I endeavoured to carry out, and that is the principle which, as in 1892 and 1903 I affirm to-day. There is another principle of almost equal importance, and that is regard for the compactness of the constituency, and, as far as possible, for the county unit. Under our system, the county is the unit of population, so far as public life is concerned. Let me repeat: the county and the municipal organization in this country is the unit of population in so far as the public life of the country is concerned. The county is the basis of our judicial system; it is the basis of our municipal system; and our municipal system and our judicial system are in turn the bases of our public life, our political life, I may say our national life. The selectmen in every county have to meet several times a year for the discharge of their judicial functions as jurors and their municipal functions as municipal councillors, and at these meetings they prepare themselves for the public life of the country. They discuss not only the matters pertaining to their Judicial or municipal functions, but naturally the larger questions which concern national problems. It is evident that this predisposes men to proper and safe judgment upon all matters of public interest. It seems to me obvious that if you interfere with the lines of the county unit, separate those who meet periodically for the discharge of their municipal and other duties, and provide that they shall only meet once in four or five years to decide on political questions, you detract from, rather than add to, their appreciation of public questions.

These views have been put before Parliament more than once since Confederation by the most eminent men we have had in this House. Mr. Blake made them the subject of many a pronouncement, and Mr. Dalton McCarthy, who was an authority upon such matters, not only spoke many times on the question, but moved the following resolution in which was embodied the principle which I now contend for:

> That the distribution of seats of the members of this House should, so far as practicable, be based on equality of population, due regard being had to the community of interests existing in localities, a full and fair expression of public opinion and the permanence and stability of constituencies.
>
> That the most effectual way of accomplishing these ends is to assume county and city boundaries as the natural limits of electoral districts, with equitable divisions thereof constituted with compactness as regards geographical position, and based on well-known existing areas where the population entitles the city or county to two or more representatives.

I am aware that the principles which I lay down cannot be applied mathematically. In the equalization of population it is not possible to have arithmetically the same number of people in each constituency. I am well aware also that you cannot with absolute rigour maintain the municipal boundaries; but I submit to the House that while it would be pedantic to assert that these principles have to be applied without any exception whatever, still reason and commonsense can be made to prevail. There are few rules to which there is not an exception; but the principles I now lay down ought to be the guiding principles for the committee in the discharge of the duty with which we now entrust them.

I am aware also that it has been stated in the press and in this House that our practice has not been in conformity with our precept in this regard. I have heard it stated that on more than one occasion we ourselves departed from the principles I have just laid down. I have heard it stated on the floor of the House that in the Bill of 1903 we departed from the principle of county boundaries in the case of Lavaltrie, Caughnawaga, Lacolle, Notre Dame de Stanbridge, Notre Dame des Anges, St. Pie, St. Marcel. It is true that in the Act of 1903 the parish of Lavaltrie was taken from L'Assomption and placed in Berthier. It is true also that the village of Caughnawaga was transferred from the county of Chateauguay to the county of Laprairie; that the parish of Lacolle was transferred from Missisquoi to St. John-Iberville; that the parishes of Notre Dame de Stanbridge and Notre Dame des Anges were transferred from the county of St. John to Missisquoi; that the parish of St. Pie was transferred from Rouville to Bagot, and that the parish of St. Marcel was transferred from Bagot to Richelieu. But I say now that the transferring of these different parishes from one county to another county in 1903, far from being a departure from the county unit, was, on the contrary, in absolute conformity to the principle of the county unit, because these parishes, by the redistribution of 1892, had been transferred from the county to which they belonged to another county.

I should say here that our county organization in Quebec goes back to the year 1833. With a few exceptions which have taken place since it was constituted in the year 1853 by the Act 16 Victoria. By the Act of 1892 the parish of Lavaltrie was taken from the county of Bertheir and placed in the county of L'Assomption, with which it had not connection whatever. Lavaltrie continued to belong to the county of Berthier for municipal purposes, for judicial purposes, and for electoral purposes, so far as the Quebec legislature was concerned. So that after 1892 the parish of Lavaltrie voted in the provincial elections in the county of Berthier and in the Dominion elections in the county of L'Assomption. In 1911 we brought back Lavaltrie to the county of Berthier, where it belonged. The same thing happened with the village of Caughnawaga. This village, by the Act of 1853, which is reproduced in the consolidated statutes of Lower Canada of 1861 was in the county of Laprairie, and in 1892 it was placed in the county of Chateauguay. In 1903 we brought it back to the county of Laprairie, where it belonged.

The same thing happened with the town of Lacolle. Lacolle always belonged to the county of St. John. In 1892, it was taken from St. John to Missisquoi, and in 1903 we brought it back to St. John.

The same thing happened in the case of Notre Dame de Stanbridge and Notre Dame des Anges. They belonged to the county of Missisquoi and they were carried over to St. John in 1892. We brought them back in 1903 to Missisquoi.

The most glaring case of all was the parish of St. Pie. From 1853 it had always belonged to the county of Bagot. In 1892 it was taken from Bagot and put into the county of Rouville, where it had no business at all. In 1902 we brought it back to Bagot again.

St. Marcel in 1892 was taken from the county of Richlieu and put into the county of Bagot. In 1903 we brought it back into the county of Richelieu where it belonged.

The parishes of St. Guillaume d'Upton and St. Bonaventure d'Upton by the Act of 1903 were placed in the county of Yamaska. Up to that time St. Guillaume and St. Bonaventure had always belonged to the county of Drummond. Why did we place them in 1903 in the county of Yamaska, where they now belong? The reason is this. As far back as 1872 an Act was passed by the local legislature of Quebec to detach these parishes from the county of Drummond and district of Arthabaska, and to annex them for all purposes whatsoever to the county of Yamaska. This is the disposition:

1. From and after the first day of January, 1873, the parishes of St. Guillaume d'Upton and St. Bonaventure d'Upton shall be detached from the county of Drummond and district of Arthabaska, and shall be annexed to the county of Yamaska for all electoral, municipal, registration and other purposes.

Mark the purposes:

For all electoral, municipal, registration and other purposes.

From the first of January, 1873, the two parishes of St. Guillaume d'Upton and St. Bonaventure ceased to belong to the county of Drummond and were annexed to the county of Yamaska. From that time, these two parishes voted in the provincial elections in the county of Yamaska, and continued to vote in the Dominion elections in the counties of Drummond and Arthabaska. Following the principle of county unit, the legislature of Quebec having thought it proper to annex these two parishes to the county of Yamaska, to which they belonged geographically much more than to the county of Drummond, we thought it equally right that these two parishes should belong to the county of Yamaska also for federal purposes.

The parish of Ste. Flore has also been mentioned. As to this, I have not the same information, but I understand that the parish of Ste. Flore was in 1903 detached from the county of Champlain and put into the county of St. Maurice. I do not understand why it was in the county of Champlain, because the county of Champlain is bounded on the west by the river St. Maurice, and Ste. Flore is to the west of the river St. Maurice, so that between Champlain and Ste. Flore there is the river St. Maurice, and naturally, geographically and for the sake of compactness, Ste. Flore has belonged to the county of St. Maurice.

Mr. PELLETIER: There was another parish left west of the river—St. Jean des Piles.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand that. I have not been able to refresh my memory as to why that was done, although I know that it was done. I know that the committee made a suggestion which was corrected by the House, but, so far as I remember, Mr. Monk, who was a member of the committee, did not object at the time. I speak subject to correction, because I have not had an opportunity of looking again into this point.

We have endeavoured to follow the principle of county unit in every case. Of course, there may be exceptions to all rules. If there is such an exception, it is the only one on which I have been able to refresh my memory and, even if there is such an exception, it would only go to maintain the principle for which I have all along contended and for which I still contend, that we should always preserve the county unit.

The task of the committee is not an easy one. The committee will have these two principles to work upon: first, equalization of population between constituency and constituency, and, secondly, maintenance of county boundaries. I have no doubt whatever that occasions may arise when these two things may clash, and then the committee will have to come to some decision as to what to do under such circumstances. In the majority of cases, however, there ought to be no more difficulty in maintaining the principle in 1914 than there was in 1903.

There is another principle which must also be taken into consideration, and to which my right hon. friend alluded when he introduced this Bill, that is, that the unit of population cannot be the same in urban as in rural constituencies. It has always been admitted, in 1872, in 1882, in 1892, and in 1903—that the unit of population cannot be the same for cities as for rural constituencies. It is useless for me to dilate upon the reasons why this should be so, because the principle has always been admitted by both sides of the House. Therefore I am satisfied that, on this occasion as on previous occasions, the committee will have to adhere to that principle, and to say that in the cities the unit of population must be much larger than in rural constituencies. Without going into all the reasons, there is one supreme reason, namely, that in a country like Canada, where there is a very large territory with a sparse population, if you were to give the same unit of population to cities and counties, in rural constituencies you would have such a large area of territory as to be almost impossible to control or to cover. This is quite sufficient to justify the principle which has been adopted on every occasion on which we have had redistribution.

My right hon. friend, in this Bill, has refrained from making one provision, the absence of which seems to me a weakness in the Bill, and, I cannot but think, also a weakness on his part. He refused to determine whether or not the Island of Prince Edward is to lose a member. He left that blank and referred it to the committee for determination. I have to represent to my right hon. friend that that is a matter upon which the committee cannot have any jurisdiction; it is a matter on which this House has no jurisdiction. Parliament in this matter is not a free agent; the whole question is simply a question of arithmetic. The very argument which my right hon. friend makes to-day in answer to the suggestion offered by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is an answer for the action—or rather want of action—with regard to Prince Edward Island. The right hon. gentleman stated categorically that he would like to give more representation to Nova Scotia than is given under this Bill, and I have no doubt that he did spend many an hour trying to escape the necessary result of the census, the loss on the part of Nova Scotia of two members. That is quite natural. I have had in my day the same problem to deal with; but we had to come to the conclusion that we had no discretion in this matter—that Parliament must simply carry out the constitution as it stands. But when my right hon. friend leaves it to the committee to determine whether or not Prince Edward Island shall lose one member, what will he say to my hon. friend from Pictou or any other member from Nova Scotia should he suggest that it be left to the committee to determine whether or not Nova Scotia shall lose two members? What will he say to a member from New Brunswick should he ask that the same privilege be accorded to that province? What would he say even to the great province of Ontario, which under this Bill must lose four members, should a representative of that province ask why Ontario should be treated differently from other provinces? I say in this matter jurisdiction is not with the Prime

4 p.m.

Minister, nor myself, nor the Committee, nor even Parliament; it is a matter of the law and the constitution; the provision of that constitution must be maintained whatever the consequence. Therefore I regret that my right hon. friend has introduced in his Bill a principle—no, I cannot call it a principle, but rather a vicious feature—which might land him in very serious difficulties were its necessary implications followed to their logical conclusion.

Having taken this exception to the pro-

visions of the Bill of my right hon. friend --and it is the only criticism I have to offer—I will submit just one suggestion upon which I believe we can find it more easy to agree, and that is that the committee should be composed, not of seven, but of nine members. Under former redistributions the West had not the importance that it has since taken on. We have two more provinces in Confederation than we had even in 1903. We have four natural units of population—the Maritime provinces, Quebec, Ontario and the provinces west of lake Superior. I would suggest, and I hope my right hon. friend will receive that suggestion favourably, that the committee should have nine members, so that we on this side may have four, one from each of these great sections of our country.

Having said this much, I have nothing to add at present. Of course, I am glad my right hon. friend has taken the course of referring this matter to a committee. The work, then, is no longer in his hands, or in mine, or even in those of the House. The committee will have to seek our ratification of their work. I have every hope that the two sides of the House will be able to reconcile their differences, and that all members will be inspired by the sincere desire to make this Bill what it ought to be, a law to carry out the spirit of our constitution, and that spirit is that our system of representation should be so framed that, as elections take place from time to time, the results may be, as far as possible, an accurate expression of the public mind at the time, regardless of who wins and who loses.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): I think the importance of this measure warrants the attention of this House to a little greater degree than would be given if the present debate were to close at this juncture. My right hon. friend who leads the House has proposed to submit to a committee the task of filling the schedule in the Bill which at present is blank. The task thus referred to the committee is one of very great responsibility, and involves the recognition of certain rights which it is well, I think, that the House should in some degree define before the committee enters upon its duties. My right hon. friend and leader has directed the attention of the Prime Minister to a very important provision in the enacting clauses of the Bill in regard to the province of Prince Edward Island, and the effect of that provision upon other provinces which might be affected by the comparison of population provided for under section 51. Perhaps it would not be out of place to look for a moment at what rights and powers Parliament has in this matter, and what special limitations are laid down in the British North America Act with regard to this whole question of representation. The first section to which I will refer is section 40, which begins as follows:

> Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, shall, for the purposes of the election of members to serve in the House of Commons, be divided into electoral districts as follows:

And the special electoral districts in Canada in 1867 are set out in detail in the Bill. The language of this section is important, because, unless there is some limiting clause to be found in some other portion of the Act, the phase 'until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides' under the 'implied powers' principle in the interpretation of constitutional laws, means that the powers of Parliament would be enlarged, and would extend not merely to increasing and reducing representation in this House, but to dealing with cases where specific provinces that have not kept pace with the rest of the Dominion in the increase of population.

However, there are other clauses which deal with this matter which must be looked at. If you come to section 52 of the British North America Act, a section which is but very seldom referred to in the consideration of this question, you will find that there is a certain limitation upon the general power given in section 40 in the following language:

> The number of members of the House of Commons may be from time to time increased by the Parliament of Canada, provided the proportionate representation of the provinces prescribed by this Act is not thereby disturbed.

Interpreting that section, it will be found that in addition to section 40 there is this limitation, that Parliament can increase the total of its representation if you have regard to the proportions provided in section 51 of the Act; but it cannot decrease the total number of that representation by any special Act of Parliament unless that decrease is brought about as a result of the application of section 51 of the Act. The power, therefore, to increase the total representation of this Parliament exists in Parliament; but the power to decrease that total representation does not exist unless

it is worked out as a result of the application of section 51.

We come now to section 51 of the Act, which is the governing clause so far as the right of Parliament to deal with this question is concerned, having regard to the general provisions of section 40, and we must move within, and can only move within, the power conferred and the limitations laid down under that particular section. One does not need to refer to this sub-clause of the Bill, you have the number for Quebec fixed at 65, and thereby determine the electoral unit for the whole Dominion. You ascertain what the representation of each province in the Dominion is by dividing that electoral unit into the population of the respective provinces. When you come to subsection 4 of the Bill, you come to the saving clause which is intended to prevent the loss of representation by the application of the electoral unit to the population of each province; and unless you can work out under the provisions of subsection 4 of section 51 of this Bill some right by which the provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island on this occasion will be saved the loss of their representation, it is impossible for a committee of this House or this Parliament, as a matter of law, to give to any one of those provinces any more representation than what you can obtain by working out this plan. If the right does not exist under subsection 4, it is not of much use for the right hon. gentleman to submit a Bill in blank and send it to a committee and ask it to be filled in, because the action of the committee would be wholly illegal and improper. So would the action of this Parliament if we undertook to give to Prince Edward Island or to any other province a greater number of members than the number ascertained by the application of that section. I say that with the greatest possible regret, for the reason that I am convinced that a province like Prince Edward Island, maintaining its individual entity as a province, with all the paraphernalia of government which attaches to a province, occupying the insular position which it does, having its peculiar rights on account of that peculiar position, would naturally ask for some recognition of its peculiar rights in the parliaments of the Confederation. But if we can find no power to give to that province the representation which it now enjoys, it is impossible for us to give it to that province in any other way. That this has been recognized by Parliament in the past to be an absolute rule will be found in the Act of 1892, which was the last Act introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite when they had to do with the question of representation in this country; and if you look at the preamble of that Bill you will find a declaration made by Parliament that the question of representation of those provinces had been fixed and determined unalterably in the following language:

> Whereas by the census of the year 1891, and in accordance with the British North America Act, 1867, and certain other Acts of the Parliament of the United Kingdom and of the Parliament of Canada, the province of Manitoba is, by its present population entitled to seven members in the House of Commons, the province of Nova Scotia to twenty members, the province of New Brunswick to fourteen members, and the province of Prince Edward Island to five members respectively.

There you have the legislative declaration of the fact that the number of representatives of these provinces which then constituted the Confederation had been definitely and positively determined as the result of the then last census, and that it was not for Parliament to alter or to interfere with the result of the calculation. That was a legislative declaration made in an Act of Parliament in 1892 and it stands to-day as a matter of law and constitutional practice and of right, as positive and certain as it did at that time. So I submit it is impossible for us, much as we regret it, to consider under the law the possibility of filling in the words of this Bill so far as the province of Prince Edward Island is concerned, with any larger numbers of members than what she may be entitled to under the provisions of section 51 of the British North America Act.

Mr. CARVELL: You have as good a right to make it six as four.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend suggests that once you open the door, once you exercise the authority of Parliament to determine the representation outside the provisions of section 51 generally, there is no limitation to the extent to which that right might be exercised and no limitation to the number of representatives which might be given to each province. If you come to exercise the right conferred by section 52 of the Act of increasing the number of representatives generally, whatever power may be inferred from that particular clause can only be exer-

cised under and by virtue of the powers conferred by section 51. It has always seemed to me an anomaly, with the greatest possible deference to the distinguished public men on both sides of the House who, on previous occasions, have taken the position to refer to the provinces of the Dominion the question of considering the amendment of this representation question. There is no more argument, either from constitutional reasons or practice, why you should summon the representatives of the different provinces of the Dominion to consider the question of remodelling section 51 of the British North America Act than that you should summon them when you want to have legislation which might be deemed to be an extreme exercise of the federal power so far as the provisions of section 91 of the Act are concerned. In 1867, by virtue of the Imperial Act, there was committed solely and entirely to this federal Parliament the duty of determining this question of representation, and if we are to follow the view which has been lately taken by Lord Haldane, in an Australian case, only a month ago, as to the method in which the Canadian constitution should be interpreted, a view which in some degrees, so far as the Privy Council is concerned, is a novel one in that he declares categorically and definitely that the constitution of Canada is not a federal constitution in the proper sense of the term not as the Australian constitution is, the absolute power of dealing with the whole question of representation was committed to this federal Parliament; and the provinces and provincial Governments have nothing whatever to do with it except on the most theoretical principle. If you apply that theoretical principle in regard to section 51 of the British North America Act you must apply it to every other section where the exercise of powers by the federal Government is provided for. Why do I make that proposition? For this reason, that I wish to make a suggestion to my right hon. friend that if he desires to help the smaller provinces of the Dominion—and I am free to say that I believe he does,—an opportunity arises for him to do so because of the anomaly in regard to representation which arises in connection with this province of Prince Edward Island, to which he referred the other day. By the provisions of this Bill, the province of Prince Edward Island will have three representatives in this House, while it has four representatives in the Senate. New Brunswick will have eleven representatives here, while it has ten representatives in the Senate, and it is not too violent a presumption to make that perhaps at a very early date there may arise conditions under which that representation may still further be reduced. You would then have a condition under which these smaller provinces would have a larger representation in the Senate than in the popular branch. That is certainly an anomaly which was never contemplated by the fathers of Confederation or by the leading men of those smaller provinces when they gave up their individual identity in order to become merged in the greater federation. It seems to me that if my right hon. friend is really desirous of assisting the smaller provinces, he should proceed in the only method in which he can legally proceed, by moving an Address to the Imperial Parliament, asking them to amend the British North America Act, so that for any province of the Dominion of Canada there shall not be, at any time, a less number of representatives in the popular branch than in the Senate. I think that is a proposition which would not be unfair or unreasonable, and having regard to the many considerations which might be urged on behalf of the smaller provinces, it seems to me to be a proposition which might very well receive the approbation of the whole House. I have dealt at some length on this point because I contend that Parliament should not send out to this committee the task of dealing with this question of representation in any elastic or uncertain way, so far as the question of numbers is concerned. The status of that committee, their powers, and their limitations should be definitely recognized by this House, and at this stage, so that there may not be any attempt by the committee to exercise any unconstitutional power or to proceed beyond their authority in dealing with this question.

My right hon. friend was good enough to refer to a question to which I called his attention on the introduction of the Bill, when I was unable to place fairly before the House a point that is held by a good number of hon. gentlemen here and by quite a number outside the House to be an important one; that is, in regard to subsection 4 of section 51. My right hon. friend has answered the point which was raised at that time. The popular view in regard to subsection 4 is that the clause was to apply only in cases where there had been a certain

percentage of reduction in population. The percentage contemplated by the state is one intended to be made between two fractions, the numerator of the fraction being the population of a particular province ten years ago and the denominator being the population of the Dominion at that time. You take similar fractions for the last census and you make a comparison between the two; the question then is, whether or not that section is to be interpreted by ascertaining whether the difference between these two fractions is less than a fraction of one-twentieth, or whether it is less than one-twentieth of what the original fraction was. That may seem a little complicated, but that is the way in which one would put the question as a matter of accuracy. After deliberation I am inclined to agree with the interpretation put upon this by my right hon. friend. In ordinary language the subsection reads, unless the difference between these two fractions is ascertained at the then latest census, to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upward. Does that mean one-twentieth part of the fraction which was made by a comparison made with the population of the province ten years ago, or is it the fraction, one-twentieth, without relation to that? I am inclined to say that I agree with the right hon. gentleman in the view he takes of it. I submitted the proposition because the suggestion had been made to me by a gentleman of another chamber who felt this question of representation, its reduction and the status of the smaller provinces—as all must feel who give any thought at all to the matter—to be of very great importance. So much for that phase of the question, but I submit that we should have from the Minister of Justice who is the official adviser upon these questions, a statement as to whether or not he agrees with the view put forward by my right hon. friend and leader, in regard to the power Parliament has to interfere with the scale of representation definitely and positively laid down under section 51 of the Act. My right hon. friend in introducing this Bill, outlined certain principles which he thought should guide the committee, and as the House after this second reading will have heard the last of this question of representation until that committee reports, I think the lines upon which they should act with regard to matters of policy should be very carefully considered. The Prime Minister mentioned that the committee which dealt with this question in England were affected by certain considerations: first, equality of population; secondly representation in borough divisions of a population of an urban character; thirdly, compactness in respect of geographical position and fourthly community of interests, and in suggesting to this committee what their motive should be in dealing with this question, he suggested that they should have before them, first, the observance of municipal boundaries. That idea is one which has been accentuated by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, and although in times gone by battles waged in this House around the question of municipal boundaries, it is gratifying to-day to know that both parties have come to realize the importance and necessity of having regard to municipal boundaries when delimiting constituencies for the federal Parliament. The second principle which he thought should be regarded, was that of equality of population which of course was one which had to be considered in connection with the observance of municipal boundaries; the third, a greater unit for city constituencies than for country constituencies without fixing any definite percentage and, fourth, a community of interests and geographical contiguity. The Prime Minister indicated that these suggestions come within what his views are to the lines within which the committee should act.

It seems to me that there are some considerations further than that which ought to be regarded. We should have regard to the permanence and stability of existing constituencies. Where you have a constituency in which men have resided for long periods of time, where their municipal interests are bound up together, where their business interests centre around certain villages or towns in a particular community, and where, for a long period of time, public men on both sides have been wont to deal with the necessities and interests of a particular class of people, it seems to me that we should not lightly interfere with settled conditions of that kind. That proposition seems to be one the wisdom of which is so patent that I am quite sure the Prime Minister will agree with me as to its desirability.

But a difficulty will arise, as it always has arisen, in this way: Where, as a result of the increase in the population of existing constituencies additional members have to be provided for, how are you

going to proceed? Take the situation in the new provinces of the Northwest, where we have ten, and ten and seven members respectively? Take the two great provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta where the additional representation created by this Act will necessitate the breaking up of constituencies which are represented in this House by hon. gentlemen. On what principle are you to proceed in that particular? Where you do not have to interfere with the representation of any particular province by increase or diminution, where you have county boundaries and existing conditions, there is no special warrant for the committee undertaking to interfere with those conditions as far as representation is concerned unless there is some great disparity in the unit of representation with reference to a particular constituency. The discharge of such a task ought not to be a very great one, but when you come to deal with the problem of increased representation, where you have to take existing constituencies and break them up in order to provide for representation throughout the borders of a once great constituency represented by one member, on what principle are you going to proceed? In the Northwest, unfortunately, to-day, we have not municipal government throughout the rural districts. We have not, therefore, that guiding spirit of municipal institutions that we have in the eastern portion of Canada. It seems to me that the prime consideration that ought to exist there in regard to the determination of the question is unity of interest and the geographical position of the new constituency as it is to be formed. There is no use in creating a constituency an indefinite number of miles in length, in which the people at one end never see the people at the other end from one year to another. What a farce it must be, as a matter of representation, for an hon. gentleman in this House to represent a constituency in which these principles of community of interest and geographical connection have been disregarded for some other considerations. I hope that the committee, in dealing with this question, will not be affected by political considerations, but will be guided by the lines laid down so well by the Prime Minister and by the leader of the Opposition.

Another principle arises where you have districts which are divided by stretches of water or other natural or geographical barriers which prevent a community of interest and that intimate connection which one part of a constituency should have with another in order to have that proper touch between the representative and the people. I venture to point out that the situation that exists in our own province affords a particular exemplification of the principles that I want to deal with. There we have the island of Cape Breton which historically at one time had a separate existence from that of the province of Nova Scotia. It is not connected with the mainland in any way. A stretch of water runs between the Island of Cape Breton and what is called the mainland of the province of Nova Scotia. There we have had within the last fifteen years what might be called a displacement of population. The development of the steel and coal industries in that island has resulted to a very great degree in the farmers leaving their farms in the country, or the young men leaving the old people on the farms, and going off to work in these industrial centres. As a consequence the population of the island of Cape Breton has not been diminished. They have had four representatives in this House, and I would submit that there is an idea strongly held that as you have this natural barrier which prevents this island and its people from having direct communication with the mainland, the entity of the island of Cape Breton should be recognized and that the four representatives of that portion of the province should be maintained there. You can go to other portions of the Dominion where you find natural barriers and where it is not easy to divide one class of people from another. These should be arranged so that you would not have a mixed constituency in which one portion of it would have no interest whatever in the men who happened to live across the barrier. That proposition seems to me to be self-evident.

I was surprised that the right hon. Prime Minister did not state to the House that he was considering the question of proportionate representation. I do not propose to argue that question at very great length, but inasmuch as public men have from time to time during the last ten or fifteen years in this House and elsewhere discussed this important question, it seems to me that on the present occasion some pronouncement should have been made by the Prime Minister with regard to it. I invite the attention of the Prime Minister now to this matter.

I hope also that the Prime Minister will respond to the suggestion of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in

regard to increasing the numbers of the committee, not for any reason other than that I think the public interest would be served and that we would have better results. It might be urged that if you have nine members on the committee you are more apt to have complicated questions arise than if you have only seven. I recall that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister ten years ago suggested to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition that the committee should be made up of four from each side of the House, which would have made the membership of the committee eight. The request of the leader of the Opposition to make it nine seems to me a natural one in view of the fact that we have in these two new provinces and in the country extending from the Great Lakes to the Pacific Ocean, a body of men interested in this country whose representation in this Parliament will exceed the representation that some of the provinces of the Dominion had at Confederation and for some time afterwards, and will exceed what they now have.

In no spirit of contention, but simply with the idea that under such an arrangement this problem may be worked out upon the lines which I apprehend the Prime Minister would like to have it worked out upon, I have ventured to put forth these suggestions. If the committee is to partake of the nature of a conference with the idea of devising an equitable scheme of representation, then my right hon. friend will have an easy task in so far as representation problems are concerned in this Parliament. The ideal, I think, should be that the committee, in discharging their duties, should act as conferees. If, on the other hand, you are going to have this condition in the committee, that merely on account of the fact that you have a preponderance of members on the committee who are going to exercise their authority in regard to any hard and fast scheme, the whole object of the committee will be at once nullified.

The Prime Minister, on the motion for the first reading, declared his satisfaction with the methods pursued by the committee appointed ten years ago. If these rumours, which we hear now and then, as to the studious efforts of certain gentlemen in parcelling out constituencies in certain provinces of the Dominion, are correct, and if these gentlemen are to produce before the committee a hard and fast scheme, by which the considerations which have been discussed on the first and second readings of this Bill are to be ignored, then I say to the Prime Minister that he can hardly expect that this committee can, in any sense, be called a combination of conferees in the public interest. Rather, it would degenerate into a combination in which the majority would rule, if they were permitted to rule. The Prime Minister himself, in dealing with this question, has approached the consideration of it in a very fair spirit, and has indicated the lines upon which the committee should act. I trust that spirit may be maintained.

A suggestion was made by the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) ten years ago, as to whether this committee should not have power to send for persons and papers. I do not know what form the resolution to be moved by my right hon. friend in regard to the appointment of the committee will take, but if the committee should proceed upon the lines of being conferees in the public interest, there may be no necessity for this special power being delegated to the committee. Of course, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House should reserve the right to come to Parliament and ask that this power be granted should occasion arise.

It is to be hoped that in dealing with this question the policy which was inaugurated ten years ago—a policy which has been followed to a wider extent in England—will dominate the deliberations of the committee to which this Bill is to be referred. The party advantage which may momentarily be obtained by an unfair redistribution is one which ultimately does not bring that satisfaction or that result which men in public life should aim at. We on this side of the House, as our right hon. leader has said, hope that the Government will implement, in the appointment of the committee, and in the conduct of its deliberations, the generous assurances which the right hon. the Prime Minister has given us in moving the first and second readings of the Bill.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Prince Edward Island): There is no doubt whatever that the delegates from Prince Edward Island who negotiated the terms upon which the Island came into Confederation, were convinced that they were getting for that province in this House of Commons six representatives for all time to come. There is equally no doubt, that the sub-committee of the Privy Council, with which they

negotiated these terms, were under the same impression. An examination of the Confederation documents and of the negotiations at that time, will convince any person of the fact as I state it. I am satisfied that the Prime Minister recognizes this fact, and I am satified also that several members of this House are equally convinced. Unfortunately that provision was not put in the terms of Union, and so we have to abide by the British North America Act as it exists. If the purpose of the Prime Minister in leaving the Prince Edward Island Schedule in the Bill blank in the reference to the committee, is because he thinks the committee is a better body than this House to examine the documents and to come to a decision, and if, should the committee recommend, after consideration of the matter, that Prince Edward Island should have four or six representatives, it is the intention of the right hon. gentleman to petition the home Government to so amend the British North America Act, then I can understand his course in thus referring the matter to the committee. But, if on the other hand, the committee should make such a recommendation, and the right hon. gentleman does not intend to carry it out, then I can hardly give the Prime Minister credit for sincerity. However, I will take the more honourable view, and I will suppose that the object of the Prime Minister in submitting this matter to the committee as he proposes, is to take the necessary steps to carry out the recommendation of the committee, in this respect, if such recommendation should be made.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER: The committee may or may not find it necessary to look into these matters to which my hon. friend (Mr. J. J. Hughes) has referred, but I would like to point out to him that I have tried to find in 'Hansard' any record of protest from gentlemen representing Prince Edward Island on the two former occasions when the representation of that province in this House was reduced. I may not have covered the whole ground in my search, but so far I have not been able to find any such protest. If there has been any such protest in this House on these former occasions, it might be well to place it before the committee. If there was no protest, why was there not a protest?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: As I understand it, when the first reduction was made in accordance with the census of 1891, Sir John Thompson, then Minister of Justice, gave it as his opinion that under the British North America Act, the provisions of which would have to be carried out, Prince Edward Island would have to lose a member. Several eminent jurists have given expression to a similar opinion. The province brought its case before the Supreme Court of Canada, and afterwards before the Privy Council, and the decision was against the contention of the province. If no protest was entered, I presume it was because of that. However, on two different occasions in this House, once when a petition was going to the home Government to have the British North America Act amended with regard to the increased subsidies to the provinces, I thought it a good time to have this amendment made, if it were to be at all, and I presented my views to the House, and the hon. gentleman will find them in 'Hansard.' I presented the case then, and I need not go over the arguments now. I thought I made out a fairly good case, that the intention of both parties to the terms of union when the province of Prince Edward Island came in was that it should have a fixed number of six members. We stayed out of Confederation for six years on that point. Finally we came in. I have not the arguments here, but they can be easily obtained.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer briefly. It affects myself in a personal way to a great extent. When the Prime Minister introduced this Bill on the 10th of this month, he stated that the hon. member for Kings—that is myself—in 1903 had argued both strongly and forcibly against claims put forward by Prince Edward Island with respect to representation. I was somewhat surprised to hear the Prime Minister make such a statement, because I had no recollection of ever having done so, and I could not find in 'Hansard' of 1903 where I had done so. I asked him to point out the place in 'Hansard' Yesterday, before the Orders of the Day were called, he told me that I would find my remarks to which he had referred on page 10,909 of 'Hansard' of 1903. In order that we may clear up this question, I think I had better read the statement that the Prime Minister made in reference to myself when he introduced this Bill. This was the paragraph in his speech:

> It has been noted that in 1882 the Redistribution Bill did not diminish the representation of the province of Prince Edward Island, although according to the census of 1881, Prince Edward Island was at that time entitled to no more than five members. At first I was very much impressed by this circumstance, but I

observed that in a speech made by the hon. member for Kings, Prince Edward Island, in 1903, who argued strongly and forcibly against the claims put forward on behalf of the province at that time, he attributed this result to the fact that there was no previous census with which the census of 1881 could be compared for the purposes of subsection 4 of section 51 of the British North America Act so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, and probably that accounts for the result in 1882.

I would gather from that, that the Prime Minister stated really that he did not apprehend the meaning of subsection 4 of section 51 as fully as myself. Of course, that is a very high compliment for the right hon. gentleman to pay me, because I am not at all learned in the law, and I always understood that my right hon. friend was a distinguished member of the Bar. However, if he wishes to pay me that compliment, I will accept it and I can only say this, that there are many subjects on which I am much better informed than I am on legal questions, and I would be glad to give my hon. friend information at any other time on any other subject. I have turned up page 10,909 of 'Hansard' of 1903, and I find that my speech on that occasion was very short, exactly one page of 'Hansard.' Mr. Hackett, the member for West Prince, P.E.I., had been speaking and had pointed out that in 1882 the Government led by the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald had not decreased the representation of Prince Edward Island, although according to population it was entitled to no more than five members at that time, whereas it had six. He said that Sir John Macdonald was entitled, so far as Prince Edward Island was concerned, to a great deal of gratitude for not decreasing the representation. He also stated that this Parliament had the power to give Prince Edward Island its original representation of six members. That was an extraordinary statement to make. Although I was not learned in the law, I knew that this Parliament had no power to give to Prince Edward Island six members or any more than it was entitled to under the provisions of the British North America Act. As my statement was very short, I will read it so that there will be no misunderstanding as to what I said in regard to the matter. This is what I said:

I have listened with some surprise to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett), in view of the fact that some ten years ago, when the last Redistribution Bill was under consideration and when the representation of Prince Edward Island was first reduced, my hon. friend and his political associates in Prince Edward Island did not raise a solitary objection. At that time there were two Conservative representatives from the county of Kings in this House, and neither of them raised any objection. My hon. friend at that time, though not a member of this House, was an influential man in the riding which he now represents and took an active part in politics. At that time not a meeting was held in the hon. gentleman's constituency, not a resolution was passed, no objection was raised, no protest was entered against the reduction of the representation of Prince Edward Island. Now, why bring it up at this late date? In my opinion, the proper time to enter a protest was when the representation was first reduced. But the hon. gentleman's political friends were then in power, and perhaps it was not thought to be good, political tactics to bring up the question at that time.

As I listened to the hon. gentleman's remarks this evening, I could not help thinking what an opportunity he lost when he failed to go before the Supreme Court and argue the case of Prince Edward Island when this matter was submitted to it for decision. He made a strong argument here to-night, and it is a pity this argument was not presented when the Supreme Court was considering the case. If there had been any constitutional objection to my hon. friend appearing before the Supreme Court on account of being a layman, I am sure if he had given his views to the counsel who was representing Prince Edward Island, that gentleman would have been very glad to present them before the court. The hon. gentleman says that in 1881 the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald allowed Prince Edward Island to retain its original representation, though the population of the province did not entitle it to to that representation. The reason of that was, I think, because the census of 1881 was the first Dominion census that was taken after the Island entered Confederation, and consequently there was no previous census with which to compare that one, so far as Prince Edward Island was concerned. Therefore, no one could tell whether the twentieth part saving clause would protect the province against any reduction in its representation. That, I think, was the reason why the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald at that time did not reduce the representation, at all events, it would be a good and sufficient reason. But in 1891-92 when the next census was taken the representation of that province was reduced. At that time, I think, Sir John Thompson was leader of the Government—if not, he was Minister of Justice—and he declared there was nothing in the constitution to protect the province against a reduction in its representation. As I have already pointed out, the Conservative representatives in this House at that time, the Conservative party and the press of Prince Edward Island—everybody acquiesced in the reduction that then took place. Therefore, I think it is altogether too late for my hon. friend and his political associates from Prince Edward Island to try to make political capital out of it at this time. We have to abide by the constitution under which we live.

I regret as much as any man can regret that the delegates at the time that the province of Prince Edward Island joined the union overlooked this important point, and did not provide against the contingency that has since arisen. I also regret that a reduction has taken

place in the representation of the other Maritime provinces, because it will weaken the voice of those other provinces down by the sea to that extent in the great counsel of the nation.

In view of the fact that the highest constitutional authorities in Canada have declared that the law affords the Maritime provinces no protection against a reduction of their representation, that there is nothing in the British North America Act that will preserve their original representation, I believe, however, that if the matter were properly presented to our friends from the other provinces they would agree to a change in the British North America Act providing that the representation in none of the provinces should be reduced beyond the representation they possessed when they originally entered Confederation. I believe that if the members from the other provinces would agree to that, it could be carried out, and possibly and probably that will be done before the next decennial revision takes place. That is the only way, in my judgment, that this matter can be accomplished. I cannot understand what my hon. friend had in view in bringing up this question to-night, unless it were to try to make political capital out of it. As I say, we have to bide by the constitution under which we live, and in view of the fact that this question has been argued before the highest court in Canada and decided against us, I am sure my hon. friend has sense enough to know that nothing he could say this evening would affect the issue in any way. He has merely brought up the matter again for the purpose of seeing it ventilated in Prince Edward Island, and giving the Conservative papers down there something to talk about, and an occasion to raise some objection to the present Administration.

Now, Sir, I have read every word that I uttered on that occasion, and I say that there is not a sentence, not a line, not a word, not a syllable in that speech to justify the right hon. Prime Minister in saying that I argued against the claims put forward by Prince Edward Island. Of course, under the circumstances, I believe the right hon. gentleman made a mistake and that the idea must have been suggested to him by somebody else. If he has read my speech, I am sure he will have come to the conclusion that there is nothing there to justify the charge he made against me. He has misrepresented me. And I would ask him, and expect him, to say that he was mistaken, or misinformed, and, as an honourable man and Prime Minister of this country, to withdraw the statement. That is due to his position.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I think we can all compliment the House on the fair way in which it has approached this measure. I shall ask for the attention of hon. members for only a minute or two to mention one or two points that, I think, should be stated, before the Bill goes to the committee. In the first place, I sympathize with what the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) says about proportionate representation. I listened very carefully to what the former Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said with regard to municipal representation and preserving municipal bounds, but to my mind more important still is the representation of the minorities and of great classes that now are not represented. Proportional representation is now widely agitated and the system is well developed, but it has not quite found expression in our law. I do think that we should make the effort in the direction of proportional representation so as to secure the representation of minorities in this House. Take, for instance, the city of Toronto, where I live; we have now eight members for the city and the county of York. But there are substantial minorities in that city that are not represented here. There is a great labour vote in Toronto, yet Toronto does not send a labour representative to this House. A feature of representation in England is the strength of the labour representation in the House of Commons. If we had proportional representation recognized in this country—

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL: What about the Liberal vote?

Mr. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman can deal with that. But perhaps proportional representation would secure some representation of the Liberals in this House, and, if so, the hon. gentleman should give me encouragement in this matter.

Mr. MARCIL: The hon. gentleman said there were important minorities not represented here, and I said that the Liberals of Toronto form one of those minorities.

Mr. MACLEAN: Then, proportional representation would give them what they desire, and I should expect the Liberals to uphold that principle rather than the principle of municipal bounds. We should seek, not to give fair representation to municipalities, but to give fair representation to the political thought of the people.

As to this complaint of the smaller provinces as to reduction in their representation, if I had my way I would greatly reduce the number of members in this House, in the Senate and in our legislatures generally. I believe we should have better legislatures and a better Parliament if our numbers were smaller. While I regret that some of the provinces have to accept a reduction—Ontario being one of them—it becomes the duty of those provinces to im-

prove their representation if they possibly can. If the Maritime provinces wish to be strong in the Confederation—if I may be pardoned the suggestion—I think there ought to be a Maritime union into a single province. The Maritime provinces would be stronger in this House and in their influence in the country than they are to-day, divided into three provinces and with this question of representation, and especially this question of reduction in representation, coming up every ten years.

For forty-six years the experiment of Confederation has been going on, and it has succeeded in a remarkable degree.

But that constitution, which was written nearly fifty years ago, could not foresee all the difficulties and circumstances that would develop. Probably the time has come, or will be here when our next Parliament sits, when Parliament should give attention to a constitutional revision to deal with the questions that have been widely discussed and that must be settled. Probably that would be the time when the smaller provinces could present their claims for better representation in this House. Certainly, the time will come when the Senate of this country must be reorganized. With the province of Prince Edward Island represented by four members in the Senate and only three here, it is clear that there is an unfair condition of things, and that unfairness should be removed. I trust that in the next Parliament some proposal for a conference of the provinces on the subject of constitutional revision will be made and a number of anomalies and grievances—and there are not many—will be removed, or at least an attempt made to remove them. I believe that when that takes place the smaller provinces can have any fair grievances brought before this Parliament and before the Imperial Parliament for cure. In the meantime it seems to me there is nothing to do but to respect the constitution and carry it out literally. The people of Ontario, as far as I can speak for that province, will stand for the reduction that is coming to them. The province has been greatly increased in its territory, yet the representation has to be reduced, and we abide loyally by the constitution as it should be carried out. We also are glad to see that the great provinces in the West are having that increased representation which is coming to them. If there is a place where proportional representation could be tried it is in the West. I do not say that we could put it in force on this occasion but there is no reason why proportional representation should not be attempted in some constituencies, and in that way we might bring about what this law should bring about, a better representation of the political thought of the people, rather than a representation of people who seem to think together municipally. That is no great bond in regard to politics. Our effort should be to get in this House a fair representation of the political thought of all the people of the country.

5 p.m.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has followed the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in the discussion of proportional representation. I am not sure but that there is a good deal in his contention. If I remember, a few years ago something of this kind was tried in Toronto but it was withdrawn.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: It was not broad enough.

Mr. GRAHAM: Probably it was not broad enough. It should have extended outside of Toronto.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Or to the whole city.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is a good deal to be said in favour of minorities being represented. As a matter of fact, the minorities under our system are not represented as they should be. A difference of one voter in a constituency may make an entire difference of the thought which the member pretends to represent. He comes here as representing the thought of the whole constituency, but he does not do anything of the kind. I am rather inclined to believe, with the member for Pictou and the member for York, that there is a great deal in the contention that proportional representation might be tried at least in a portion of Canada with no detrimental result to any one.

Mr. BURNHAM Has the hon. gentleman looked into the fact that there may be a variety of different opinions in any constituency, and if he is going to give representation to those opinions he might have not one but five or six candidates.

Mr. GRAHAM: They would work out their own salvation on that line whether they were one or ten. Generally speaking, the voters in a riding are divided largely into two classes and they culminate their

views in the discussions between the two great parties; but if there be some other wing of the people who have something else in their minds, they ought to be represented in this House; and under proportional representation it would be possible to work that out.

Now as to the question of the smaller provinces, I do not propose to speak for Ontario, I am speaking now for myself. Possibly the members for Ontario may agree with me largely. The basis of our representation is supposed to be population. That decision was not arrived at without a good deal of discussion, thought and hard feelings on many sides; but finally the representation of the Dominion of Canada in this House is supposed to be by population, and to change that must be to change the foundation in that respect of the British North America Act. The Confederation itself was based on compromise. No country has ever achieved great success in any departure from existing conditions without both schools of thought compromising to some extent, without, as we say, giving and taking. As Confederation was based on compromise, I would have no hesitation, if it could be worked out, either by a change of the British North America Act or otherwise, in allowing the smaller provinces to maintain their present representation, or even to have the representation which they had at the time of Confederation. This is not Prince Edward Island, or Manitoba, or Quebec, or Ontario, Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick; this is Canada, and what is best for Canada as a whole we, in each part of Canada, ought to try and work out, regardless of whether it harmonizes entirely with our own beliefs or not. But, coming back to representation, there is something wrong with our basis of representation, so far as minorities are concerned. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), the other night had a grievance from Quebec as to the number of members in this House on each side. He contended that, according to the votes cast in 1911, there should be a difference of only one, thirty-two Conservatives and thirty-three Liberals; whereas there was quite a large discrepancy between the number of Conservatives and the number of Liberals returned to this House. I was struck with the figures and commenced figuring to see if the basis of the whole fabric of representation was not wrong. I took the Dominion of Canada and the vote cast in Canada in 1911. The total number of votes cast was 1,307,528. For the Conservatives there were cast 669,594, and for the Liberals 625,103, and for the Independents 12,831. The difference in the Dominion of Canada between the votes cast for Conservatives and for Liberals was only 44,491—and that included Toronto. The average vote cast in each constituency was about 6,200. If we work that out as did the Postmaster General, in this House at the present time there should be 114 Conservatives and 107 Liberals, or a majority of just seven. That is worse than my hon. friend found in Quebec.

Mr. PELLETIER: If the hon. member takes the figures of the elections of 1908 for the whole Dominion of Canada, I would like to know what the result will be.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will give them to my hon. friend when the Bill comes back. As this redistribution is on the census of 1910 the figures before that would not be conducive to the enlightenment of the House.

Take my own province of Ontario—and it, I think, will show that the hon. member for South York is right in saying that minorities are not properly represented under the present system—and with such an injustice done to the Liberal party by a Liberal Government you can see that there must be something wrong with the system. I almost hesitate to trust ourselves even to that committee under that system. Take Ontario, the total vote cast was 480,572. Of these 269,930 were cast for Conservatives and 207,078 for Liberals, a difference of 62,852. Let me see how it worked out. We have in this House 72 Conservatives and 14 Liberals. There was more difference than that before the South Bruce election, but at the present time it is 72 to 14. If we worked this out according to my hon. friend's figuring, there should be from Ontario 38 Liberals and 48 Conservatives, a difference of 10 instead of 58. I applied the figures of the Postmaster General for the whole of Canada to our own province to show that there must be something wrong with our system if it is not applicable to present-day conditions. I recognize that the work of the committee will be arduous. There will be many differences of opinion, but I urge them—and I feel confident they will do it—to take all possible pains to see that, while county boundaries are maintained so far as possible, the people of the Dominion of Canada are given the right to be properly represented according to their views, and according to population, whether it be in condensed centers or rural districts.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, Prince Edward Island): I was pleased to hear the remarks of my hon. friend from South Renfrew with reference to the representation of the Maritime provinces. I agree with him that, under present conditions, it would be proper for this Parliament to restore to the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island the representation which they had at Confederation. In 1864, when the first conference in regard to Confederation was held in Charlottetown, at which representatives of all the provinces were present, a programme was drawn up but was not agreed to at that time. The conference was adjourned to Quebec, and the programme again submitted, but the delegates from Prince Edward Island did not see fit to agree with the programme as regards their representation. It gave them only five representatives in a House of, I think, 194. They thought that they would lose all their influence if they agreed to any such programme, and in consequence they did not enter Confederation in 1867. The Dominion of Canada, in order to round out the Confederation, wanted Prince Edward Island to come in, but the Island held out for six members. Their population did not justify the Dominion granting them that number; it only justified the granting of five members. But at last, on the 9th of July, 1873, Prince Edward Island was granted six members and came into Confederation. The question of redistribution has been before Parliament on many occasions. The first redistribution was made in 1881, when Prince Edward Island, though only entitled to five members, was allowed to retain her six. I wish to impress this upon the House, because at that time it was well known that Prince Edward Island had not the population to justify the granting of six members. When my hon. friend from Kings (Mr. J. J. Hughes) made his address before this House in 1903, he made the statement attributed to him by the leader of the House:

> The hon. gentleman says that in 1881 the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald allowed Prince Edward Island to retain its original representation, though the population of the province did not entitle it to that representation. The reason of that was, I think, because the census of 1881 was the first Dominion census that was taken after the Island entered Confederation, and consequently there was no previous census with which to compare that one, so far as Prince Edward Island was concerned.

I think that was a lame excuse from the hon. member for Kings. He is a man well informed on public affairs and when he made that speech in 1903 he knew well that a census was taken in Prince Edward Island in 1871 and that a report of that census was in the library of this Parliament. He knew that, when he made the statement that there was no census of Prince Edward Island to compare with the Dominion census of 1881. He made a statement which he knew was not in accordance with the facts. The census of 1871 gave the population of Prince Edward Island as 93,698.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I was out of the Chamber when my hon. friend was referring to me but I understand that the hon. gentleman has said there was a Dominion census before 1881. He must know that statement is incorrect.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: I made no such statement. I said that there was a census of Prince Edward Island before it entered Confederation; that the report of that census was in the library in 1903 when the hon. member made his speech, and that the report of that census could have been compared with the Dominion census of 1881. But instead of the hon. member getting that information from the library and giving it to the House, he found fault with the Conservative members who represented the province in the Parliament of 1881. In 1892, he also found fault with the manner in which the Prince Edward Island representatives conducted this business of representation. At that time the province was very ably represented on the Liberal side. Sir Louis Davies represented one of our constituencies. He sat in this House during the discussion, but not one word was said by him, or by any other representative with regard to representation in Prince Edward Island. I do not know why, and I do not suppose the hon. member for Kings knows anything more about it than I do. No reflections need be cast on any one for having neglected to do his duty as a representative of Prince Edward Island at that time. After the Redistribution Act of 1892, the people of Prince Edward Island began to agitate for the restoration of their original representation, and in 1902 they forwarded a resolution, passed by the legislature of the province, to the Dominion Parliament protesting strongly against the reduction in representation. That resolution is to be found in the journals of the Prince Edward Island legislature. It placed the matter clearly before Parliament.

The resolution is a very long one. I do not intend to read it at the present time. I may have another opportunity of bringing the matter to the attention of the House before the debate closes. This resolution was moved by the Hon. Mr. Peters, at that time Premier, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Rogers, and adopted by the Legislature of Prince Edward Island. In it all the different stages by which Prince Edward Island was admitted into the Union are described. It sets forth that the terms and conditions upon which Prince Edward Island entered the Dominion of Canada were expressed in addresses from the legislature of the then colony, and amongst these conditions was the following:

> That the population of Prince Edward Island having increased by 15,000 or upwards since the year 1861, the island shall be represented in the House of Commons of Canada by six members;—

Here is a matter which should receive the consideration of this House when it is dealing with the representation of Prince Edward Island. Why was it that the number six was put into that address? It was because the population of Prince Edward Island had increased by 15,000 or upwards since the year 1861.

An hon. MEMBER: What date was that?

Mr. McLEAN: That was in 1873. It says that Prince Edward Island was to be represented by six members, and the representation to be readjusted from time to time under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867. They must have thought, when this resolution was passed, that Prince Edward Island would always be entitled to six members no matter how the population decreased, and that if it increased the representation should be readjusted. There is no other inference to be drawn from this resolution except that. Why were the words '15,000 or upwards' placed in this resolution, unless it meant that the representation should not decrease? We were only entitled, when the resolution was passed, to five representatives. We got six, but the gentlemen who drew up that document knew that they were only entitled to five. They gave a reason for it and that reason was that the population had increased by 15,000 since 1861. Whether that is a valid reason or not is a matter for the consideration of this House. Then they go on in this resolution and give the reasons why these delegates who were at the Quebec conference did not agree to enter into Confederation in 1867. A schedule of extracts from speeches delivered at the conference of 1864 is given. Mr. Haviland said at that conference:

> Prince Edward Island would rather be out of the Confederation than consent to this motion. We would have no status, only five members out of 194, would give the Island no position.

There was certainly the idea in the minds of these gentlemen that Prince Edward Island would lose whatever influence she possessed unless she had a representation of six members. They held out at the conference of 1867 and they continued to hold out until 1873 against coming into the Confederation unless they got the representation to which they thought they were entitled to give them the same status as that which they already possessed. Mr. Palmer said:

> Representation by population is not applicable when a certain number of provinces are throwing up their self-government and individuality.

The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) said that the basis upon which Confederation was formed was representation by population, but the gentlemen who were present at that conference did not think so. To a certain extent they may have thought so, and that principle may have been applied, but it was not applied all round. Mr. Palmer continues:

> When a colony surrenders that right she should have something commensurate in the Confederation. Why give up so great certainties when we have only a feeble voice? I never understood that any proposition that Charlottetown was to be binding as to representation by population.

Here is the opinion of a man who was present at the conference at Quebec, and who, in a speech which he made at that conference, said that he never understood that any proposition was too binding as to representation by population. That is a statement made at the conference itself and how are you going to get over it? Mr. Whelan said:

> I do not think, however, I could say that I was satisfied with the representation of five members to the federal House of Commons. We are in an isolated position, our resources are not large and our people would not be content to give up their present benefits for the representation of five members. It may be said that Confederation will go on without Prince Edward Island and that we shall eventually be forced in. Better, however, that than we should willingly go into the Confederation with that representation.

Col. Grey, who was the leader of the Government at that time, said:

> I am instructed by my co-delegates to say that the provisions of five members is unsatis-

factory. Prince Edward Island is divided longitudinally into three counties, we cannot divide three counties into five members.

Mr. Coles said:

Mr. Galt has proposed six members for Prince Edward Island; I approve of that rather than Mr. Brown's motion because it allows us to give our counties two members each.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this conference of 1864 refused to give six members to Prince Edward Island, and Prince Edward Island refused to enter into Confederation. It remained out until 1873. The Dominion Government being very anxious to obtain Prince Edward Island as a part of the Confederation, entered into further negotiations, not only in regard to representation, but in regard to the subsidy which the province should get, and two delegates came from Prince Edward Island to Ottawa. The first delegate to come was Mr. Robert E. Haythorne. He came on the 26th of February, 1873, and he held a conference with the Government. He telegraphed to the Government of Prince Edward Island:

Held two conferences. Increase of annual allowance. Probably yield six representatives.

It is clearly laid down in the correspondence that we held out for six representatives. The correspondence shows it, the telegrams show it, the speeches show it, and there can be no doubt about it. If we are not entitled to this legally, if a mistake has been made in drawing up the terms of Confederation, the resolution of 1873, it should be amended. As a matter of equity, we have the right to ask that the resolution be amended. It has been stated here by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that this Parliament has no power to deal with this matter. Then, the necessary steps should be taken by this Parliament to ask the Imperial Parliament to right this wrong. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that a wrong has been done in the drafting of this resolution. The men who were the delegates were not lawyers, they were not versed in the technical words which are used in the constitution, but they depended a great deal upon the officials of the department in Ottawa; these officials wrote these resolutions and they were passed by this House. From the conversations which they had with the Government and from the correspondence which they had exchanged with the Government, the delegates concluded that they would get a representation of six members for all time to come. That is what they depended upon and upon that representation, and upon that agreement, they entered Confederation. Some years afterwards they found out that the words which had been put into the resolution were wrong. Is the fact that a palpable error was made in 1873 any reason why this Parliament should not right that wrong? Is it just that this Parliament, the highest court of equity and of justice in this land, should not right that wrong? I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is it not simple justice that the people of Prince Edward Island should ask that this wrong be righted by this Parliament. I wish to place on record the following telegrams bearing on this question which passed when the terms of Confederation were being considered in 1873:

Telegram from Robert P. Haythorne to Lieutenant Governor Robinson, dated February 26, 1873:

Held two conferences. Increase of annual allowance. Probable yield six representatives.

Telegram from Robert P. Haythorne to Lieutenant Governor Robinson, March 6, 1873:

Highly probable get six representatives try and send reply Council as soon as possible.

Telegram from Lieutenant Governor Robinson to Robert P. Haythorne:

Council concur in advising dissolution. We hope six representatives will be conceded.

Telegram to Hon. Edward Palmer from Robert P. Haythorne, March 8, 1873:

Except modifications stated and interest difference old debt better terms allowed. Six members conceded.

Does any one imagine that the delegates from Prince Edward Island, having the case of British Columbia before them and knowing the agitation that was made by the representatives of British Columbia in 1871, before they entered Confederation, to have a fixed number of members in this House, would allow a clause to be put upon the statute-books by which the representation of the province could at any time be decreased? It has been stated over and over again by the members of the Prince Edward Island delegation who were present, that they thought they were getting the same terms as British Columbia had obtained. British Columbia fought for a minimum representation of six members, and that was conceded to her notwithstanding that at the time the white population of that province was only 10,000. British Columbia had a representation of six members in this House for twenty years, and

the most she was entitled to during that period would be four members. And yet, Prince Edward Island came into Confederation under the same moral agreement as did British Columbia. Then, when Manitoba came into Confederation, Manitoba was conceded four members when her population was less than one unit, entitling her at most to only one member. There was a further provision in the Manitoba Act that after the census of 1881 the representation of the province should be readusted under the terms of the British North America Act. The census of 1881 showed that Manitoba had a population of 62,260, which would have entitled her to three members, but in that redistribution Manitoba got five members and not three.

The question of the representation of Prince Edward Island has been before this House for a great number of years. It was discussed in 1903; and in 1905 and 1907 resolutions with respect to the matter were moved. I believe that every hon. gentleman who heard these discussions was convinced, that morally and equitably, Prince Edward Island was entitled to have her original representation restored. If a wrong has been done Prince Edward Island, this is the time and the place to right it, and I trust the committee, which will be appointed under this Bill, will have power to consider the claims of the province and to make a recommendation in accordance with them. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said that the committee could not deal with this matter, but I take it that this House can delegate to its committee any powers it wishes to. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition, this afternoon, pointed out, that at one time it was proposed that the redistribution of constituencies should be submitted to a committee of judges, and consequently the right hon. gentleman evidently believes that under the British North America Act Parliament could delegate that power to the judges. If that be so, why cannot Parliament delegate equal authority to one of its own committees. Section 51 of the British North America Act provides:

> On the completion of the census in the year one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, and on each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such a manner, and from such time, as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides.

This Parliament can, therefore, readjust, by such authority and in such manner as it may deem fit; and consequently this Parliament can lay down rules for the guidance of its committee. That committee can make recommendation that Prince Edward Island is equitably and honestly entitled to six members in this House, and that recommendation could be inserted in the Bill. I have no doubt that the Imperial Parliament would, on the petition of this Parliament, if that were necessary, amend the British North America Act so as to give proper effect to the terms, in this respect, on which Prince Edward Island entered Confederation. As this matter will be discussed again during the session, I shall have something further to say on it.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester, N.B.): I have so many times spoken on this question in previous parliaments and in this, that I feel embarrassed in having again to address the House. I agree very sincerely with the suggestion of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition that the Prime Minister should withdraw the suggestion of referring the representation of Prince Edward Island to the committee. It is not with pleasure that I, or any other of the Maritime province members, look upon the reduction in the representation of our provinces, in view especially of the immense preponderance of representation that is bound to come from the West. At the same time I for one have always taken the ground that in this country we must adhere to the fundamental principles of the British North America Act. Whenever we undertake to deviate from those principles, we are always in danger of making our position worse than before.

While I agree with my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in standing firm by the principles of representation as outlined in our constitution, even for my sister province of Prince Edward Island, I do so because I believe that this Parliament has no power, as has been so clearly put by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, to deal with this question, and the committee therefore that would be appointed by this House has still less power to deal with this question. If we have no power in our hands, we cannot convey any power to the committee in respect to the matter. I believe that my right hon. friend the leader of the Government in making that suggestion has been carried away by sympathy for the Maritime provinces, more particularly for the smallest of the Maritime provinces. I wish to commend to him the words of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition to-day, that he will consider again and withdraw this recommendation which may perhaps only be useful in maintaining an agitation for representation

to which we have no right, and which can be given to us only by change of the constitution, and this Parliament has no power to change the constitution except by reference to the provinces and that cannot be done to-day.

We had a convention of the provincial premiers in October last, and the question was submitted to them. No understanding has so far been arrived at. They decided to leave the matter where it was, and therefore we should do the same until a new convention is held and then, perhaps, they may arrive at a unanimous decision. It would only be then that we could apply to the Parliament of Great Britain for a change of constitution. This cannot be done now and the country cannot wait until we have a change of constitution.

For my friends from Prince Edward Island I have the greatest possible sympathy. I am in the same position as they are, but perhaps I might be of some use to them in giving them the advice which I have given them in the past, that between the Maritime provinces, in order to strengthen our position in this Parliament, we have other means at our command. Therefore, we should direct our energies to those means that are practical and possible. We should unite the three Maritime provinces, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia into one province. This matter has already been brought up. It was brought up before Confederation, as my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce knows very well, and Confederation was helped along by the idea of bringing the Maritime provinces together into one province. We would then be represented in this House by as large a number of members as any of the other provinces of the West are to-day. Possibly under the sympathetic views of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, we could give Prince Edward Island the four representatives which her people would like to keep to-day, because in the united province we could distribute our representation so as to give that island the representation which the people would like to keep while maintaining our dignity as well. My hon. friends from the Maritime provinces would willingly go into such a question again. I would suggest that we try to bring into Confederation Newfoundland with whom we have the same interest in every respect. Then our representation would be increased by say ten or twelve more, and we would be as strong a province as regards representation as any province in the Dominion.

As to what has been said about representation, it is very well known that the fathers of Confederation from the Maritime provinces would never have consented to representation by population unless the Senate had been constituted as a compensation for the representation in the House of Commons, and unless that representation had been made permanent and effective and proportionate. Therefore, the constitution of the Senate, in so far as it is made to represent the smaller bodies of Confederation, to represent the smaller provinces as well as the smaller bodies in every province concerned has not been made on the principle of the American Senate or of a similar body in any other country. It was made to meet the circumstances of Canada as a whole, as it was to be with that growing preponderance from the West. This Senate, therefore, has one chief object in view, that is, the protection of minorities. When I speak of minorities, I mean smaller provinces as well as minorities in the different provinces. Therefore, we cannot say that there is an incongruity in the fact that, after this redistribution of seats in the House, perhaps the province of Prince Edward Island will have as large a representation in the Senate as it has in the House of Commons. If the people of the Maritime provinces do not exert themselves more than they have done in the past to keep their population at home, the time may come when New Brunswick and Nova Scotia may be represented in this House by fewer representatives than in the Senate, where for each of these provinces we have ten. In my opinion, the fathers of Confederation, knowing that this great development was bound to continue for centuries to come, were well aware that nothing would induce the people of the Maritime provinces to stand here only on representation by population. If we were to commence again to-day, I for one would not consent to see New Brunswick or the other Maritime provinces come into this Confederation under the principle of representation by population if we did not have some other means of security for the future.

It is said that the province of Prince Edward Island is under peculiar circumstances; and that when she came into Confederation, after having refused to do so for a certain number of years, she came in under the expectation that she was to be represented by six members in the House of Commons in perpetuity, and that the

representation would not be decreased no matter what her population might be in proportion to the population of the other provinces. On this point I entertain a different view. It may seem strange that the representatives from Prince Edward Island, after having opposed Confederation for a certain number of years, came in under the terms of the British North America Act; but I claim that if they did come in that Act, they came into Confederation conscientiously, and that the Government of that day that brought Prince Edward Island into Confederation did it conscientiously also. In the debates of the first days of Confederation much more will be found to justify my position than to justify the position taken by my hon. friend (Mr. McLean). The reason why the Government of that day did not feel justified in bringing Prince Edward Island into Confederation, except under the terms of the British North America Act, was that the same Government had committed the error—perhaps in good faith—of bringing British Columbia into Confederation in 1871 with six members, though its population did not justify so large a representation, and of giving it a right to retain that number of members for all time to come. That was discussed in Parliament at the time, and I can say that it was because the Government of that day saw that they had made an error that they were determined not to repeat that error when Prince Edward Island came in. For authority I give you the very gentleman who in New Brunswick had been the strongest opponent of Confederation, particularly on this very point of representation. I speak of the gentleman who was the first representative in this House of the county which I now have the honour to represent, Hon. T. W. Anglin, who for four years enjoyed the dignity which is now yours, Mr. Speaker, as President of this Chamber, and whose son now adorns the highest tribunal of this country. He was one of the great factors in the discussion which resulted in the decision of New Brunswick in favour of Confederation, and it was this very question of representation which caused him to oppose Confederation. He wielded a powerful influence, having a great newspaper at his command, the Freeman of St. John, and was besides a recognized authority on these questions. But, while he opposed Confederation, yet, when the final decision was reached, he was willing to stand by the terms of the constitution. But for that very reason he was determined to see to it that it was maintained for British Columbia as well as for the Maritime provinces.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 65, respecting the McClary Manufacturing Company.—Mr. Beattie.

Bill No. 66, respecting the Patent of the National Wood Distilling Company.—Mr. Clements.

Bill No. 67, to incorporate the Norfolk and Elgin Railway Company.—Mr. Marshall.

Bill No. 68, respecting the Western Central Railway Company.—Mr. Henderson.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Borden for the second reading of Bill No. 82, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, resumed.

Mr. TURGEON: Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was commencing to endeavour to demonstrate to this House, in reply to the hon. member for Prince Edward Island who had just taken his seat, that the Parliament of Canada, in 1871, committed an error in respect to the constitution when British Columbia was admitted into this Confederation with a representation of six members, which was not to be decreased, but was to be increased according to the terms of Confederation. The wording perhaps did not strike the attention of many members of Parliament or other people in Canada, but it was an infringement on the principle of representation by population, and if it was allowed to pass, no doubt it was with the expectation, justified in the hopes of every man in Canada, that the province of Nova Scotia, with her immense territory and her immense resources of every nature, would certainly be able to keep her representation in comparison with the other provinces. Meanwhile let me say to my friend from Prince Edward Island that, in my opinion, and in the opinion of any member of high authority in this country at the time and ever since, those six repre-

sentatives of the province of British Columbia, while they were taking their seats in this House until that province acquired a sufficient population to allow it six seats in this House, were taking their seats unconstitutionally, and had virtually no moral right to be in this House. If I had had time to make some researches, I am sure I could quote eminent constitutional authorities to sustain this statement. Meanwhile I sympathize with my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, who finds it hard that that province, coming into Confederation after British Columbia with the expectation in the minds of the people that their representation of six would not be diminished in the future, must submit to a reduction of representation. The terms of the Act bringing Prince Edward Island into Confederation leave no doubt as to the intent and spirit of the constitution itself when it reads that Prince Edward Island, having increased her population to such a number, should be admitted to Conferdation with a representation of six members but to be readjusted according to the terms of Confederation. If the word 'readjusted' had been used in the statute of British Columbia instead of the words 'to be increased according to the terms of the British North America Act, there would not have been any difficulty as to British Columbia. It is no doubt owing to the debate which took place in this Parliament on the bringing of British Columbia into Confederation that the Government in 1872 was more particular in not repeating the same error they had made in the case of British Columbia, and then, too, the principle of representation had been sustained by the representatives of the Maritime provinces, those who were here, ready, as I am to-day, to submit to the circumstances into which our constitution may bring us, with more or less representation in the future. I quoted my predecessor in office, the Hon. Timothy Warren Anglin, who represented for fourteen or fifteen years the county which I now represent. I may also quote the name of Sir Albert Smith, who was a strong opponent of Confederation, but who strongly supported the terms of Confederation after the provinces had been admitted, and who, although from the Maritime provinces, took the stand that I take to-day, that if we want to perpetuate the good will of the people of the different provinces and to work for their future happiness and for ours, we must stand by the principle of representation by population, even if it involves a sacrifice on the part of some sections of the country. In a country like ours, with a territory stretching from ocean to ocean, with a population which is increasing by a million every year, so that in a few years we will have fifteen millions to twenty millions of people, we cannot expect that everybody will be equally satisfied, owing to the great diversity of interests that must exist in different sections of the country. For the sake of the future happiness of this country, we of the Maritime provinces are prepared to make sacrifices.

It is not merely the number of representatives that makes for the happiness of this country, but the good will of all. When I stand here to-day, begging, as I might say, not only my colleagues from the Maritime provinces, but the people at large, to stand by the terms of Confederation, I am consistent. That is the stand I have always taken. My first public act almost was to stand by the terms of Confederation under the most difficult circumstances. In 1873, by a judgment of the Privy Council, the Catholic minority in the province of New Brunswick were told that we had no constitutional rights as to separate education. Young as I was, I was one of the first of the Catholic minority in the province of New Brunswick to stand by that judgment and to appeal to my people to stand by it, and direct our energies through other channels for the redress of our grievances. I took the same stand not very long ago, when the question came up of increasing the provincial subsidies. If my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition were here, I would recall to his memory that at that time I wrote him a letter telling him that I would be only too glad to see more money given to the provinces for the construction of roads and for educational purposes; but I pointed out that the money would have to be distributed according to population, and under the sole control of the provinces. I had a satisfactory reply from my leader, telling me that he held the same views, and he asked what I thought of a conference of all the provincial premiers. I replied that I was perfectly agreeable to such a conference, and that I would adhere to whatever conclusion they reached; and to-day I take the same stand.

Let me tell my right hon. friend that I am not alone in the province of New Brunswick in holding these views. Men who have devoted many years to the

study of conditions in this country, men of high attainments and independent of politics, hold the same views, and I would be derelict in my duty if I did not take this oportunity of expressing my views and of begging the Prime Minister to withdraw, for the sake of Prince Edward Island, the suggestion he made to the committee. I fear that its effect would be to stir up a useless agitation. I, for one, hope that the members of this House will always be animated by a spirit of justice. I expect that every member who may come in from the far West will, when he enters this sanctuary of the Canadian people, be animated by a sense of justice and chivalry for the poor and weak. No Canadian wants charity, we want justice. Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, in the words of the late D'arcy McGee, who compared Canada to a tree, carrying in its growth the true spirit of British institutions. It has already expanded and covered Canada from coast to coast, and in the course of a few years it will extend over the shores of Newfoundland. To repeat his own words, 'And of that tree every Canadian is always sure to get his fair share of the shelter and the shade.' With that hope, I call upon my right hon. friend to withdraw his suggestion to the committee. I thank you for your kind attention.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister): I have only a few words to say in speaking in reply on this Bill. My right hon. friend, in the course of his observations, did not take any pronounced exception to the principles which I had submitted for consideration in introducing the Bill. He went somewhat at length into the question of the extent to which county boundaries had been departed from in the readjustment of 1903. It is neither necessary nor desirable that I should go into that question at length to-night, because it will be a proper matter for the consideration of the committee. The right hon. gentleman dealt only with the province of Quebec. If he had taken the province of Ontario and some other provinces, he might have found a good many illustrations in addition to those with which he has favoured the House. In the province of Ontario I recall that the municipal boundaries were departed from in the case of the county of Carleton, the city of Ottawa, the county of Russell, the county of Frontenac, the city of Kingston, and I think also in the case of the county of Leeds; and in addition to that in relation to the territorial district of Nipissing. In the province of Nova Scotia the county of Cape Breton was divided and a part of it added to the adjoining county of Victoria. In saying this, I do not at all intend to suggest that great consideration should not be given to the question of county boundaries. I only desire to repeat that, in connection therewith, another principle must be taken into account—the equalizing, to as reasonable an extent as possible, of the population within the various electoral districts which are to be established in Canada.

The right hon. gentleman was more or less exercised because I had left a blank in the Bill with respect to the representation of Prince Edward Island. But, in discussing that question, he did not even allude to the matters which I thought worthy of consideration by the House and by the committee, namely, the fact that the province of Prince Edward Island has alleged, and still alleges, whether rightly or wrongly, that there was an unfortunate mistake made in drawing up the terms of Confederation in that regard. Nor did he allude to what I thought was proper for the consideration of the House and the committee—the question as to whether or not it is a desirable thing that any province in Canada should have a smaller representation in the lower House than in the Senate. Nor did he pay any attention whatever to the suggestion which I made, that the population of Prince Edward Island, being almost entirely a rural population, it would be entitled, if situated in any other province in Canada, to have a representation of at least four members. Both he and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) seemed to be more or less disturbed about some proposed attempt to depart from the compact by which the various provinces were given representation upon a certain basis. My hon. friend from Pictou, as well as the right hon. gentleman himself, sought to enlighten me as to the capacity of this Parliament to deal with the question under consideration. I am not disposed at the present moment to debate the legal question, but it might be worth while, in passing, to allude to the fact that upon a strict application of the 51st section of the British North America Act in 1882, the province of Prince Edward Island would then have had its representation reduced to five members.

I did allude to the consideration put forward by my hon. friend from Kings, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes), but I alluded to it as a consideration present

to the minds of those who framed and introduced that Bill, and not as a legal ground which would have justified them in concluding that upon strictly legal considerations the province could have retained its membership. Given in the first place the unit fixed by the population of the province of Quebec and applying that unit to Prince Edward Island, you would thus find that the representation of that province must be reduced. Then when you came to seek relief from that result by reason of the provision of the 4th subsection of the 51st section of the British North America Act, the reason suggested by the hon. member of Kings would not justify a departure from the result arising from the first part of the section. If the conditions demanded by the provisions of that subsection were not capable of being invoked, the subsection could have no operation. However, that is by the way. I did suggest, in regard to Prince Edward Island, that at least that province ought to have the right to be heard, and I venture to propose that the province shall have the right to be heard before that committee, notwithstanding the apprehensions which have been expressed with very great eloquence and earnestness by the hon. member for Gloucester, New Brunswick (Mr. Turgeon). I am afraid that my hon. friend is of too timorous a frame of mind altogether, because no one is disposed to rush into an attempt to depart from the compact which was entered into at the time Prince Edward Island was brought into Confederation. The questions which have been presented for our consideration speak for themselves.

If my right hon. friend, who leads the Opposition, is somewhat exercised about my own attitude in this regard, I would like to tell him, if he were present, that if there has been any departure from the compact made between the original provinces in 1867, when a certain basis of representation in this Parliament was fixed, it seems to me that my right hon. friend is the only one who is to be credited with such a departure. When we, two years ago, in pursuance of a resolution passed by this House some years before, added a very large territory to the province of Quebec, we made two provisions which were fair, on the one hand, to the province of Quebec and, on the other hand, to the Maritime provinces and all the other provinces of Canada. We provided, by the terms of the Bill which at that time was passed by Parliament, that if there should be in the additional territory a population entitled to representation in this House of Commons it should receive that representation. That was fair to the province of Quebec. We also provided that, for the purpose of fixing the unit which should determine the representation of the Maritime provinces and the other provinces of Canada, the population within that added territory should not be taken into consideration. That was fair, as I say, on the one hand, for the province of Quebec, and it was absolutely fair, on the other hand, to the people of the Maritime provinces and the other provinces of Canada.

When my right hon. friend added 250,000 square miles to the province of Quebec in 1897 he took no such course as that. He enlarged the geographical unit upon which depends the representation of all the other provinces of Canada by about 250,000 square miles, and if there should be one person for every four square miles of territory inhabiting that added territory, the result would be that the unit which determines the representation, and will determine the representation of the Maritime provinces and of the province of Ontario for all time to come, would be increased by no less than one thousand. Every hon. gentleman in this House will understand that that would make a very material change, and would, I believe, if it were acted upon at the present time, change the representation of more than one province in Canada in the measure which we now propose. Therefore, in view of the fact that my right hon. friend has expressed so keen an anxiety that we depart in no measure whatever from the compact which was entered into at the time of Confederation, it would have been well for him at the time he made that change in 1897, to have had regard to the same considerations which affect him so deeply to-day.

My hon. friend from the county of Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has alluded to the methods by which the British North America Act has been changed in the past, or may be changed in the future, namely, by an address to His Majesty's Government asking that a certain change should be made in the Constitutional Act which is the charter of the people of this Dominion. That is one method; but perhaps my hon. friend from Pictou is not aware that other methods have also been established on more than one occasion since 1867, and that there have been occasions when legislation has been passed by

this Parliament admittedly, or probably, beyond the jurisdiction of this Parliament, accompanied with a stipulation that it should not be put into force until after an Act had been passed by the Imperial Parliament confirming the provisions which were therein set forth.

My hon. friend from Pictou also made certain observations with regard to the principles which should govern the committee. I would like to say, in so far as these are concerned, that while some of the principles which he laid down would be entirely desirable if they were practicable, I do not for a moment think that they would be practicable as determining the conclusions of the committee; nor are they in force to-day in half of the constituencies in Canada. When the hon. gentleman expressed not only the importance but the necessity of having all the people within a constituency in direct relation with each other in a business way and otherwise, he certainly must have known that no such desirable result is possible. In my own county it is not possible; in his county I do not think it is possible; and there are many other constituencies in Canada in which such a result could not be obtained. At the same time, in so far as it can be obtained, I find no fault with the suggestion of my hon. friend.

In regard to certain observations addressed to me by my hon. friend from Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) and in connection with which I am the innocent cause of that hon. gentleman thinking it necessary to read to the House the whole of a very excellent speech which he delivered in 1903—I beg to say to him that it is not by any means my desire to misrepresent him, and I am perfectly willing to leave his speech and my observations to the judgment of the members of the House. The hon. gentleman may have one opinion in regard to his observations and I may have another, but I can assure him that my opinion is as sincerely held by me as his opinion can possibly be held by him. I do not know of one argument that has ever been raised against the claims of Prince Edward Island which was not embodied in the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in 1903. If he is able to state now one single argument ever put forward against the claims of his province which he did not put forward in that speech, I will yield the floor to him and let him state what it is. That his province was debarred by reason of acquiescence, he emphasized over and over again.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Did I make one statement that was not correct, according to the British North America Act?

Mr. BORDEN: I stated that my hon. friend had argued against the contention of Mr. Hackett, and I said he had argued strongly against it. The hon. gentleman himself will not deny that he argued against the contention of Mr. Hackett, and if I do him the compliment to say he argued strongly, surely he ought not to find fault with me.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Will the right hon. gentleman say that I made one statement contrary to the proper interpretation of the British North America Act?

Mr. BORDEN: My hon. friend did not confine himself to the British North America Act; he put forward the theory of acquiescence. He said Prince Edward Island could not make any claim now because of acquiescence, and in the concluding part of his speech he said that Prince Edward Island could not raise its claim now because of the lapse of time. Further, he put aside the contention which had been raised then, and is still raised, that there had been an actual mistake as between the two contracting parties in 1873, and he declared that the resultant condition was due simply to the fact that the gentlemen who represented Prince Edward Island on that occasion were guilty of an oversight. He did not contend that there had been a mistake, but that there had been neglect and forgetfulness. Under the circumstances, I do not know how I could have criticised the observations of my hon. friend, if I alluded to them at all, except as I have done. My hon. friend certainly argued against Mr. Hackett; he will not deny that, and I thought he argued strongly against Mr. Hackett; but if he desires me to withdraw that, and to say that he tried to argue strongly but argued weakly, I will let the matter go at that.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has referred to the number of the committee, and has made an appeal to us to increase the number from seven to nine. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side were content, and we were content in 1903, to have a committee of only seven. The argument is put forward that inasmuch as there are nine provinces now, the committee should consist of nine, there having been only seven provinces in 1903

and seven members on the committee. Perhaps hon. members who have not looked at the record will be a little surprised to learn that although there were seven provinces in 1903, only three of those seven provinces were represented on that committee. Ontario had three members: Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Hyman and Mr. Haggart; Quebec had two members: Mr. Fitzpatrick and Mr. Monk; the Maritime provinces had one member: myself; and the Northwest Territories had one member: Mr. Davis. The provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, were not represented at all on that committee. If we are going to have every province in Canada represented on both sides it would involve a committee of 18 or 20 members, and I do not suppose anything like that is suggested.

I am disposed to give the subject every consideration, although I think my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will agree with me on reflection that for the purposes of a conference, as it is called, of this character, the smaller the number of the committee, within reasonable limits, the better. That is my idea, and for that reason I acquiesced in the proposal of the right hon. gentleman in 1903. Still, when such a suggestion is made by our friends on the other side, it ought not to be lightly dismissed, and for that reason I will not give a definite reply to-night, but at the conclusion of my observations I will move the adjournment of the debate in order that I may on Thursday or Friday next—in the meantime having conferred with my right hon. friend and possibly some other gentlemen on the other side of the House—be able to say whether a committee of seven members or nine members is really most likely to be the more effective. It is my desire, as far as may be reasonably possible to meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen opposite in this matter. What I have said is only with the view of pointing out that there was no attempt in 1903 to represent the various provinces of Canada on that committee. The only object which governed the constitution of the committee in 1903, was to have four members from one side of the House and three members from the other side, who would be able, conferring with each other, to present views which would represent the opinions of the two sides of the House in regard to matters of a possibly controversial character, and to endeavour, by reasonable compromise, to reach an agreement, if possible. If that was the object in 1903, I cannot at the moment see the advantage of increasing the committee from seven to nine members.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): I do not think the increase in membership is suggested with the idea of having a member from each province, from each side of the House, which would be absurd; but does not the right hon. gentleman see that in our general rough division of the country we have the Maritime provinces, Quebec, Ontario, and the West, and the idea in the minds of some of us was that if local knowledge were required as to the various districts, it would be a little invidious to make a distinction against the West as between the other geographical divisions of the country.

Mr. BORDEN: I realize the point of view of my hon. friend from Red Deer, and any observation of his is always entitled to careful consideration. I would like to point out to him that the only two provinces established in the West at that time, Manitoba and British Columbia, had no representation upon the committee. So far as our side of the committee was concerned, we had absolutely no representation upon it in respect of either British Columbia, Manitoba or the Territories. As a matter of fact, the constitution of the committee in 1903 was rather curious, as it turned out in the end. Mr. Monk and Mr. Haggart, who were associated with me on the committee, were not perhaps as attentive upon it as I was myself, for the reason that Mr. Haggart did not desire very much to deal with details and Mr. Monk confined his attention almost entirely to the province of Quebec, which was arranged between himself and Mr. Fitzpatrick without any great difficulty, as I understand. The result was that, outside of the province of Quebec, I had imposed upon my feeble shoulders the burden of every province in Canada so far as the Opposition was concerned.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I hope my right hon. friend is not vindictive.

Mr. BORDEN: Not at all. I cannot say that I enjoyed the task very much, because the session lasted for seven months and thirteen days. We did not get away that year until the 24th of October. I found it necessary also to give a good deal of attention to a very important measure which was introduced that year, known as a Bill to establish a National Transcontinental railway. Between the Redistribution Bill

and the Bill to establish a National Transcontinental railway, I am free to say that the session of 1903 made upon me a profound impression which I do not think will ever be obliterated.

Mr. EMMERSON: I would like to make a suggestion. Does my right hon. friend appreciate the difference between this year and 1903, in respect to the number of constituencies in western Canada that will have to be dealt with now and that did not require to be dealt with in 1903? I simply present this suggestion as something that may have weight with my right hon. friend.

Mr. BORDEN: I appreciate the difference between 1903 and the present year, not only in that respect but otherwise, and I will give to this suggestion of my hon. friend the best consideration that I can.

I have nothing further to add except to say that, when my hon. friend the member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) makes those remarkable calculations with regard to the majority which is represented by a certain number of persons in Parliament today, every hon. member knows that calculations of that kind do not amount to much and that one could make an endless variety of such remarkable calculations by taking up a certain number of constituencies in one or other of the provinces of Canada. As a matter of fact, in 1908, my hon. friends on the other side of the House, although having a majority of something over forty in this House, had a minority, if I am not mistaken, of the popular vote. That does not really amount to very much in our system of popular government because, where the majorities on one side are very large and on the other side happen in many cases to be narrow, the result which I have just indicated may be very easily brought about, and no way of avoiding it can be reached unless we adopt the proposal of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean), that we should enter into one of those elaborate schemes for proportionate representation.

I remember having given some consideration to that subject some years ago. It was very strongly advocated by Earl Grey when he was Governor General of Canada, and I think he still continues to advocate it. But I am bound to say that under the system of party government, it seems to me—as I told Earl Grey at the time, although I was then in Opposition—to involve very considerable difficulties, because, if you had exactly the same proportion of representation in Parliament as would be determined by popular vote, you never could have a working majority in the House of Commons. Previously to 1908, my hon. friends on the other side of the House, as I calculate, would have had, according to the popular vote, a majority of only three and a half in this Parliament.

Mr. GRAHAM: And one middle bencher.

Mr. BORDEN: One middle bencher; and every one of us knows that it is necessary and desirable, whether one party or the other be in power, that a reasonable working majority should be on hand. I do not very well see how we could carry on our system of party government without that. I do not intend, however, to discuss the subject at length. It is sufficient to say that we are prepared to give it consideration, but I do not think we shall attempt to put it into force at this readjustment. Perhaps in the course of the next decennial census we may have further light on the subject. Further consideration in the meantime might bring about changes of opinion.

Mr. EMMERSON: You had better not give any assurance as to the future.

Mr. BORDEN: No. I will leave the number of representatives on the committee in abeyance for the present. I move that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. TURGEON: In the apparent determination of my right hon. friend to submit the question of Prince Edward Island to the committee, and in the event of the committee allowing the four representatives to the province of Prince Edward Island and thereby reversing the decision of the Privy Council, which has pronounced upon the matter, would my right hon. friend be at once ready and willing to give the four representatives to the province of Prince Edward Island?

Mr. BORDEN: My hon. friend has mistaken me. I am not submitting any decision of the Privy Council to the committee, and, with respect to what I shall do, I will remind my hon. friend from Gloucester that I have just been cautioned by my hon. friend from Westmorland not to make any promises as to the future.

Mr. GRAHAM: What day will the committee be named?

Mr. BORDEN: I will propose to resume the adjourned debate on Thursday, and then the committee will be immediately constituted. In the meantime I

will take the opportunity of conferring on the matter with the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition.

Motion of Mr. Borden agreed to, and debate adjourned.

BRANTFORD PUBLIC BUILDING.

On motion of Mr. Foster for Committee of Supply:

Mr. NESBITT: I would like to discuss for a few moments the questions which I placed on the Order Paper the other day and the answers given to the same.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are these questions answered and disposed of? If this is an anticipating of questions on the Order Paper, it would not be permissible to discuss them now.

Mr. NESBITT: They were answered, and it is the answers I wish to deal with.

Mr. SPEAKER: If this were held to be referring to a past debate, of course, it would not be in order; otherwise it would be permissible. The rule is that answers given by ministers of the Crown are given in the exercise of their best judgment and must be accepted as given.

Mr. NESBITT: The answers are perfectly plain, but I wish to make some comment on them. The questions and their answers are as follows:

1. What stone was specified to be used in the Brantford public building by the architect?
2. Was it to be Canadian?
3. What was the estimated value?
4. From whom was it purchased?
5. From where was it purchased?
6. Who was the contractor for cutting the stone?
7. Where was his home when contract was made?

Mr. Rogers:

1. Georgetown, Ontario, was specified.
2. Yes.
3. No detailed estimate was made for the stone.
4. The stone used was Berea, Ohio, sandstone, as the price quoted by the contractor in his tender was considerably lower than the price for Georgetown stone and this tender was accepted.
5. Berea, Ohio.
6 and 7. The cutting of the stone was included in the contract awarded to P. H. Secord and Sons, Limited, Brantford.

One would almost wonder if all the loud-mouthed protestations of loyalty to imperial trade and of desire to patronize home manufactures on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite were merely for the purpose of deceiving the people. In the last election, from end to end of this country, there were protestations by our friends on the other side that we should trade within the empire and should patronize home manufactures. This referred even to the conduct of private individuals in the carrying on of their business. But here we find the Government itself declaring in the first place by their specifications for a public building that Canadian stones should be used, and then going outside and buying—from whom? From the Yankees, the very people to whom we were going to be annexed to if private individuals bought from them, the very people to whom we were going to be made an adjunct if we even trade with them. It seems almost impossible to believe that our friends opposite should stoop so low as they proclaim it, as to buy from people like the Yankees. And, above all, where do you suppose this building was constructed? Why, in the riding of my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), the lord high chancellor of the doctrine of patronage of home manufactures. And at that the earthquake did not come until the other day.

Mr. EMMERSON: He is the evangel of imperialism.

Mr. NESBITT: Why, he is the John the Baptist of the movement. But that is not the worst of it. I understand from a very reliable person who visited the works that the foreman employed on the stone-cutting —and employed in contravention of the alien labour law—was a Yankee, and that some of the other men employed on the work were Yankees. In Brantford! Think of it!

Now, that is the farcial side of the question, but there is a serious side. The answer to question No. 4 says that the stone used was Berea, Ohio, sandstone, as the price quoted by the contractor in his tender was considerably lower than the price for Georgetown stone, and this tender was accepted. Mr. Speaker, there is a rule of commerce throughout Canada, an absolute rule, that when tenders are called for on specifications, and the specifications are afterwards changed, every man who has tendered is allowed to amend his tender or new tenders are asked for under the new specifications. In this particular instance, the stone specified was Georgetown, Ontario, which was dearer. Now, some of the tenderers complained that somebody had the inside tracks with this Government, and that somebody must have been

the lowest tenderer, considering that he was allowed to use Ohio stone in place of Georgetown stone. The first aspect of the question to which I referred may be merely an illustration to the Canadian public that the loud protest of hon. gentlemen opposite were merely for the purpose, if I may say so, of deceiving the public. But this is a serious question. In private life no honourable individual or corporation would permit the changing of specifications for one tenderer without giving every tenderer the same opportunity. And as to the cutting of the stone, surely there could be found in Canada a foreman capable of overseeing this work. Has it come to this, that we Canadians not only cannot build battleships, but we cannot cut stone? I merely give these answers to the House as they were given to me. I asked the questions purely to get at the truth of the rumour in our section of the country that these facts as they have been given by the department were the real facts in this case.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of Public Works): The hon. gentleman for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) himself admitted that he tried to be farcial, and I am sure that in that respect, if in no other, he succeeded in his remarks. But he has said that there is a serious side to this question which he has brought before the House, and it is on that serious side that I propose to say a word or two. He make the statement that somebody must have the inside track with the Government and that this accounts for the condition of which he complains. As far as I know, no man has an inside track in the letting of contracts in connection with the Public Works Department of Canada. In respect to the contract as let for the building of a post office in the city of Brantford, I have to say that it was let upon the merits of the tenders as put in according to the terms of the specifications and conditions under which the tenders were to be received. The facts are that we had, I think, two or three tenders for that work. Secord & Company tendered, according to specifications with the use of Georgetown stone, for $273,108; and with the use of New Brunswick stone for $259,980. The Schultz Bros. Company, Limited, tendered, according to the specifications with the use of Georgetown stone, for $273,908; and with the use of New Brunswick stone, for $247,718. The specifications were followed absolutely and correctly. The specifications contained the following clause in respect to stone:

> The facing stone (excepting granite) on elevations from top to base course to top of coping, tower, pent house, sills to all windows, lintels to all windows and doors, copings, band courses and where coloured umber to be approved Logan stone from Georgetown, Ont., or other approved stone of equal quality, to the entire satisfaction of the chief architect.

We have here the facts of the case. When the tenders were received it is true that Secord and Company tendered for $244,000 under the suggestion of using American Berean sandstone, a stone which has been used to a very large extent in the Dominion of Canada. It is the stone of which the post office and the Bank of Montreal in the city of Ottawa are built. When it became a question of whether we should accept the tenders of the Georgetown stone or of the Berean stone I at once said to the Deputy Minister of my department that we must, if we possibly could, use Canadian stone. But, on a consideration of the question, it was shown that there was a difference of $28,000 in the cost of this stone. The chief architect, who was to be the judge of the matter, was appealed to and stated that in his opinion the Berean stone was fully as good as, if not better than the Georgetown stone. That was the simple and the only reason why the tender was accepted for Berean stone for the construction of the building in the city of Brantford in preference to the stone first specified, known as Georgetown stone.

This is simply a recital of the facts in order that the hon. member for North Oxford may not be carried away with any misunderstanding of the true conditions of the letting of the contract and of the tender which has been referred to in respect of the construction of the post office in Brantford. I say that the contract was let in accordance with the recommendation of the chief architect of the Department of Public Works. The chief architect of that department is a man known, I think, to every hon. member of this House; and I am sure that no hon. member would say that I would be justified in paying $28,000 more for Georgetown stone when the chief architect said that the Berean sandstone was really a better stone than the Georgetown stone and could be secured at a cost of $28,000 less to the people of Canada.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland): I quite agree with the Minister of Public Works that in letting contracts, either in that department or in the Department of Rail-

ways and Canals, so far as my experience has gone, and I have had some considerable experience, there is no one who has inside information; and I quite appreciate his other statement, that the chief architect of the Department of Public Works is one of the best men we have in the public service in Canada. I have known him for a good many years and I am not so much criticising the position which the chief architect took in allowing American stone to be used in this contract as I am criticising this particular phase of it, that I do not think the Government should allow American stone to be used at all. I do not think the department should have specified Georgetown stone. We have in the Niagara district limestone quarries, the Queenston quarries and the Beamsville quarries and the Thorold quarries, which produce the finest stone that this or any other country can produce. It has been used to build and construct the heaviest work that has been constructed in Canada and it can be procured at a cheaper figure, I believe, than the Georgetown stone can be procured, and just as cheap as the Ohio sandstone can be procured. The Government specified Georgetown stone and consequently the men who are interested in the Queenston, Beamsville and Thorold quarries would not tender, although they might have been able to supply the stone at as low a figure as it was supplied by the contractor who got his supply from the United States. It is that phase of it that I desire particularly to criticise, namely that the Government should not specify any particular class of stone except as to it being a good quality of limestone such as would be approved of by the chief architect of the department, whether Georgetown, Beamsville or Queenston stone. And when we come to the point of stone-cutters, we have in Niagara district the best stone-cutters the world can produce. I would call that to the attention of the Minister of Public Works and of the Government generally, that if they want stone-cutters all they have to do is to come to the county of Welland and they can get the best stone-cutters the world can produce. Or they can come to the county of Lincoln. I see my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) smiling at that. He has stone-cutters in his constituency, and I am surprised that he has not made something of a disturbance in regard to this.

Mr. ROGERS: I would like to draw the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that this was a contract let to Secord & Sons. They had a perfect right to employ whom they wished so long as they did not violate the Alien Labour Act.

Mr. GERMAN: It has been suggested that the Government allow the Alien Labour Act to be broken so that these stone cutters could come in. But I wish to call the attention of the minister to this one fact which is within my own knowledge: it is absolutely impossible for a Canadian to go into the United States and to get such a contract as that; they would simply be barred out, and I think it is time we began to bar the people of the United States from coming over here and using American stone and American stonecutters on a Government building. We are just as capable of doing the work as the people of the United States. It may be said that this is political talk and for effect generally, but I do not wish it to be so considered. I believe that we in Canada are capable of doing our own work, and of doing it as efficiently and as cheaply as it can be done, and I, for one, am prepared to stand by the principle that we should keep Canada for the Canadians in that particular and use our own stone and our own stone cutters even if it costs a little more. I do not wish to insinuate that any contractor had any inside information or that he could possibly have got any inside information from the department.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): I think I know a little about this question, and I would like to say to my hon. friend that he is barking up entirely the wrong tree in his attempt to fasten any wrong-doing on the Public Works Department in connection with the Brantford public building. If we had got one-quarter as good value from the contracts let by the Government my hon. friend has supported so vigorously, he might have got up and criticised this question. He has shown a lamentable want of knowledge of the facts. The Minister of Public Works has made the facts plain. In the first place the specifications called for Georgetown stone or other of equal quality. What are the facts in regard to Georgetown stone? The minister has shown that the building would have cost $28,000 more, if it had been built of Georgetown stone instead of the stone selected. Another point was, that the Georgetown quarries could not turn out enough stone for that building even if we got the whole output for two years.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: Why was that stone specified if you could not get enough of it?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: When the specifications were made out, it was not known that we could not get the Georgetown stone. We understood that there was a very large deposit of stone, and that there would be no trouble as to the quantity; but when the tenderer examined the quarry he found that he could not get enough stone to complete that building even if he used the whole output of his quarry in two years.

Mr. NESBITT: My hon. friend said that the specifications called for Georgetown stone or other of equal quality. I was only going by the answer I received from the department, which specified Georgetown stone and says nothing about 'other of equal quality'.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am speaking by the book.

Mr. NESBITT: Which book?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The book is the specifications as written.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: Then the answer is untrue.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am giving what I know to be the facts. The specifications called for Georgetown stone, or other of equal quality. Then it was found that the Georgetown stone would cost $28,000 more. My endeavour was to have Canadian stone used in the building, but my hon. friend who has to account to the public for the expenditure of money was of the opinion that $28,000 was too much to pay for one building, as between Canadian and American stone. There were three or four tenderers, and I may say to my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) that the contract will stand thorough investigation as to its straightness. No insinuations which he has made are worthy of consideration. The lowest tenderer—a man who is doing an honest and good job—got the work. My hon. friend has made an endeavour to appeal to labour and has named the foreman. I am not in a position to give the nationality of the foreman stonecutter, but I can tell my hon. friend that ninety-five per cent of the stonecutters on that job are British subjects.

Mr. NESBITT: I did not say they were not.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend just picks out one man on the building. Surely if these American come here to settle they have a right to work. I visit the building almost every day and, as I said, my hon. friend can rest assured that 95 per cent of the stone-cutters on that building are Canadians and British subjects. Mr. Secord, the contractor, is doing the best work ever seen in the city of Brantford, and he is giving 100 cents on the dollar on that job. The whole matter from start to finish is being conducted in the most thorough manner. The site was purchased from the city of Brantford and the property is to-day worth more than double what was paid for it. I do not mean to say that Brantford intended to be over-liberal but they sold the property on which this building stands to the Government, so that the public might get the benefit, if there was any benefit in it. The building is being rapidly pushed to completion in a way that could not have been done if we had chosen Canadian stone. I brought to the attention of the minister various Canadian stones, and it was found that every one of these would cost considerably more than the one chosen, and some of them would have to be transported some thousands of miles. It is a lamentable fact that within a distance of one hundred miles of Brantford you cannot find a first class stone in large quantities, and I say it with all deference to the constituency that has been mentioned by my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German). If he has a good kind of stone there I would like him to name one first class building in which it has been used. I do not know of one, and I have looked at several public buildings and endeavoured to come to a conclusion as to the best stone. I think the Government ought to be upheld because they have saved the country $28,000 by using this particular stone. The Chief Architect said that this stone was equal to the best, and therefore I think the criticism of my hon. friend from North Oxford is entirely aside from the question. The whole matter is just as honest and above board as any contract ever let by any Government, and if he has any doubt about that, I would be willing to have the most full investigation in regard to the whole matter.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: It is rather an interesting thing to see my hon. friend rushing to the defence of the proposition that you can get better stone in the United States to build Canadian buildings with than you can in Canada, and get it cheaper. If my hon. friend has attempted to prove anything in the remarks he has made, that

apparently was the object of his ambition. It means that when the Minister of Public Works came to ask for tenders for this work, he apparently was not aware of the fact that somewhere else in this country there was some stone other than the Georgetown quarry stone. All over the country there are quarries producing stone of a most admirable quality, such stone as the large banks and the great commercial buildings are being constructed of in different cities in Canada. Why did the Minister of Public Works confine the tenders for this particular building to a stone that he knew the quarry had run out of?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes, because the hon. member for Brantford says so.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I did not say so.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend from Brantford did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. MACDONALD: What did the hon. member for Brantford say?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I will tell the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am dealing with the Minister of Public Works. What did the hon. member for Brantford say?

Mr. ROGERS: The hon. member for Brantford said that it was impossible to get the stone out as quickly as it would have been required for the construction of the building at Brantford.

Mr. MACDONALD: Did the Minister of Public Works, or any of the officials of his department, know when they made that a condition of the contract, that they could not get Georgetown stone?

Mr. ROGERS: Apparently they did not.

Mr. MACDONALD: Well, then, the result is that we have the fact established that the Minister of Public Works specified and prescribed as the one and only stone that could be placed in this building, a stone coming from a quarry in regard to which they had made no inquiries whatever to find out whether they could get any stone or not. The hon. member for Brantford tells us that this stone which was stipulated as the only stone which could be used came from a quarry where you could not get it inside of two years.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The hon. gentleman does not want to misrepresent me.

Mr. MACDONALD: No.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I did not say that. I said that the tenders called for Georgetown or some other stone of similar quality. Why does the hon. gentleman leave out the latter part of it?

Mr. MACDONALD: For the very good reason that the hon. member for Brantford is not the Minister of Public Works in this Government, and that if any member of this House wants to get a statement as to what was prescribed and approved of for this work, he does not go to the hon. member for Brantford to find out, but he goes to the Minister of Public Works, who, in response to the question of my hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), who wanted to know what stone was specified, answered that stone of the Georgetown quarry was specified. What is the use of the hon. member for Brantford coming here and, in order to extricate himself and his friends from a difficulty, telling us that this statement of the Minister of Public Works is absolutely incorrect? Contractors were told: You can put no stone in that building but Georgetown stone. The Minister of Public Works has told us that the stone that he specified was the Georgetown stone, and when he found that this stone which had been specified came from a quarry could not produce any stone for two years, what did my hon. friend do? These gentlemen, who did not want any truck or trade with the Yankees, said: You cannot get any stone in Canada; Canadian stone is no good, except this stone that you cannot get out of the Georgetown quarries within two years; we will not bother looking up and down the country to find whether there is any stone to be got in Canada, but we will take Ohio sandstone; that is the best of all; it is better than any Canadian stone, and besides you can get it cheaper. We, on this side of the House, are all good enough Canadians to say to the Minister of Public Works: If you had used stone from any other Canadian quarry, even if it had cost a little more than Ohio sandstone, we would not have complained about it. We would give the minister some credit for realizing that Canada had some natural industries that deserve to be patronized. It was not necessary, especially in the case of a public building belonging to Canada, to blazen it abroad and to tell the men who are connected with the construction of public works in the country: If you want to erect a public building for the

Canadian Government, you must not buy Canadian stone for the purpose of doing it.

Mr. BURNHAM: What about free food?

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend, the alarm clock, is starting again. However, it has been proved beyond the shadow of a doubt to the House and to the country that, in the estimation of this Government, Canadian stone is no good when you can get American stone to be used in public buildings.

Mr. HENDERSON: I just desire to say that Georgetown is in the county I represent. I know the quarry referred to. The demand for Georgetown stone is certainly very great, and I am not surprised that this contractor could not get a sufficient quantity of stone in time to finish his contract from that quarry on account of the large demand for Georgetown stone. I will undertake to say that there is no better quality of free stone in the province of Ontario than is taken out of the Georgetown quarry.

Mr. MACDONALD: It is better than American stone?

Mr. HENDERSON: It may be far superior, but, unfortunately, Mr. Logan, whose name is given as being the proprietor of the quarry, was not able to supply the stone in sufficient quantity at the time it was needed. That does not say one word against the quality of the stone; nor yet does it say one word against the quantity of the stone. There is a mountain of this stone right where the quarry is. If the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) wanted to erect a very large building within a reasonable distance of the quarry I have no doubt that an abundance of stone could be obtained provided sufficient time was given to take it out.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why had you to go to the States to get it?

Mr. HENDERSON: Well, now, the hon. gentleman had better be patient. I think he has had that fully explained to him. There was a limited time to get this stone. I never heard anything of this matter before, but it appears that the Georgetown quarry was not able to supply this stone in the quantity that was wanted and in the time provided for in the contract. There is no evidence that the Georgetown quarry could not have supplied the stone if a reasonable time had been given or if they had had sufficient notice. I see the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) smiling. The post office in his town is built from stone taken from the Georgetown quarry. The post office was built by the Government that he supported and I will undertake also to say that he does not find any fault with it and that he will not say that the stone taken from that quarry is not of the best.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We do not say that there is anything against the stone.

Mr. HENDERSON: The hon. member for Pictou tried to give a black eye to this stone. The hon. gentleman does not know this quarry. It is being worked all the time full force and were it not for the terrible demand for Georgetown stone I have no doubt that this building at Brantford would have been built of Georgetown stone. The hon. gentleman must take all these circumstances into consideration. The Georgetown quarry is no one-horse affair. It is not limestone. It is the best quality of free stone. It is not like the limestone that they have in Welland county. It is a very fine quality of stone and as evidence of that let me say that a building was erected in my county during last year and the cut stone required for that building was taken out of the Georgetown quarry. It was approved by all parties and it also had my approval. It had the approval of everybody that looked at it. It was pronounced by everyone as a very superior quality of stone.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why was it not put in the Brantford building?

Mr. HENDERSON: How many times does my hon. friend want to know that? I said that the men who are running this quarry, if they had sufficient notice, might have been able to supply the stone necessary; but owing to the tremendous demand for Georgetown stone, they could not get it out on time. The hon. gentleman had better take a run up to Georgetown and see the immense quantity of the superior stone that is being shipped from there, and then we will hear less complaints from him. I could not sit quietly in my seat and hear the hon. gentleman speak in that way of the quarry—

Mr. BRODER: That you represent.

Mr. HENDERSON: No, but in the county I represent.

Mr. MACDONALD: It was the member for Brantford, and not I, who reflected on the quality of the stone.

Mr. HENDERSON: I listened to the hon. gentleman from Brantford, and I did

not hear him cast any reflection on the quality of the Georgetown stone. It has been said that the American stone has been obtained for less money, and I am not doubting that, because I do not know anything at all about the matter; but I do know that if Georgetown stone is not a better stone than the American stone, the demand for it would not be so great as it is. You must take into consideration the superior quality of the Georgetown stone when you remember the demand there is for it. I have no brief from Mr. Logan to praise the quality of this stone; I know it is a hard quarry to work, but I know they dig an immense quantity of stone out of it, and I do say it is stone of a very superior quality.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON: I do not think I am making any mistake when I say that the Georgetown stone is of superior quality, and it would have been just as well for the hon. member for Pictou if he did not cast any reflections on it.

Mr. MACDONALD: What I said was, that it was better than the American stone.

Mr. HENDERSON: The member for Brantford has told us that 95 per cent of the men who work on that building are Canadians, and I have no doubt he is quite correct, as he usually is, in any statement he makes.

Mr. GRAHAM: You mean he is as correct in that as in any statement he makes ?

Mr. HENDERSON: No, I said he is as correct in that statement as he usually is in any statement he makes in this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite having cast reflections on the Georgetown stone, I trust they are now satisfied that it is stone of a very superior quality.

Mr. PARDEE: The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) seems to be somewhat perturbed for fear we will not think the Georgetown stone is a stone of excellent quality, but he need not be alarmed on that score, because I can tell him that the Sarnia post office is built of Georgetown stone, and as he has invited hon. members to look at that stone in its natural state in the quarry, I invite them to come and see the finished product in the Sarnia post office. A remarkable fact about all this is, that it was well known, or it ought to have been well known when the specifications for the contract were prepared, that the stone could not have been obtained from Georgetown for two years. My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) says the manager of the quarry told him that.

Mr. HENDERSON: I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. PARDEE: Well, it was so understood then.

Mr. HENDERSON: I do not know how it could have been understood.

Mr. PARDEE: The hon. member for Brantford said the stone could not be obtained from Georgetown for two years.

Mr. HENDERSON: I think it was the hon. member for Pictou who said that.

Mr. MACDONALD: I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. PARDEE: Well, it was said, whoever said it, and it is not denied there is enough stone at Georgetown to supply the contract on the specification which called for that stone. But when the Government knew they could not possibly get the stone from the Georgetown quarry, there was nothing in the world to prevent them asking for tenders from some other Canadian quarry. Instead of that they rushed off to the United States to get the stone. No doubt they went to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), who was most anxious to have a public building in his constituency, and they said to him: we cannot get the Georgetown stone for two years, but we will get you stone from those terrible Yankees. And, you can imagine the hon. member horrified to think that the Yankees were to be traded with, but at the same time saying: if that is the case, I want to please my constituents, I want to be a good fellow, go ahead, never mind the other Canadian quarries, buy from the Yankees, it will do just as well. That is really the whole story. My hon. friend from Halton says there is a mountain of stone to be had at Georgetown, but it was not to be obtained for this Canadian public building. It is like the cry: water, water all around and not a drop to drink. There was a mountain of stone there but the Government could not get it, and hence it was that, presuming the Georgetown quarry could not supply the stone, instead of asking for new tenders, and giving other Canadian quarries a chance, this Government that two years ago was howling from the house tops: have nothing to do with

the Yankees, said: we will give no other Canadian industry a chance; we will give our wicked friends in Ohio the opportunity to supply this stone, and, anyway, we will get it cheaper there than in Canada. Well, I wonder how it would be with regard to ploughs. I do not think my hon. friend would for a moment stand for that. He would say: you can buy the stone from the Yankees, but keep your hands off me when it comes to ploughs. The whole story is summed up in this: that the member for Brantford, finding he could not get Canadian stone to have the building erected speedily, went back on all the tenets he preached in September, 1911, and said: I will swallow myself to this extent, and I will have just a little to do with the Yankees, if it helps me, the member for Brantford.

Mr. EMMERSON: The discussion on this subject is a unique commentary on what transpired in this Parliament in 1903 and 1904, with respect to the Transcontinental railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific. I remember how some hon. gentlemen opposite sat up nights trying to work some section into the Acts whereby the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and the Transcontinental Commission would be prevented from using any foreign or American material in the construction of that railway. There are to be found to-day clauses in these Bills which prohibit the use of material other than Canadian, where it is possible to secure it. We hear a different story to-night. The hon. gentleman from Halton seems to think there is only one stone quarry in Canada, and I take his word for it that the Georgetown stone is splendid stone and that there are mountains of it there, but I would remind him that there are other productive quarries in the Maritime provinces and elsewhere. He told us that the Georgetown quarry was not by any means a one-horse affair, but he succeeded in convincing the House that those who operate it are operating it as a one-horse affair, or else they could have produced stone enough to build one public building in the city of Brantford. I think my hon. friend in that way deprecated the quarry in his constituency. Why did not my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works turn his eye towards the Maritime provinces? If he wants splendid quarries, he will find them there. He will find evidences of those quarries and samples of the stone from them in the municipal building in the city of Toronto; he will find sandstone from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and from the county of Westmorland, in that splendid building in the city of Toronto and in other splendid buildings. I think the stone would be sufficiently good to be used even in a public building in the city of Brantford, represented by my hon. friend. But, no! they must go to Berea, and the justification of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is that private individuals have done so; that the banks, railway corporations and other corporations of the country in the construction of great buildings in our large cities have bought stone from Berea and other sections of the state of Ohio. True it is, but a party that fought night after night and complained because there might be a danger of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company purchasing material for the construction of its railway outside of Canada, a party that took up the time of this House complaining because of the employment of engineers who were American citizens in connection with the survey of the transcontinental line of railway, a party that took that attitude and then take the attitude that they are taking to-night, surely should be condemned and their attitude is its own condemnation.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

On the motion of Mr. Foster for Committee of Supply:

Mr. EMMERSON: I want to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to an Order of the House passed on the 20th of January, 1913, for the return of certain papers in connection with the officials of the Dorchester penitentiary, as to their appointments and promotions. It is not a very long return, but it has not yet been furnished. That is a grievance that I think I have a right to place before His Majesty before we resolve ourselves into Committee of Supply to furnish money for the purposes of government.

I want to call particular attention to the fact that certain information for which I have asked during this session, in fact at the beginning of this session, from the Department of Railways and Canals, has been withheld and is not forthcoming. It is very important for this House, in the consideration of certain questions, to have the full facts of what is known as the Gutelius-Bosworth agreement. It cannot be a very long document, and the papers in connection with it cannot be very voluminous. This document was promised by my right hon. friend the leader of the Government in October last to a deputation

which interviewed him from the city of St. John. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) promised his friends in the city of St. John that a copy of that agreement would be sent forward. They have not received it. This House ordered that we should have a copy, and it has not yet been brought down. I think that I have reason and hon. members have reason to complain of the very serious delays that are occurring with respect to information that is sought for from the Department of Railways and Canals. Questions that were on the Order Paper at the opening of the session have not been answered up to this moment, questions that are important, questions that do not require a lengthy answer. Perhaps the information may be in Moncton, but that is no excuse or justification. There is a private wire between the Department of Railways and Canals and the railway offices in the city of Moncton; the department are in communication almost hourly with those offices. This information surely should be given.

I take the fourth question on the Order Paper, which is as to whether or not a water supply has been furnished in connection with a certain station. Thirty minutes' work on the part of a clerk could prepare that information. The sixth question—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in taking up subjects on the Order Paper and discussing them. It is not permissible to anticipate a subject on the Order Paper and to discuss it.

Mr. EMMERSON: I cannot discuss those questions and I do not propose to do so. What I am discussing is the delays that are occurring in the furnishing of information to the House on matters of importance to the members and to those whom they represent. Yesterday certain questions on the Order Paper were converted into notices of motion, questions, the answers to which could not be brought down in the form of returns, questions that in my opinion should be answered because they relate to the knowledge of the Government with respect to the act of one of their subordinates, the general manager of the Intercolonial railway, Mr. Gutelius. By the action taken, another week or perhaps a fortnight will expire before we can possibly hope to secure this information. I trust my right hon. friend the leader of the Government will call the attention of his Minister of Railways, who is absent, to the desirability of having all information from the department furnished at the earliest possible moment. I have no desire to complain of lack of courtesy on the part of the Minister of Railways. He takes pride somewhat in the meagreness of the information that he furnishes to the House. Certainly his friends have rather praised him for the course which he has taken in that regard in times past. In all fairness, I think that we are entitled to this information, and I would rather have it than have a grievance with respect to it. It is a grievance, and I ventilate that grievance in this House on behalf of my constituents, choosing an occasion which is not only opportune but in accordance with the rules of the House.

Mr. DOHERTY: I can assure the hon. gentleman that the order to which he refers has not been overlooked. But as to there being a serious grievance because he has not been given the information asked for, if he will look at 'Hansard' he will find questions intended to elicit information as to these promotions in Dorchester penitentiary and also the answers to those questions.

Mr. EMMERSON: The hon. minister answered the questions promptly, but that answer did not give the information called for by this motion for a return.

Mr. DOHERTY: I will see if there is anything further.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY INVESTIGATING COMMISSION REPORT.

On motion of Mr. Foster for Committee of Supply:

Mr. GRAHAM: I desire to say a word, not by way of complaint, but in view of existing circumstances. There will be a discussion in this House on a certain document recently placed on the table and now in the hands of the printer. It is necessary that members of this House should be seized of the fullest information in order to discuss that matter intelligently. I understand from the press that the health of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) not being the best, he desires to go away as soon as possible, in fact, it is said that a date for his leaving has been fixed. I think the Prime Minister should impress upon him the necessity of giving us this information at least before he leaves; for, of course—and I am not using these words at all by way of a threat—the Prime Min-

ister will see how impossible it would be for the Minister of Railways to go on with his Estimates until we get the information necessary to discuss this bigger question. I have several questions on the Order Paper, the answers to which should not be very lengthy and the information to answer which, I should think, must be in the Department of Railways here or in the Ottawa office of the Transcontinental Commission. Even if it were more difficult to obtain the information, I think a special effort should be made to answer these questions with all possible speed.

Mr. BORDEN: This matter was mentioned by my hon. friend yesterday. I understood the Minister of Railways and Canals to say that he would furnish typewritten copies.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is, of the report; but what I had reference to was the several questions asking information not in the report.

Mr. BORDEN: Questions only?

Mr. GRAHAM: Questions and one or two returns. These will be necessary before I can read the report intelligently from my point of view.

Mr. BORDEN: I observe that question No. 24 and question No. 30—

10 p.m.

Mr. MACDONALD: No railway questions were answered yesterday.

Mr. BORDEN: I believe not. Question No. 24 was given notice of on February 12, and question No. 30 on Febuary 13; so there has not been a great deal of delay in regard to these. I do not know whether in either of these cases it will be necessary to obtain information from Moncton or elsewhere. There is also question No. 15, of which my hon. friend gave notice on February 9. I do not observe any others at the moment.

Mr. GRAHAM: And there are three or four motions for returns. In view of the peculiar circumstances, as to the minister's desire to leave and as to this debate coming on, I would urge special attention to this matter. Take, for instance, question No. 15. This refers to the Toronto-Sudbury Canadian Pacific railway line, which, according to the newspapers, was referred to in the report on the Transcontinental. What purports to be a synopsis of the report in the press states that a comparison was made between the Transcontinental and this line. Before we can discuss that comparison we ought to have this information. The commissioner who made that comparison must have that information.

Mr. BORDEN: I will direct the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to the observations of my hon. friend in regard to these questions, and I have no doubt he will be disposed, as I am certainly disposed, to give the information at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would make a request of my right hon. friend now: I have not put a notice on the Order Paper, but I should like to have the Order in Council appointing the investigating commission of the Transcontinental. I believe that should be laid on the table.

Mr. BORDEN: I am almost sure that it was laid on the table, more than a year ago, but if not, there is no reason why it should not be.

Mr. GRAHAM: I looked for it and could not find it.

Mr. BORDEN: We can get another copy.

Mr. PARDEE: I wish to ask a question, in view of what has appeared in the Ottawa Evening Citizen in regard to the Transcontinental railway. Is that report open for any one to see? Members of the House have not got it, though it has appeared in the Montreal Gazette, the Montreal Star, and the Ottawa Citizen.

Mr. BORDEN: I have no personal knowledge of the matter. The document has been laid on the table, and so, according to the practice of this House, has become a public document and open to the press. The clerk has informed me that there is a copy upstairs, and it is probably from that copy that the newspaper synopsis has been made. I only suggest that because I have no more knowledge than the hon. gentleman has as to how the newspapers obtained the summary to which he refers. In fact, I have not seen the summary myself.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Reference has just been made by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) to the fact that the Minister of Railways was about to leave Canada for the benefit of his health. That reminds me that the Minister has not yet asked for Supply. There are several matters which I should like to have the

opportunity of discussing with the minister before he leaves, and I dare say that other gentlemen would like a similar opportunity. I would ask the Prime Minister, cannot it be arranged to allow the minister to take up Supply to discuss matters of a general character, even if he does not go into the details of the Estimates?

Mr. BORDEN: I could not say at the moment whether that would be possible or not As the minister is going away for a considerable time, there are naturally a great many matters to engage his attention. Whether he will be able to take up Supply or not is unknown to me at the present moment. Of course my hon. friend will understand that if the minister is not here to discuss matters and give information, there will be someone else in his place to perform that duty in the House.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

Canada's proportion of expenditure in connection with International Customs Tariffs Bureau, $662.

Mr. FOSTER: This is an international arrangement into which almost all the countries of the world have entered. The head office is located in Brussels. It is an international clearing house for customs tariffs. All the tariffs of the world are collected there and are printed and distributed to all the nations in certain proportions. All changes that take place from time to time are notified there, and notifications are sent out to the different countries. It is a sort of international customs clearing house.

Trade Commissioners and Commercial Agents, including expenses in connection with negotiations of treaties or in extension of commercial relations; miscellaneous advertising and printing, or other expenditure connected with the extension of Canadian trade, $150,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: How many trade commissioners have we?

Mr. FOSTER: We have at the present time about fifteen trade commissioners and four correspondents. The trade commissioners are stationed at Leeds, Manchester, Bristol, Birmingham and London in England, and at Glasgow in Scotland. There are trade commissioners in Paris, at Hamburg, and at Rotterdam. There is a trade commissioner in the West Indies stationed at Barbados, one in South America stationed at Buenos Ayres, and one in China and one in Japan There is also a travelling trade commissioner for the present travelling through the different West Indian islands on a special trade mission. There is a trade commissioner in South Africa, one in Australia and one in New Zealand. I think these take in practically all. We had a trade commissioner in Mexico, but owing to the disjointed state of affairs there that office has been practically closed. Not closed as regards information that may be sought and given, but it is in the hands of the British Trade Consul at that place, who acts under an arrangement with the Foreign Office for Canada with respect to that country. As to the United States, we have no trade commissioners.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Outside of the commissioner at Barbados, have we not representatives of some kind in the other West Indies, such as Trinidad and Jamaica?

Mr. FOSTER: The others are correspondents. They are stationed at Trinidad, the Bahamas, Jamaica, and an acting Trade Commissioner in Havana.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What do you pay these correspondents?

Mr. FOSTER: I think $500 a year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What do you pay the trade commissioners?

Mr. FOSTER: They are graded from $3,000 up to $4,000 according to their services and the position, their salaries increasing at the rate of $100 a year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Where is most of this $150,000 expended?

Mr. FOSTER: It is distributed among the different commissioners I have named. There is the salary of the commissioner, the rent of the commissioner's office, and such clerical assistance as may be employed, and the general expenses of each office. The expenditure as a proportion can be seen when divided amongst the number of trade commissioners.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Was not a commercial agent appointed at Boston two years ago?

Mr. FOSTER: No. I have had a great many requests for the appointment of commissioners in the United States, but we have not appointed any there up to the present time, and it is not the policy of the department to appoint agents there. We have agents in Great Britain for very

good reasons. Then we have agents in foreign countries where we are trying to work up trade and where difficulties, for various reasons, have to be overcome. Our trade with the United States is very large, very free; we are countries which lie in juxtaposition with each other, communication backwards and forwards is of the very best, and I have not thought it necessary to incur the expense of establishing agents in the United States.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Has the minister had any request for the appointment of Mr. Watson Griffin as a special Trade Commissioner to the West Indies? He was appointed a month or two ago at a salary of about $4,000. Has he had any request from any of the exporters in Canada for such an appointment and does he expect that Mr. Griffin can accomplish anything for Canadian trade; and if he thinks so, would he mind telling the committee how? The reason I ask the minister that question, is because I have heard the appointment very severely criticised and I am inclined to think there is nothing which Mr. Griffin can accomplish for our trade in the West Indies. I am not saying anything against Mr. Griffin, I know nothing about him. He may have every accomplishment necessary to make a successful trade commissioner, but really I fail to see what it is he can do for Canadian trade especially in view of the fact that we have correspondents in all those islands who understand the trade very much better than Mr. Griffin can do for a good number of years at least, and who I think are doing everything possible for the extension of our trade with the West Indies. There is also this to be remembered. A great number of Canadian exporters frequently visit the West Indies. It is an old established trade, and is known pretty well.

Mr. FOSTER: I will try, I will not say to satisfy my hon. friend, but I will make an explanation with reference to Mr. Griffin's appointment. In the first place, that appointment was not even colourably made for the sake of finding a billet for a political friend. I think my hon. friend will believe that when I state it to him. I see he assents with a nod and a smile. The West Indian Islands are so situated that it is rather a difficult matter to know what is best to be done in order to bring about the best results. My hon. friend has said that we have commissioners there now. That is true. We have one situated at Barbados, and then we have three or four correspondents whom we pay at the rate of $500 a year. They do their occasional work but of course they are not supposed to—they could not be supposed to—give the whole of their time or a great deal of their effort towards helping trade between the two countries. The islands are very far apart in some respects, and the resident commissioner on one of the islands is, for that island in which he is resident, of some use, but for the islands outside, if he remains resident in the one in which he is placed, he is not of much more use than if he were here in the department at Ottawa. I may say frankly to my hon. friend that the appointment of Mr. Griffin as a special commissioner has been made for a term of one year, is to test out what I am thinking at the present time is the best method of carrying on our commissioner business in the West Indies; that is, instead of having resident commissioners, one or two in one or two of the larger islands, a travelling commissioner continually going from one island to another with correspondents in the different islands will be, I think, a better solution of the question which we are trying to solve, and will bring better results than any other system that we could have. It was with that in view, that I appointed Mr. Watson Griffin. The question was asked me as to whether I had numerous requests. I had not. I was looking about for a man who had the qualifications for the purpose for which I needed him. The purpose for which he is needed is two-fold. In the first place he has to grasp the salient points in the trade conditions in the West Indies, and in the next place, to present those to the trade and producing public in Canada. Mr. Watson Griffin has, I think, good qualifications for that business. He has had a long experience in Canadian work, and in all parts of Canada. Mr. Griffin was in charge of the Weekly Herald and Star, Montreal, from 1886 to 1896, and was therefore in a commercial metropolis and had to do very largely with commercial currents, commercial thought, and commercial transactions as reflected in that centre. He left the Star for purposes of travel and general press work, going later to the Daily Star as chief editorial writer from 1898 to 1901, again in much the same currents of trade in the central trade position in Canada. In the service of the Star he was sent to make special examinations into the iron and steel industry in Nova Scotia. I have had the pleasure and the benefit of reading Mr. Griffin's reports

on that industry, and they are as able reports as I have ever seen written, well couched in language, selecting the principal points and using no verbiage or effort on what did not seem to be primary matter—on the whole, as good reports as I have read in reference to that kind of investigation. From 1902 to 1906 he was in the service of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, where he became thoroughly acquainted with the manufacturing industries in this country, what is produced, where it is produced, and the quality and the conditions under which it is produced. In 1912 he went to Brandon as publicity commissioner, and it was whilst he was at Brandon that I got into communication with him and asked him to undertake this work. The range over which Mr. Griffin works cannot, I think, be better shown than in the instructions that were issued to him, and if my hon. friend would like to know what those instructions are I will read them to the committee:

1. Your appointment runs as Special Trade Commissioner to the West India colonies, where the principal part of your labours will be done. This, of course, includes British Guiana.

2. If not too inconvenient in the way of transport, you should also visit other principal West Indian islands, with the exception of Hayti, looking in upon our office at Havana and going thoroughly into conditions and possibilities with Mr. Quilez.

3. Special attention should be given, when in Jamaica, to investigate and weigh out the conditions there as between Canadian and United States interests. This, of course, has to be very carefully done—diplomatically in fact, so as not to arouse any antipathies, and above all to be careful not to draw public attention to that phase of your investigation.

4. In the Danish Islands, if you visit them, it would be necessary to note, in addition to other information, particularly methods of transportation.

5. In all colonies which you visit, outside of general conditions governing interchanges between them and Canada special attention should be paid to financial and banking facilities,—

My hon. friend will see what an important bearing that has on the general exchanges between the two countries.

—customs, qualities and styles, both of goods and packages which are required by the customs of the people or habits of trade, facilities for transportation, the conditions as to prices and grades of goods required and customs regulations, with a view to noting carefully any existing hindrances to trade in any of these respects which it may be possible to remedy.

6. Generally your mission will be to interest these people in Canada and Canadian production and resources and impress them so far as possible with our capacity to fill their wants in the leading staple lines. Particular attention should also be paid as regards transportation facilities and freight rates, to the comparative situation as between Canada and the United States, noting whatever conditions may be possessed by the latter and so far as possible suggesting methods by which these can be offset either entirely or in part.

7. In visiting the different agencies of the department you will try to make yourself thoroughly acquainted with what is being done in each and note, for our information, what improvements you would consider advisable.

8. As regards statistical data, you will gather everything that may be useful, especially having regard to such points as are not probably brought out by the general public statistics, in so far as these may be made accessory to an increase of trade.

9. As regards your intercourse with officials and public bodies, you will have letters of introduction in each of the countries you visit, which are to be used, of course, carefully and with due respect to rank and situation.

10. As to the advisability of public addresses, you will be governed by what you consider is best in each case. Addresses to boards of trade and commercial bodies are valuable when they are properly conceived and carried out, always bearing in mind to keep the country and its interests to the front. Particular care should be taken in regard to newspaper interviewers and reporters to avoid anything that would commit the Government on one hand, or have even the shadow of interference in regard to home questions and controversial subjects.

11. You will, of course, keep a careful diary of your movements and make extensive notes therein and favour the department with a running report of your work, reserving the main and special preparation of information for use here on your return.

When Mr. Griffin returns, besides the running reports that come in, he will have another mission to perform, and that is to portray to the public through the press and in other ways the conditions that he found in the West Indian Islands, and, by personal communication as well as by literary work, to bring these things before the people as widely and definitely and luminously as possible. I have received some of these reports already, and I can assure my hon. friend that, as far as they have gone, Mr. Griffin has done very valuable work during the short time he has been there and shapes as though he would do very good work for us during his whole mission.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does he work with the British Consular offices as the minister has explained is done elsewhere?

Mr. FOSTER: Wherever he goes he has letters to the British consuls or the representatives of Great Britain who are there. There are not many British consuls in the West Indies, but the advice, the counsel, and all the courtesies and influences which bring him into connection with people are freely and generously given to him. He

has letters of introduction to the governors of all the islands, and through these he will get all that is necessary to make him au fait with conditions and persons in the islands.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am very glad to hear such a favourable recommendation of Mr. Griffin. I know nothing of him personally and I trust he is a promising servant of the Government as the minister leads us to believe. However, I think there is a limit to the extension of Canadian trade in the West Indies and I have always feared that the present Minister of Trade and Commerce had altogether too exalted an idea of the possibilities of extending Canadian trade in the British West Indies and that he was prone to indulge in a somewhat too elaborate and expensive a scheme for the development of this trade. Of course, I would not think of impeaching the motives of the minister. I always consider that it is his desire to extend this trade, but my opinion is that he does not have a true conception of trade possibilities between Canada and the West Indies. After consultation with men who know the West Indian trade better than most men in Canada do, I have received the impression that there is decidedly a limit to trade expansion with the British West Indies. I will perhaps discuss this question a little later, on some other Estimates in the minister's department, particularly those which relate to steamship subsidies. That will perhaps be a more opportune time to discuss this particular matter. However, I suppose, as the minister suggests, that no harm can be done by giving Mr. Griffin a trial and possibly some good may come of it. Our trade with the British West Indies after all relates to a few products—sugar as an import and fish, lumber and flour as exports. As far as the fish and lumber trade is concerned, no commercial agent can advance that trade in any respect. It is a long established line of trade, is well known to those who are engaged in it in Canada and I think very little or no assistance could be rendered by any official commercial agency. I doubt if any consular or any commercial agent could increase our import of sugar from the British West Indies. I do not think that the minister would argue that he could. Therefore, the work that is open to a commissioner in the British West Indies is very limited indeed. There is always this to be borne in mind, that Great Britain is after all our competitor in that market. They have splendid lines of transportation, their trade with the West Indies is now quite old and it is a trade which the British people very well understand. The year before last, the Nova Scotian exporters of fish met very severe competition from British exporters. That frequently happens. With regard to almost all that we produce in Canada and which we might probably sell to the British West Indies, we find that freight rates are more favourable from Great Britain to the West Indies than they are from Canada to the West Indies. After all, our strongest competitor in that market is Great Britain, outside of the United States in one or two articles, such as flour. However at a later time, perhaps I will take up this subject.

Mr. FOSTER: I may be a little on the optimistic side, but we have undertaken this work and I think it is better to make a trial and make it quickly and that the machinery which is necessary ought to be put into operation at once so that during the continuance of our present steamship subsidy, which is about four or five years now, we will be able to test out the question. I have better hopes of results than my hon. friend has indicated that he has in what he has said to-night. Before Mr. Griffin went I had a circular letter prepared and we sent out about 2,000 to traders, boards of trade and producers in Canada. I think that from those circular letters we certainly got more than a thousand or twelve hundred replies, and those replies took up just exactly the practical points that were in these persons' minds as to certain things that might be done with their products in the West Indies.

Almost without exception, they have expressed their gratification that Mr. Griffin was being sent out. Mr. Griffin took these letters with him; he is working at these things as he goes along, and is sending back reports which are coming in from day to day. The interest shown in this commissionership by the business men themselves is one of the most gratifying things about it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: How will you circulate the reports you receive from Mr. Griffin?

Mr. FOSTER: Through our bulletins, and by direct correspondence sometimes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the agent do any actual practical work in the way of putting the manufacturers and merchants of Canada in touch with those who want goods in the West Indies? Suppose he saw a newspaper advertisement in Jamaica, requiring buoys for the harbour, or wanting

steel rails, how would he put that information before the Canadian manufacturers? I understand that the agents of the United States Government do practical work of that kind. They do not depend on bulletins, which very few people read.

Mr. FOSTER: Our agent would give to the persons in the West Indian Islands the names of the makers in Canada of any article that would be required, and he would give the same information to the department which publishes the inquiries from week to week in the bulletin. A manufacturer reading that inquiry would communicate with the department, and get the names of the intending purchasers.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If Mr. Griffin could work out a method of furnishing us with the trade returns by separate islands in the British West Indies, it would be valuable information. I had some difficulty in getting such information last year when our arrangement with the West India Islands was under discussion. Has any of the British West India Islands become a party to the treaty, other than the ten original signatories?

Mr. FOSTER: One other island sent its adherence to the treaty some two or three months afterwards.

Mr. NESBITT: When Mr. Griffin returns will he be available for consultation by manufacturers?

Mr. FOSTER: That is one-half of his work.

Mr. NESBITT: I commend the minister for allowing the trade commissioner to be consulted by the various manufacturers. I know that a great many manufacturers do read the bulletin and that there is a good deal of interest taken in it.

Mr. LOGGIE: I assume that Jamaica has not so far come into the group of islands which give us a lower rate of duty. Mr. Griffin would confer a great benefit on the producers of pickled fish if he could arrange with the authorities in Jamaica to allow pickled fish to enter that colony free of the import duty, which at present is very heavy. It would be a great boon to the country if pickled fish were allowed into Jamaica at a reasonable rate of duty, if not free of duty altogether. The freight on pickled fish, from Halifax to Jamaica, is three shillings per barrel, and the duty is two and sixpence, so that there is a first charge of $1.50 on the value of the fish, which would be about three dollars per barrel. There was an overstock of alewives last year, and they might have been marketed to more advantage if they were admitted into Jamaica free of duty. Could the minister find out from his agents, the islands into which pickled fish, known as alewives, are imported. The New Brunswick exporters sometimes deliver these fish in New York, and the New York export merchant seems to be able to find a market for them which the Canadian producer cannot overtake. I know there is a considerable market in Hayti for pickled alewives, but except Hayti and Jamaica, I am not aware of any of the British West India Islands which use this fish to any great extent. The same remarks would apply to pickled herrings.

Mr. FOSTER: My hon. friend is aware that Jamaica has not given a preference to Canada, although we give a preference to her goods.

Mr. LOGGIE: I am aware of that.

Mr. FOSTER: There is a three years' period of grace allowed, and it is to be hoped that something may eventuate during that time. Of course, the men who export pickled alewives will have to use business methods to find a market, but the aim of the department is to assist them in every way possible by securing whatever information can possibly be obtained to enable them to transact their business. It is difficult to get the statistics the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) has referred to, but we are trying to ascertain as nearly as possible what proportion of Canadian goods comes into these different West India Islands from New York, mainly, and from Boston partly.

If we can differentiate as to that, we can have a much clearer idea of what business we really are doing with the West Indian Islands. That I think can be, although not wholly, approximately brought about. The other is to get the trade statistics of the different islands. These we are getting, but there again we find some difficulty because of the very fact that I have mentioned, of finding out in the different islands the origin of the goods, the place from which they start, a good deal of the importations being through New York and some through Boston. Both of these points are being taken into consideration by the department.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I notice in the Canada West India magazine reference to the matter of shipments of flour which are entitled to preferential treatment under

the West Indian trade agreement. Two shipments from United States ports of what was alleged to be Canadian flour but which the Comptroller of Customs suspected to be American flour, were the subject of some litigation in the courts of one of the West India Islands. I have observed elsewhere in the press that on one or two other occasions some questions arose as to the validity of certificates of origin of flour shipments entitled to the preferential tariff. One can quite well understand how that difficulty might arise very frequently, particularly in the matter of flour, and one can as well understand that a great deal of American flour might go into the West Indies if improperly invoiced and thus secure the preferential tariff rate.

Mr. FOSTER: That was absolutely liable to take place the moment that the preferential arrangement went into force. It is of course to the interest of Canada that Canadian flour only shall have the preference when it goes into the West Indian Market. Therefore, we are interested in tracing any transactions of that kind or any frauds, if fraud is necessary in order to complete such a transaction. We are following up that matter very carefully in Canada itself. Of course British Guiana and the other colonies—it was in British Guiana where this arose that is alluded to by my hon. friend —are equally interested, in a double capacity. They do not want other than flour which is designated by the treaty to come in under the preference, because of the treaty itself and because of the mutual advantages between the two countries. Also they have a direct interest in the Customs side of it, the revenue side of it, and they are following the matter with very great closeness. The certificates of origin came to the collector in such a way that he did not believe that they were genuine, and on his own belief in the matter he refused to grant the preference and exacted the full duty. He has not been upheld in that. The court by which it was decided took the ground that it must not be simply the belief of the Customs official but that this must be decided by documents. That then brought about what was the natural result: if the present regulations of the Customs are not sufficient, then they will make regulations which they think will be sufficient. New and more stringent regulations have been made, and they require now not only the certificate of origin, but that when shipments pass through New York they shall be visited and attested to by the British Consul in that city.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is what you would call the continuous bill of lading certified to?

Mr. FOSTER: Yes. Then there may be through the railways here a plan worked out which will still more effectually guard it; but if all other things fail, so far as I can judge, the idea of British Guiana, if not of others of the West India Islands, will be to refuse the preference to any flour that does not come by direct shipment. That may be the result. Anyway, the Customs authorities in Barbados and British Guiana are determined that the treaty in its essentials shall be carried out.

Mr. PARDEE: It appears to me that the system which my hon. friend has partly inaugurated, of having these various trade commissioners visit this country at stated times and come into touch with the manufacturers and merchants, is a most excellent one. It is the only way in which trade can be stimulated. I think it would be a good idea, if the period is not too long, if these trade commissioners would spend six months of the year in the country in which they are stationed and the other six months in the Dominion of Canada. In that way the department would be spending its money very wisely. I think the minister said that reams of correspondence came from these trade commissioners to the manufacturers here, and that it was filed and nothing much more heard of it. If that is so, the only way to get over the difficulty and to stimulate trade is to have these commissioners interview the merchants and manufacturers here and in a five minute or a half-hour conversation they might do more than in a month's correspondence. I would urge upon the minister that for at least three months of every year these agents should come to the Dominion of Canada from their various stations; that they should get into actual touch with the merchants and manufacturers here. By carrying out a systematic course of visits by these commissioners, trade would be greatly stimulated, which, of course, would be for the benefit of every one.

Mr. FOSTER: I think that I mentioned that matter the other day. I would not go so far as saying six months and six months because I think that one-fourth of the time here and three-fourths in the foreign or

outside country would be a fairer proportion.

Mr. PARDEE: Perhaps so.

Mr. FOSTER: Immediately after I came into connection with this. I saw that a great deal of expenditure and effort was lost because it did not get the application to the business men in our own country. It is a policy that I have adopted and will carry out, that a certain proportion of the time of each year will be spent in Canada by the trade commissioners. As an example of that, Mr. Poussette made a very thorough tour of the whole of South America and went into every country. He had the best facilities for gaining knowledge; talked with the best businessmen in South America. He then came back, and has been two months in this country, going through to British Columbia, and will be here another month. The information I get from him is that his work here has been more satisfactory than two years' work at long distance would have been. He has brought men together. Having made these personal visits in the other countries, making the personal visit here to the man who is interested, he is able to bring together for business men whom he probably never could have brought together by correspondence. I thoroughly believe that a portion of the vote should be spent on home mission work as well as the other portion on foreign mission work.

Mr. OLIVER: If this is the proper time, I should like to ask what progress is being made in trade with Japan. What articles are we sending to Japan, and is our trade with that country increasing or decreasing? 11 p.m.

Mr. FOSTER: I have not the report for this year with me, and therefore my answer will be general. Our trade with Japan is increasing, and during the past year there was, I think, an increase in the quantity of flour we sold to that country. I think I made the remark somewhere that there were promises in the East of consumption of Canadian grain material which we could not afford to overlook. I think China is naturally one of the richest countries in the world, yet, so far as its resources are concerned, except in agriculture, it is one of the least developed of the great countries in the world. One cause of lack of development has been the lack of internal communication; you cannot do much in trade over a vast area if you have to carry everything in baskets slung over your shoulder along footpaths in which even an animal would find it difficult to keep its tracks. But China is growing in the way of railroad expansion, and when once she gets railway facilities her development will be very great indeed. That is going to do two things. In the first place it is going to open up the whole country to western ideas, new activities, and customs of living. In the second place, it is going to cause a very large demand for machinery, for workmen's tools and for all that attaches to development of that kind. The four hundred millions of China and the sixty-five millions of Japan live, as a rule, on scant material. And, although some people may laugh at the idea, the fact is that in Japan and in parts of China rice is becoming too dear for the native to eat. His best grades of rice are sold in the foreign market, and he is restricted to the inferior grades or to something else which does him for food. They are beginning to get the idea of adding the products of flour. Once that idea is taken up, even though there be but a gradual and fractional increase, just compute what the result will be among those hundreds of millions of people. Though the increase be but little in each case or in each district, the aggregate will be enormous. In this respect, I believe that in both China and Japan there is a great future for Canadian flour, wheat and other Canadian products. We have a great front door on the Pacific, and through it look out upon these nationalities which in the future are to be live centres of industry and production, and we cannot afford not to keep our eyes wide open and have every string we possibly can attached to the growing trade of those countries.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Do they produce wheat themselves?

Mr. FOSTER: To a certain extent. But rice is the main production, with millet, the soya bean, vegetables of every conceivable kind, and roots that grow in all sorts of contorted shapes and in infinite variety.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Has the hon. minister any plan to teach the Chinaman to abandon rice and eat Canadian flour? We have heard that it is extremely difficult to turn the Chinaman's mind towards anything new. We all remember Charles Lamb's story of how the Chinaman com

menced to eat roast pork. The House of one of them got afire, and as the pig was living in the House, he was burnt. In clearing up the ashes, the owner got his fingers into the carcase of the pig, and, putting them into his mouth, got the first taste any Chinaman had had of roast pork. Then, they began setting fire to their houses everywhere to enjoy this new dainty. Finally, a great philosopher arose who told them that they could roast pork without burning down their houses. Has the minister any method by which he can do the trick of causing the Chinaman to use flour instead of rice?

Mr. FOSTER: If I were to give any account of that, it would not be half so interesting as the hon. gentleman's well-given historical description of how the Chinese came to learn the virtues of roast pork. The hon. gentleman is so ingenious that if he will make application, I think I will devote a certain amount of this appropriation to send him over there, and what he could not do I think it would not be worth while to attempt doing. But seriously, I think necessity and changing circumstances will be the best teachers in that respect.

Mr. OLIVER: The minister has told us what is possible, but I was anxious to know what was being done and how far we had progressed in the sale of flour, fish lumber and other things to Japan. What is the amount of our trade there, approximately? Do we find in China and Japan parallel conditions to those existing in the West Indies—that our competitors to the south have established themselves in the trade of these countries, and we not only have the difficulty of bringing our products to the favourable attention of the people but also have, to a certain extent, to displace some of our competitors in order to attain these markets. How much flour are we selling to Japan to-day and how much is the United States selling? I would like the same information in regard to China and also with regard to lumber and fish.

Mr. FOSTER: As I said I have not the reports before me for the year and I cannot carry these in my head, but if the hon. member will look at part No. 3 of the report of my department he will find that information extended in detail for a period of years. Offhand, the trade with Japan is increasing substantially. Our exports to Japan and China are also increasing. I know from having visited that country that in the matter of flour and lumber, but partially of flour, we are already doing quite a trade with China.

Mr. OLIVER The newspapers published sometime ago a statement that our flour was displacing that of the United States in the Chinese markets. That is a very satisfactory condition of affairs. Has the minister information to that effect, that our flour, on account of its superior quality, was displacing the flour of the United States in the markets of China?

Mr. FOSTER: Whether it is displacing it or finding greater access without displacing United States flour I cannot say without looking at the statistics, but I can say it is going into China in increased quantities. It is not altogether the superior quality of flour that is looked for by either Japanese or Chinese; they do not take the highest grade of flour, and it is a competition in the lower grades of flour. That is one of the best competitions for Canadian millers, as my hon. friend will see. They have no difficulty in getting rid of their high grade flour in this country, the difficulty is to find markets for the low grade flour.

Mr. OLIVER: Does the information received show whether the bulk of this flour is consumed by the common people or by the better classes?

Mr. FOSTER: The sale of flour as of most products in China is not, in the first place, to the masses of the people, it is to what they call the different guilds and the negotiations must be conducted and any arrangement must be made with the guild. Once you get a large and prominent guild interested in your quality or brand of flour and they take it, your work is done, they do all the distributing. as to who eats that flour after it gets in, I think it is distributed probably a little generally; but the lower grades would go to the lower classes of the people and the higher grades to the better classes of Chinese, much the same as it would here.

Mr. BOULAY: Mr. Chairman, the remarks which the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) has just made are very important and very wise. There is no doubt that the taade commissioners who represent our country abroad cannot render the same services to us as they would be able to do if they were well acquainted with our resources, and they could acquaint themselves with them by visiting our coun-

try every year, by communicating with our business men, instead of merely sending in reports, as they do.

I would like to know from the Minister of Trade and Commerce the average salary of these commissioners in England, Rotterdam and Hamburg.

Mr. FOSTER: I have stated that the salaries grade from $3,000 a year to $4,000, according to years of service. The commissioner at Hamburg is a new appointment, and he receives $3,000. At Rotterdam the commissioner, who is an older servant of the department appointed in 1910, receives a larger salary and so on, according to the service that has been given the salary grades.

Mr. BOULAY: As I understand the list, we have no such commissioner in France, Italy, Spain or Germany?

Mr. FOSTER: We have a trade commissioner in Paris, who is one of the highest paid trade commissioners in the service. His duties are primarily to look after the extension of trade, seek information, answer inquiries and communicate with the department. We have no other trade commissioner in France except that general trade commissioner in Paris. In Italy we have had no trade commissioner as, indeed, we have not had trade commissioners in most of the the European countries. That service is being gradually extended and I have not tried to extend it much because I have not been certain that the work is being carried on on the proper basis. We have spent a good deal of money, and I am afraid we have not received the best results. I am going slowly in order to work out the best plan for doing it before extending very largely into other countries. But I was successful in making an arrangement with the Foreign Office, through the Colonial office, by which the British consular trade agents, wherever we wish them, will act for Canada the same as our trade commissioners do, in the way of receiving letters of inquiry and giving information as to openings for Canadian trade. While always they must consider that their first duty is to British trade, they are asked and instructed to answer such inquiries and give such information. I suppose there never has been a time when a British trade consul has not been willing to do that, but they have never before been given to understand that that was a part of their duty, and Canada never before felt that she had a right to ask them. Under that arrangement I am arranging to-day for the British representatives at Milan and Genoa and perhaps another city in Italy to represent Canada in those places. The same thing is being done in the different European and some Asiatic countries where we have now some trade, and as the trade develops this arrangement with the British consuls will be brought into effect.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Before this item is passed, I would like to ask the minister a question respecting the tariff upon dried salt fish entering Portugal. This is a matter of some interest to the Maritime provinces, as from there quite a quantity of salt fish is shipped. British dried fish entering Portugal pays thirty-five cents per quintal higher than fish from Norway, Germany, or Iceland. Canadian exporters of dried salt fish feel this additional tariff to be quite an impediment to their trade. I mention this to the minister because a resolution respecting it was passed by the Halifax Board of Trade, and a copy of it sent to the minister for his consideration, at a time when I think a new commercial treaty was being negotiated between Great Britain and Portugal. Perhaps the minister can tell us whether he has had it under consideration.

Mr. FOSTER: Yes. Great Britain has, for the last two years, been trying to negotiate a treaty with Portugal. It has not yet been negotiated. When I was in London, I saw the representatives of the foreign office and of the colonial office and discussed the matter with them, and the British Government has that matter in charge for us. The whole matter has been placed before them. Of course, Portugal will naturally require a quid pro quo from Great Britain if such a treaty is finally brought to a fulfilment, and a quid pro quo will naturally be required from Canada, for instance, should she get her fish in on a favoured basis. In the ultimate result it will depend on what the quid pro quo is.

Mr. OLIVER: I would like to know what progress our trade is making with Australia and New Zealand: what lines of produce we are sending in, and particularly what we are getting?

Mr. FOSTER: In regard to Australia, the trade is increasing each year. We have no preferential arrangement with Australia. We send to Australia even under present conditions, a large amount of print paper, automobiles and vehicles of that kind to a large extent. We send lumber

to a certain extent, and a lot of manufactured articles spread over quite a large range. Then our natural productions such as apples are sent over. The two seasons are the exact opposites of each other. When they have no fresh fruit, ours is in season and vice versa, and there is the foundation of a fairly good trade, I think.

Mr. OLIVER: Do we ship any considerable quantity of apples to Australia?

Mr. FOSTER: The apple trade is growing. I think quite a considerable quantity is being sent there; certainly a considerable quantity is being shipped to New Zealand and the trade is growing quite rapidly.

Mr. OLIVER: Are they British Columbia apples or eastern apples.

Mr. FOSTER: I think largely British Columbia apples, because they are close to the coast and are shipped at much less expense than apples from this side can be shipped. Australia sends to us a certain quantity of dried fruit. Part of Australia is a grape growing country. When in Australia, I visited the warehouses of producers and sellers, who were at that time shipping quite a large quantity of dried fruits, raisins and things of that sort as far east as Winnipeg, and, as they informed me, were making a fairly good trade. They also send to us meat and butter and some few other products. The increase in trade between New Zealand and Canada has been very marked on both sides. Our exports to that country have increased largely, and their exports to us in the lines of butter and meats have also increased largely. There is quite a difference between Australia and New Zealand. In the first place, we have a preference with New Zealand and not with Australia; but there is another difference still more important, and that is, New Zealand manufactures to only a very small degree. The result is that quite a large range of manufactured articles are going from this country to New Zealand, and in increasing quantities. When I was in New Zealand, I met travellers from St. Catherines and other places in Ontario who were travelling in that country, and who told me they had been more successful in placing orders than they anticipated.

Mr. OLIVER: Do we send a considerable quantity of agricultural implements to Australia and New Zealand ?

Mr. FOSTER: Yes, the agricultural implements of Canada take the field in Australia and New Zealand. We send a great number of reapers to those countries. Canadian automobiles also are shipped to a very large extent and paper is exported to a large extent. In fact, we are taking quite largely the paper trade of South Africa, New Zealand and Australia.

Mr. GRAHAM: When we get to item 354, I can assure my hon. friend there will be some discussion. Suppose we pass the first three items and then adjourn ?

Mr. FOSTER: Item 353 is simply a routine matter; so is item 355. We might take those and item 356, which has been there from time immemorial; also item 361.

Salaries and contingencies under the Cullers' Act, $11,000.

Mr. BOULAY: Is that a regular board of cullers?

Mr. FOSTER: Yes, there is a supervisor at $1,500, a specification clerk at $750, and six cullers at $700, making a total of $6,450. Then to the superannuated cullers there is paid $2,200.

Mr. BOULAY: Is it a regular board of cullers that we have there?

Mr. FOSTER: Yes, the board works under the Quebec Board of Trade.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Borden, the House adjourned at 11.27 p.m.

Wednesday, February 18, 1914.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

NEWPORT CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. Is Mr. Geo. J. Ryan in the employ of the Department of Customs at Newport, Vermont?
2. If not, when was he dismissed?
3. At whose request was he dismissed?
4. What salary did he receive?
5. By whom was he replaced?
6. What salary is paid to his successor?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. No.
2. 31st August, 1912.
3. Was employed as a temporary officer, and services were dispensed with in accordance with letter authorizing his temporary

appointment, being subject to discretion of the Minister of Customs.

4. $4 per day.

5. Charles A. Boright.

6. $4 per day.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. Is Mr. Charles Hamlin in the employ of the Department of Customs at Newport, Vermont?

2. If not, when was he dismissed?

3. At whose request was he dismissed?

4. What salary did he receive?

5. By whom was he replaced?

6. What salary is paid to his successor?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. No.

2. 4th October, 1912.

3. Was employed as a temporary officer and services were dispensed with in accordance with letter authorizing his temporary appointment, being subject to discretion of the Minister of Customs.

4. $4 per day.

5. Frank S. Baker.

6. $4 per day.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—ST. MALO TUNNEL.

*Mr. GRAHAM:

What is the estimated cost of the proposed tunnel beginning at a point on the National Transcontinental between the Quebec bridge and Champlain terminal, and connecting with the St. Malo shops?

Mr. BORDEN: In the absence of the Minister of Railways, I might remind the hon. gentleman that the estimated cost of proposed works is not given to Parliament, in the ordinary course of events, until the tenders have been opened.

RED HEAD HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Was any dredging or other improvement work done at or near Red Head harbour, county of Guysborough, N.S., during the season of 1913?

2. If so, who was foreman?

3. How much was expended?

4. How much was paid to the foreman?

5. What are the names of the workmen employed, the number of days work done by each, and the amount paid to each of them?

6. Is the work completed?

Mr. ROGERS: No information in the department that any work was done at Red Head, N.S. in 1913. The only dredging in Guysborough county was done at Port Mulgrave. A telegram has been sent to the district engineer asking for information.

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. When was the St. Peter's Indian reserve surrendered?

2. How many Indians of the St. Peter's band have removed to the Fisher River reserve?

3. How many are still in residence on the St. Peter's reserve?

4. What area of land on the St. Peter's reserve was sold by the Government?

5. What area of land on the St. Peter's reserve was sold by the Indians individually?

6. What amount of land is still held by the Indians in their individual right?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. September 24, 1907.

2. Three hundred and fifty-three as per annuity pay-list of 1913.

3. Eight hundred and sixty-seven as per annuity pay-list of 1913.

4. 15,123·27 acres.

5. Not definitely known to department.

6. Not definitely known to department.

EDMONTON AND FORT GEORGE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Has a mail service been established on the Grand Trunk Pacific between Edmonton and Fort George?

2. If so, what is the frequency of the service?

3. Does the service include parcel post?

4. If so, what are the parcel post rates on parcels up to 25 pounds?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Mail service has been established on the Grand Trunk Pacific railway between Edmonton and McBride, 145 miles east of Fort George. The advisability of extending the mail service from McBride to Fort George is now engaging the attention of the department.

2. Daily except Sunday, Edmonton to Edson; distance, 130 miles. Tri-weekly Edson to McBride; distance, 212 miles.

3. Yes.

4. Parcels up to twenty-five pounds are not accepted anywhere in Canada, the weight limit being six pounds for the first three months, and afterwards eleven pounds.

IMMIGRANT DEPORTATIONS AND EXCLUSIONS.

Mr OLIVER:

1. What was the number of deportations under provision of the Immigration Act during the fiscal years 1911, 1912 and 1913?

2. What was the number of deportations during these three fiscal years to the British Isles, the continent of Europe, and other countries, respectively?

3. How many exclusions have been made at ocean ports during each of the fiscal years 1911, 1912 and 1913?

4. How many of the excluded immigrants came from the British Isles, from the continent of Europe, from the United States, and from other countries, respectively?

Mr. ROCHE:

1 and 2. Deportations:

—	To British Isles	To continent of Europe	To other countries	Totals
1910-11.....	458	106	220	784
1911-12.....	540	129	290	959
1912-13.....	559	258	464	1,281
1913-14 (9 m)	756	365	382	1,503

3 and 4. Rejections at ocean ports:

—	From British Isles	From continent of Europe	From United States	From other countries	Totals
1910-11	233	1,645	20	312	2,210
1911-12.....	227	648	2	95	972
1912-13.....	161	478	14	103	756
1913-14 (9 m.)	153	1,347	9	113	1,622

VANCOUVER DRILL HALL SITE.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Who was the Government purchasing agent in connection with the purchase of Block 43, D.L. 246 A., Vancouver, for a drill hall site?
2. When did such agent receive his instructions?
3. Upon what basis is he to be paid?
4. How much has been paid to such agent and upon what account have such payments been made?
5. Was such agent personally interested in any of the lands acquired?
6. Is such agent any relation to Mrs. McSpadden, from whom the larger part of the block was purchased? If so, what was his relationship?
7. What commission or remuneration has been paid or agreed to be paid to such agent in connection with the purchase of lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 21, 22, 23 and 24?
8. Was any refund or payment or allowance made to such agent on account of moneys paid by him to secure options on any of said lots in January, 1913?
9. If so, what sums have been paid, refunded or allowed to him, and on account of what lots have such payments, refunds or allowances been made?

Mr. HUGHES: There was no Government purchasing agent in connection with the above drill hall site. Mr. Geo. H. Cowan was the legal officer for the Department of Militia and Defence.

[Mr. Oliver.]

ATLANTIC, QUEBEC AND WESTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Is the Atlantic, Quebec and Western railway being operated during the present winter between New Carlisle and Gaspé? If so, by whom?
2. Has there been any interruption in the service, and for how long?
3. How were the mails handled during such interruption, by whom, and were tenders called for such service?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes. By Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.
2. No interruptions so far as the department is aware except some delay due to weather conditions.
3. Answered by No. 2.

BONAVENTURE PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. How much money has been expended on public works in the county of Bonaventure, Quebec, since October 11, 1911?
2. Of the money so expended, how much was provided in the estimates of 1911-12?
3. What amount was expended on the works for which money was not included in Estimates of 1911-12?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. $53,350.42.

2. Matapedia bridge, $4.10; River Bonaventure, $5,000; Carleton wharf, $1,500; New Carlisle, $117.24; New Richmond, $1,366.68; Paspebiac East, $5,000; Port Daniel, $1,200; St. Charles de Caplan, $5,000; Shigawake, $499.85, total, $19,687.87.

3. Anse aux Gascons, $6,272.40; Bonaventure Island, $89.29; River Bonaventure, $4,349.31; Carleton wharf, $1,059.72; Caplan river, $1,352.15; Cross Point, $2,556.17; Maria, $9,284.79; Matapedia road, $998.99; Paspebiac East, $2,181.94; Port Daniel, $2,887.96; St. Charles de Caplan, $2,292.90; St. Godefroy, $337.93, total, $53,350.42.

RURAL POST OFFICE LIBRARIES.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has the Prime Minister received any communications setting forth the idea of establishing libraries in the rural post office of Canada?
2. What does the Government think of the idea, and is there any possibility of the establishment of such libraries?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. Certain communications were received.
2. The subject is under consideration.

STE. BRIGIDE MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Did the Post Office Department receive during last year a complaint from Israel or Isaïe Deslauriers, in connection with the granting of the contract or contracts for the conveyance of rural mail in the parish of Ste. Brigide, county of St. Johns and Iberville?

2. If so, what is the nature of such complaint?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

ST. JOHNS, QUEBEC, COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. What is the salary of the collector of customs at St. Johns, Quebec?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to have such salary increased and fixed to an amount more adequate to the present cost of living?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. $1,600.

2. The intention of the Government will be determined when the appropriation for 1914-15 is available.

COMMISSIONER DUCHEMIN.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. With reference to statement made by H. P. Duchemin, Commissioner, as found in a certain return submitted to the House, in the case of the dismissal of R. Conroy, postmaster at Country Harbour, N.S., in which the following language occurs, namely:

A Mr. Floyd, who is, I understand, a solicitor in the town, asked if he might represent one of the accused at the hearing. I declined to allow him to act, herein following the precedent laid down by Mr. J. T. Rose, the commissioner appointed in 1896-1897, to do similar work. I had months before declined to hear counsel, on the ground that it would unduly prolong these hearings and would involve very great delay in reaching the many cases that had to be taken up. My attitude in this regard was subsequently confirmed by the department for which I was carrying on the inquiry.

2. What department of the Government confirmed the attitude of Commissioner Duchemin in refusing to permit counsel to act for parties accused of partisanship?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Department of Customs issued no instructions authorizing refusal to permit counsel to act for parties accused of partisanship.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—MONCTON PROPERTY PURCHASE.

*Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Did the Intercolonial railway purchase a residential property in Moncton from the estate of the late Peter S. Archibald, C.E.? If so, through whom was the purchase negotiated, and what was the price paid and to whom?

2. How was the valuation of the property made, and were valuators appointed? If so, by whom appointed, what are their names and residences respectively, and what was their compensation; what was the total cost of valuation and expenses charged connected with securing title?

3. Is the property now occupied by F. B. Brady, general superintendent of the Intercolonial railway, was it purchased as a residence, and is it now used as such for him, is any rental for its use charged and paid, and what is the amount of such rental per month or per year?

4. Were any repairs made on the said property and buildings? If so, what was the nature of said repairs and what was the total cost of same?

5. Were car shop men employed in such repair work? If so, what men, what wages, and what was the total cost of such labour?

6. Was the lumber used in such repairs procured from the Intercolonial railway stores department, and at what cost; how was the lumber conveyed from lumber yard to the building, and was it carried by railway men?

7. What is the total cost of said property to date?

8. Is the Government aware that the late P. S. Archibald paid $1,200 for said property, purchased by him from the late John Murphy, a former paymaster or other official of the Intercolonial railway?

9. How old was the house on said property, when was it first built, was it in the early fifties or about the time of the completion of the construction, or during said construction, of the European and North American railway, which became a part of the Intercolonial railway after Confederation?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The Intercolonial railway did not purchase property in Moncton from the estate of the late Peter S. Archibald, but did purchase a property from Mrs. Clara G. Archibald, widow of the late Peter S. Archibald. The purchase was the result of a direct written offer from the owner to the railway authorities. The price of $25,000, or 82 cents per square foot, was paid to Mrs. Clara G. Archibald.

2. The valuation of the property was made by two valuators, namely, Lester H. Higgins and Wesley McAnn, both of the city of Moncton, appointed by R. Hewson, agent of the Minister of Justice, securing title. The valuators were paid $10 each, in the whole $142.60.

3. The property is now occupied by F. P. Brady, general superintendent of Canadian Government railways. It was purchased to provide for the diversion of Archibald street, and to reduce the amount of compensation that would be payable as damages on account of the construction of the approaches to the proposed Main street subway, provided for by last year's par-

liamentary vote, the remnant of the property on which the building stands to be sold after the completion of the proposed subway. The rental of $25 per month is charged and paid for the property.

4. General repairs were made to the residence on the said property at the total cost of $2,900.

5. Yes, carpenters, painters, tinsmiths, masons, labourers; at the regular schedule wages, total cost of such labour in the whole being $2,080.86, which amount is included in the cost of general repairs set out in question No. 4.

6. Yes, at a cost of $300, which amount is included in the cost of general repairs set out in question No. 4. The lumber was conveyed from the lumber yard to the property by transfer car and truck team.

7. $28,042.60.

8. The department has no information.

9. The department has no information.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—LUMBER PURCHASE.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Has the Government, since the month of November, 1913, bought any deals or other material from the firm of John Fenderson Company, of Sayabec?

2. If so, at what price and by whose order have those materials been bought, and have tenders been asked before such purchase?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.

2. Spruce planking, T and G, planed on one side, at $21 per thousand; dimension timber, spruce at $19, $20, $21 and $25 per thousand, according to size, purchased on orders of the general tie and timber agent. This being an emergency order, regular tenders were not called, but offers were asked of eleven firms and the lowest offer received accepted.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—SUNNYBRAE-GUYSBOROUGH BRANCH.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Is there a party of surveyors now engaged in surveying the proposed branch railway from Sunnybrae, N.S., to Guysborough?

2. If so, who is in charge of said survey, and who composed the staff of assistants, if any?

3. Has the Department of Railways and Canals sent a traffic expert over the said proposed line at any time? If so, who was the expert?

4. Did such expert, if any, make a report to the department?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

[Mr. Cochrane.]

3. Yes. A. J. Gray.

4. Report not yet completed.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—RATES ON FRESH FISH.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What is the present local rate of freight charged by the Intercolonial railway per 100 pounds on fresh fish between Mulgrave and New Glasgow, Mulgrave and Truro, and Mulgrave and Amherst, N.S.?

2. What was the local rate of freight by the said Intercolonial railway on fresh fish per 100 pounds between said points prior to October, 1911?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Present rates on fresh fish: Mulgrave to New Glasgow, 26 cents per 100 lbs., less carload quantities; 16 cents per 100 lbs., carloads. Mulgrave to Truro, 32 cents per 100 lbs., less carloads; 20 cents per 100 lbs. carloads. Mulgrave to Amherst, 36 cents per 100 lbs., less carloads; 20 cents per 100 lbs., carloads.

2. Prior to October, 1911, corresponding rates were: Mulgrave to New Glasgow, 24 cents per 100 lbs., less carloads; 15 cents per 100 lbs. carloads. Mulgrave to Truro, 30 cents per 100 lbs., less carloads; 19 cents per 100 lbs. carloads. Mulgrave to Amherst, 34 cents per 100 lbs., less carloads; 21 cents per 100 lbs., carloads.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—POINT TUPPER-MULGRAVE FERRY.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has a contract been awarded for the construction of a ferry steamer for the Intercolonial railway between Mulgrave and Point Tupper?

2. If so, who are the contractors?

3. What is the contract price?

4. When will this boat be delivered?

5. How does she compare in size with the ferry steamer Scotia?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.

2. Sir W. G. Armstrong, Whitworth Company, Limited, Newcastle-on-Tyne, England.

3. £71,000 sterling.

4. The contract calls for the completion of this steamer at the works of the contractors, Newcastle-on-Tyne, England, by January 1, 1915. Should necessity require the delivery of the boat during the prevalence of the winter rate of insurance, the price will be £5,000 additional. Date of final delivery at Mulgrave, N.S., to be at the option of the department.

5. The new boat will be 18 feet longer and three cars greater capacity than the old Scotia.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EMPLOYMENT OF THOMAS WILLIAMS.

Mr. TURGEON:

1. Has Thomas Williams, a former treasurer of the Intercolonial railway, been employed at any time since October 1, 1911, in the service of the railway, either temporarily or permanently? If so, what were the services rendered, what amount or amounts were paid him in each year, and what is the total so paid?

2. Was he during the period named employed by any department of the Government? If so, which, what were the services rendered, and what compensation was paid him?

3. Is the said Thomas Williams in receipt of a superannuation or retiring allowance, under any statute of Canada, yearly? If so, what amount, and out of what fund is it paid?

4. What is the total of the amounts paid him since his retirement as treasurer of the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes. Appointed by Order in Council December, 2, 1911, to prepare inventory and valuation of all stores, supplies, rolling stock and equipment, machinery and plant belonging to the Intercolonial railway and the Prince Edward Island railway. Paid in 1911-12, $1,100.89; in 1912-13, $3,373.79; total, $4,474.68.

2. Answered by No. 1, as far as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned.

3. Yes, under the Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act he is paid $1,782 per annum.

4. He has been paid from the 1st September, 1908, to the 31st January, 1914, on superannuation account, $9,652.50; and for special services as cited in No. 1, $4,474.68; total, $14,127.18.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—SAMUEL KING AND WILLIAM AIRD.

Mr. TURGEON:

Have Samuel and William Aird been in the employment of the Intercolonial railway permanently or temporarily at any time? If so, for how long, since October 1, 1911, what were the services rendered, and the amounts paid as compensation therefor, respectively?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes. Samuel King was employed by T. Williams, with the approval of the department, to assist him in making a valuation of the rolling stock of the Intercolonial railway and the Prince Edward Island railway—92 days. Paid in 1911-12, $427; in 1912-13, $462.10; total, $889.10. William Aird was employed by T. Williams, with the approval of the department, to assist him in making a valuation of the motive power of the Intercolonial railway and the Prince Edward Island railway—36 days. Paid in 1913, $290.95. He was also employed temporarily inspecting engines being built at Canadian Locomotive Works, Kingston, for the Intercolonial railway, for which he was paid $521.43.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATING COMMISSION.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Have the commissioners appointed to investigate the construction of the Transcontinental railway concluded their labours? If so, on what date?

2. What is the total cost in connection with the work of said commission?

3. What has been paid to each commissioner to date?

4. What amount is yet due to each?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes, the report of the commissioners was laid upon the Table of the House of Commons on February 11, 1914.

2. $63,388.45.

3. To F. P. Gutelius, $27,465.48; to G. Lynch-Staunton, $24,038.01; other official services, expenses and reporting, $11,884.96.

4. All accounts presented have been paid.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—OXFORD-PICTOU TRAIN SERVICE.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD:

Is it the intention of the Railway Department to change the system of running the trains on what is known as the short line between Oxford Junction and Pictou, by running through trains to and from New Glasgow and Stellarton and return, instead of from Pictou, as has always been the practice?

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

UNOPPOSED AND UNDISCUSSED MOTIONS.

Mr. McCraney.—For a return showing how many towns in the province of Ontario have a population larger than the town of Chesley, South Riding of Bruce, which was 1,734, according to the last census, and how many of such towns are served by letter boxes on the street.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a copy of all telegrams and letters written or sent by G. A. R. Bowlings, of Sydney, N.S., Arthur McDonald, of Sherbrooke, N.S., and J. L. Hattie, of Caledonia, N.S., to the Department of Militia and Defence, or to the Minister of Militia, or any officer, relating to Fenian Raid bounties, and also of all replies to such letters and telegrams.

Mr. Boulay.—For a copy of all correspondence, investigations or other documents respecting the loss of a horse killed on the Intercolonial, on the 10th of September last, the property of Johnny Roy, of Amqui.

Mr. Graham.—For a copy of the contract with Mr. Joseph Gosselin for the locomotive and car shops at St. Malo, and of all telegrams, letters and correspondence between the department and Mr. W. J. Press, mechanical

engineer, or the chief engineer, with regard to change of the price of 85 cents per cubic yard for common excavation to the price of $2.30 per cubic yard for frozen earth.

Mr. J. J. Hughes.—For a copy of all charges, complaints, memorials, correspondence and telegrams not already brought down relating to officials in any department of the Government since October 10, 1911, the number of officials dismissed, reports of investigations held in respect of such charges, items of expenditure and costs of each investigation, the names of persons appointed to office in the place of dismissed officials, and of all recommendations received in behalf of persons so appointed in the province of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. Demers.—For a copy of all documents, petitions, letters, telegrams, &c., exchanged between anyone and the Post Office Department, in connection with the establishing of a rural mail service in the parish of Ste. Marguerite de Blairfindie, county of St. Johns and Iberville, and of all documents, letters and telegrams, &c., relating to the contracts for the conveyance of rural mail in said parish.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Interim Report of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission to December 31, 1913.—Hon. Frank Cochrane.

Minutes of Evidence taken in Australia by the Dominions Royal Commission, Part 1; Minutes of Evidence taken in Australia by the Dominions Royal Commission, Part 2, Minutes of Evidence taken in New Zealand; and Second Interim Report of the Dominions Royal Commission.—Hon. George E. Foster.

Mr. FOSTER: The first interim report was simply a covering to the first volume of the evidence; the first real report issued by the commission is that which I now put on the table of the House.

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY IN AUSTRIA.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence and papers generally, exchanged between the Government and the Home authorities concerning the closing of the offices of the Canadian Pacific Company at Vienna and Trieste, Austria.

He said: In presenting this motion, I need not say that I hold no brief for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I bring the matter to the attention of the House because it seems to me that this question involves the status of a great Canadian corporation in a foreign country, and it affects every British subject, whether he be a Canadian, an Australian a New Zealander, or a native of the British Isles. The treatment to which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was subjected in this instance, has aroused much resentment in England and in Canada. The history of the case is possibly well known to members of the House, but I may be pardoned for recalling the circumstances attending the closing of the Canadian Pacific Railway offices in Vienna and in Trieste. First of all, we know that the Canadian Pacific railway, having some years ago completed its Canadian establishment, so to speak, decided to start a direct steamship service between the port of Trieste in Austria and Canada. We know also that the Canadian Pacific railway has inaugurated on Austrian territory a special tourist observation car service, which is quite a credit to that great corporation and which has been the means of advertising Canada and Canadian products.

The question which affects the present case, however, is more in relation to the steamship line of the Canadian Pacific railway. The Canadian Pacific railway had organized transportation and was carrying tourist passengers, steerage and freight business. The general manager of the Canadian Pacific railway in Austria-Hungary was Mr. Altman, who, I believe, is an American citizen, but who was acting there as the general manager of the Canadian Pacific railway. The company had also some other agents in different parts of Austria to look after its business; in fact, the organization of the Canadian Pacific railway in that respect did not materially differ from the organization of the other transportation companies.

In November last, the press of the country was informed that the offices of the Canadian Pacific railway in Austria had been closed; that all the papers had been seized by the police, and that the general manager of the Canadian Pacific railway, Mr. Altman, had been summarily arrested, without any previous notice being given to him although he was very prominently known throughout Austria. The pretext for Mr. Altman's arrest, the closing of the Canadian Pacific railway offices and the seizing of the papers, was that a breach of the emigration regulations of Austria had been committed. It was freely stated that the agents of the Canadian Pacific railway had enticed young men of Austrian origin to emigrate, in contravention of the military laws of Austria. As a matter of fact, this accusation has been denied and had been successfully attacked. As regards the statistics of emigration from Austria to Canada on the Canadian Pacific railway and also on the competing lines, perhaps it

would be well that I should give the figures. It is established beyond any doubt that between January 1, 1913, and September 30, 1913, the Canadian Pacific railway carried, as first-class, second-class and steerage passengers, 30,850 persons. Out of that total number there were only 11,860 Austrian subjects. Of the others, many were Russians, Ruthenians and emigrants coming from adjacent territories.

What about the rival companies? It is well known that there exists on the continent of Europe a very powerful pool, composed of the following well known companies: the North German Lloyd, the Hamburg-American Company, the Holland-Amerika Company, and the Red Star Company. They are under the control of Herr Balin, a distinguished and influential German financier. It is established that this German-Austrian pool carried during the same period as the Canadian Pacific railway, that is to say between January 1, 1913, and September 30, 1913, as many as 460,000 steerage passengers, of whom, according to the London Times, fully 50 per cent were Austrian subjects.

Mr. BORDEN: Are the computations which my hon. friend has given, official in their character ?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have these figures from the London Times, and I might be able to furnish them to my right hon. friend during the debate.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER: Does my hon. friend know whether those figures which he has taken from the London Times have been really got, as a source, from the investigations of the committee in the Austrian Parliament?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not think so, because they are taken from a date precedent to the investigation which was held, but I take it for granted that the Times editorially would not make a statement unless it were authentic. The Times is well known in the world as being one of the best informed papers.

Mr. FOSTER: I was not questioning that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: No. It is precedent to the investigation held by the Austrian Government.

Mr. BORDEN: As far as my hon. friend is aware, these figures have not been controverted ?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No. It became quite evident, after the summary arrest of Mr. Altman, representing this great corporation abroad, that the whole question was nothing more or less than the result of a quarrel between divergent interests. Immediately on the accusation made that the Canadian Pacific railway was violating the immigration law of Austria, an official statement from Montreal was published in the press of London and Canada simultaneously, under the authority, I understand, of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy. With your permission I will read that statement:

> Seeing that considerable misconception seems to exist with regard to the nature of the Canadian Pacific on the continent of Europe, it should be explained that in conducting the passenger business strict instructions have been issued to all the Canadian Pacific agents on the continent of Europe to follow strictly the letter of the law of the respective countries. It has always been the policy of the Canadian Pacific to conform without question, to the wishes of the governments of the countries in which their agents were permitted to do business. In Austria, the Canadian Pacific, knowing the natural dislike of the Austrian Government to heavy emigration over the frontiers, went out of the way to show the Austrians how to control emigration by concentrating the stream on the Austrian port of Trieste, where a careful examination could be made of the emigrants' antecedents and papers. The company also recommend to the Austrian Government that inspectors should travel in the steamers from Trieste to insure the proper treatment of Austrian subjects on their voyage and to prevent the possibility of exploitation of undesirables. Such examination and protection was not effective under the previous conditions, where the emigrants left so many different frontier stations that no effective control was possible.
>
> The Canadian Pacific obtained the concession of the emigration business in Austria purely as a carrying company. It has strictly forbidden its agents to conduct or promote a propaganda in favour of emigration, the tickets issued being almost entirely prepaid by friends and relatives settled in Canada or in the United States, and the passengers would therefore have left their native country in any case. The passenger offices were established in Austria with the consent of the Austrian Government, the Canadian Pacific agents in each case were approved, and in some cases even nominated, both by the central authority in Vienna and the local authorities in the respective provinces, the object being to prevent any possible abuse by irresponsible agents.
>
> The line of steamers established by the Canadian Pacific between Canada and Trieste was put on at the direct request of the Austrian Government in order that the merchandise business between Austria and Canada might be shipped direct fro man Austria port. The carryings of Austrian subjects in all the Canadian Pacific steamship lines this year amounted to only 11,361, against 14,000 in 1912.

That is one of the important sources of information as to the number of emigrants carried by the Canadian Pacific railway.

This is a small percentage compared with the carryings of the Continental Pool lines, which numbered 109,123 in 1911 and 201,294 in 1912.

I have given the larger figures for a part of 1913. This was, Sir, the statement published by the Canadian Pacific railway, and for my part I accept it unequivocally. Now, after the arrest of Mr. Altman, the agent of the company, and the closing of the various offices, there was quite a stir in the press of Great Britain. I do not know what action was taken by the Foreign Office, but as my hon. friend suggested a moment ago, an investigation was ordered by the Austrian Government. Meanwhile, Mr. Altman was kept in jail, I am not sure how long, but finally, by the end of November, if I mistake not, he was put under bail, the bail amounting to £6,250. The offices of the Canadian Pacific railway were reopened, except for steerage business—the business of emigration. A new agent-general of the Canadian Pacific railway for Austria was appointed in the person of Herr Veit, who is an Austro-Hungarian by birth, and whose appointment was made, apparently, with the approval of the Austrian authorities. I do not know what has been the result of the case against Mr. Altman, but the fact remains that, for a while at least,—I do not know what action has been taken since—the Canadian Pacific was put in an inferior position as compared with its rivals, the great companies of the German pool. There was discrimination in the fact that the pool companies could transport steerage passengers—emigrants—without violating the law, while the Canadian Pacific railway, with its large organization in Austria, and having an arrangement directly with the Austrian Government, was deprived of the right to carry such passengers. The object of my motion is to know whether or not correspondence has been exchanged between the Canadian Government and His Majesty's Government in England on this subject. We have a good many friends at court in England, and the Canadian Pacific railway, one of the greatest corporations in the world, and certainly one of the most creditable, found its case taken up by the British press, not only as a plea for the Canadian Pacific railway but as a general plea for British subjects and British corporations abroad. As I stated a moment ago, the question of our British citizenship is more or less involved in the present case. With the permission of the House I will quote what the London Times said after the offices at Vienna and Trieste had been opened under official sanction with this rider, however, that the company could not engage in steerage business.

There was never the slightest reason for the suspension of the Canadian Pacific freight and cabin business. This suspension was a wanton injury, in regard to which the company is entitled to lodge a serious claim for indemnity, and to receive, in respect of that claim, the full support of His Majesty's diplomatic service. A further claim for indemnity may be based upon the circumstances that, in consequence of the action wilfully taken against the company, its steamers at Trieste can only be handled under brokerage. An even more serious feature of the question is that, while the Austrian authorities appear not to contemplate an immediate resumption of the Canadian Pacific steerage business, which was the main object of the concession given to the company, they permit the steerage business of the German 'pool' lines, to go on practically undisturbed. Some agents of the 'pool' lines have, indeed, been arrested; and some Austrian officials have stated, in Parliament and elsewhere, that the alleged responsibility of the Canadian Pacific in transporting Austrian emigrants liable to military service, is, if it exists at all, far less considerable than that of the 'pool' lines. Yet the German steerage business goes merrily on, while that of the Canadian Pacific remains suspended, not only in the case of the Austrian, but in that of non-Austrian subjects, including Russian emigrants whose passages have been prepaid by friends and relatives in Canada. Such discrimination against British interests requires the attention of His Majesty's Government. It forms a serious count in the heavy indictment of Austrian methods which the Austrian authorities are building up against themselves in this case.

As hon. gentlemen will notice, Austrian emigrants, according to the Times, are not the only persons barred from steerage passage on Canadian Pacific liners; non-Austrian subjects, Russians for instance, who pass through Trieste and come directly by the Canadian Pacific to Canada, are also barred. So that this action on the part of the Austrian Government affects our immigration policy; it affects the right of immigrants to Canada to pass through the territory of a great country in Europe, and besides, it affects the status of a Canadian corporation doing business in a foreign country.

The Times was not alone in taking up the gauntlet for Canada, and for Great Britain as well—because the case of Canada is the case of Great Britain. Several other papers called the attention of the British Foreign Office to this high-handed treatment of a Canadian corporation in Austria. From the London Times of, I think, November 27 last, I read the following:

An authoritative assurance that the attitude of His Majesty's Embassy at Vienna has been

as firm as the circumstances warrant would be welcomed in business circles. There is ground for the belief that the North German shipping pool has enjoyed vigorous support from the German Embassy at Vienna, and though British diplomacy has not—nor is it desirable that it should have—at its command the means of influencing public and official opinion in Austria which are possessed by German diplo-
3 p.m. macy, it is expedient that the language of His Majesty's representatives abroad should leave no room for doubt as to the light in which the action of the Austrian authorities is regarded here.

And the Times adds:

Should Mr. Altman be proved, after a fair trial in an open court, to be morally unworthy or to have violated, advertently or inadvertently, the laws of the Austrian Empire, it will be just that he should suffer. But until such proof is forthcoming he is entitled to be regarded as a victim of unscrupulous intrigues on the part of commercial rivals and their agents.

The Times adds that this is a very ugly feature of the whole case. Not only was the Canadian Pacific as a corporation injured by this treatment, but on the part of the Austrian Government there would appear to be a breach of the Anglo-Austrian Treaty of 1876, in that there is discrimination in favour of the German shipping pool as against the Canadian Pacific. Under that treaty, Great Britain and her colonies are entitled to the most-favoured nation treatment as regards trade, transportation, &c. It would be interesting to know first, what has been the result of the investigation held by the Government in Austria, and second, what action has been taken by the Foreign Office in Great Britain. It would be interesting to know also whether the company has lately been informed that it can open indiscriminately all its offices in Austria, and that it can carry steerage passengers. That is the object of my motion. Again, Sir, I hold no brief for the Canadian Pacific railway, but this case has attracted my attention; the press of the country was also greatly aroused over the incident, and I think the Government should tell us what action has been taken by the Foreign Office, and whether Mr. Altman, who was released on bail, has been set free.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister): The motion which has just been moved by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) brings to the attention of Parliament and of the country a subject of more than ordinary importance. There is no objection to the passing of this motion; but of course the hon. member for Rouville will realize, in common with all other members of the House, that there is a good deal of correspondence and other documents in connection with the matter which is either of a confidential character or which, under present conditions, could not be brought down and laid on the table of the House. I appreciate fully the observations which he has made in regard to the good work which has been done by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, not only in the development of our country, but in making Canada known to the British Isles and to a great many other countries of the world by its activities in connection with the business of transportation; and it would be a matter of great regret if that company should be treated by any nation abroad in such a way as to justify the charge of discrimination which has been alluded to.

It would be entirely undesirable for me to pass any judgment upon a matter that is still under diplomatic negotiation, and which, if I understand the facts correctly, is at present also the subject of investigation by the Austrian Government or by the Austrian courts. It is sufficient to say for the moment that the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which has been put forward very cogently, absolutely disclaims the commission or omission of any act which would justify the course which has been taken in that regard. The representations which were placed before this Government by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to which I have just alluded, were forwarded without any delay whatever to the Foreign Office through the Colonial Office. If I remember correctly, the representations were also placed before the British Government by Mr. George McL. Brown, who is the representative of the Canadian Pacific railway in London.

My hon. friend the member for Rouville has alluded to the earnestness with which the British press has taken up the discussion of this subject, and it is well to note that the tone of the British press in that regard could not have been more forcible or more earnest if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had been a company organized within the British Isles, and altogether connected with those islands, instead of with Canada.

While I cannot touch the question in any but a general way at the moment, I may say that the attitude of the British press, to which my hon. friend has alluded, has also been the attitude of the British Government, and of the Foreign Office in par-

ticular, and that no action has been omitted, and no step has failed to be taken, which could assist in placing the representations of the Canadian Pacific railway before the Austrian Government, or in bringing about redress of the incidents which, according to their point of view, were altogether uncalled for and unjustifiable. Since the subject was first brought to our attention in the way already intimated, it has been from time to time the subject of further representations from the Canadian Pacific railway and of further negotiations with the Foreign Office. I am not aware—and therefore I cannot give my hon. friend any assurance at the moment—that the proceedings against Mr. Altman have been concluded or discontinued; but my impression—I do not speak with absolute confidence—is that proceedings are still pending against him and that no decision has been arrived at.

The incident that has taken place is regrettable. So far as the conduct of the officers in Austria is concerned, that is still under investigation; and as to their conduct I do not venture any opinion whatever, because I do not understand the circumstances sufficiently to judge as to whether there was any irregularity on their part. Whatever may be the case in that respect, it must be perfectly apparent to every member in this House and to all the people of this country that the general management of the Canadian Pacific railway in this country and Mr. George McL. Brown, the company's London representative, are entirely blameless in the matter, and never had from the first the slightest intention of infringing in any way the laws of Austria, or the regulations made under those laws by the Austrian Government. Pending the negotiations which are still being carried on between the Foreign Office and the Austrian Government, and pending the investigation into the conduct of the officers, it would be undesirable that any of us should pronounce an opinion one way or the other, because we cannot claim to have a sufficient knowledge of the facts. I would be very glad to have the motion of my hon. friend passed subject, of course, to what I have already said as to the undesirability of bringing down papers of a confidential character or of bringing down any papers at all, the production of which might in any way affect the negotiations which are still being carried on.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Borden.]

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE PRIME MINISTER AND EDOUARD LAPOINTE.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, papers, telegrams, &c., between the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, and one Edouard Lapointe, of Quebec City, concerning a contract between said Edouard Lapointe and the Post Office Department.

He said: I do not intend to dilate at any length on this motion. I wish simply to say to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that I am informed that there has been correspondence exchanged between the said Edouard Lapointe and himself. Of course, if this correspondence is of a personal nature I shall not insist, but if the correspondence can be made public I would ask my right hon. friend to lay it on the Table of the House.

Mr. BORDEN. I appreciate the considerate tone in which my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has made the motion in regard to this correspondence. To tell the truth, at the moment, I have not the slightest recollection of it. Possibly some such correspondence may have taken place.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You might perhaps let it stand, Mr. Speaker, and, if my right hon. friend finds that he has any such correspondence he may let me know later on.

Mr. BORDEN: I see no objection to the motion passing as it is at present. If it should turn out that the correspondence is of a personal nature, I will acquaint my hon. friend of the fact. On the other hand, if it is a document of a public character, not of a confidential character, I shall bring it down at once.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTORAL CORRUPTION.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to enact more effective provisions to punish bribery and fraud at elections, to ensure thorough publicity as to expenditures by political organizations, to prevent the accumulation of campaign funds for corrupt purposes, and to prohibit contributions thereto by corporations, contractors and promoters, to expedite the hearing of election petitions, and to prevent collusive arrangements for the withdrawal or compromise thereof, to provide for a thorough investigation of corrupt practices, and if necessary to appoint an independent prosecuting officer charged with that duty, to simplify the procedure thereof and to enforce the laws so amended.

And that a selected committee of nine be appointed to inquire into the Acts relating to

Elections to this House, and the prevention of corrupt practices thereat, and the procedure and practice upon petitions relating to such elections, and to report to the House if any changes are desirable therein. That the said committee have power to send for persons papers, and records. That three be a quorum of the committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to invite any protracted debate on this resolution. My remarks upon it will be of a very general character. It is also my desire to abstain from any partisan observations, which, of course, would only invite recrimination, because, as is realized by all hon. members of this House, one party alone is not responsible for any corrupt electoral practices, nor is the other of our two great political parties immune and faultless in this respect. If our law in respect to the subjects which are mentioned in my resolution are ineffective, or defective, I take it that it is the desire of hon. gentlemen to reform the same and remove the defects. Therefore, I desire that the resolution be debated purely upon its merits and not upon the past records of either political party with respect to electoral practices.

You will notice that the resolution is contained in two paragraphs. It is of rather distinguished parentage. The first paragraph is a declaration of principles enunciated by the present right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) in a speech which he delivered at Halifax quite a number of years ago—I think probably in the year 1904. The remarks that the Prime Minister made on that occasion, and which are contained in the first paragraph of the resolution, were later known to the public as one of the planks of the so-called Halifax platform of the Conservative party. I assume that the declarations of principle as contained in this portion of the Halifax platform are considered as sound to-day as they were on the occasion when first uttered, and I trust that hon. gentlemen opposite will recognize that I am performing a public service, and a service to the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, when I bring to the attention of this House the Halifax platform in so far as it relates to the subject matter that I am now discussing. I think I may truthfully say that hon. gentlemen upon this side of the House are quite ready and willing to co-operate with the Government and hon. gentlemen opposite in aiding the House to provide legislation, if it does not already exist, to make effective the principles contained in the first part of my resolution.

The second paragraph of the resolution is also a literal reproduction of a resolution moved by the right hon. the Prime Minister in the year 1906. That motion, as I recollect, was accepted on behalf of the Government by the then Minister of Justice, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick. The motion was referred to a committee for consideration but no definite action was taken or report made to the House by the committee. I gather from a cursory perusal of 'Hansard' in reference to this matter that the committee were not very energetic in their meetings and failed to make a report. Shortly after that motion was made by the Prime Minister, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick went out of office and was succeeded by Sir Allen Aylesworth, who was unable during that session to take time from his other pressing duties to give the matter the attention it demanded.

Mr. BORDEN: Were not certain Bills referred to a committee?

Mr. MACLEAN: Certain other Bills proposing amendments to the Elections Act and the Corrupt Practices Act were introduced by the Prime Minister and referred to the same committee. I do not remember what was the fate of these Bills, whether they were ever reported to the House or not, but at all events no legislation resulted. In 1903 a committee was appointed to consider such matters as those referred to in my motion, and that committee made a report, accompanied by a proposed Bill, which was discussed, but with no concrete results. The suggestion of compulsory voting was contained in this Bill, and that feature of it was debated at considerable length. The Bill, however, failed of enactment.

Mr. BORDEN: If I remember correctly, Mr. Alcorn, then member for Prince Edward county, introduced a Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am told that Bill never received its second reading.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It was discussed a little in the House and allowed to stand over.

Mr. BORDEN: I had the idea that Mr. Aylesworth, when Minister of Justice, accepted Mr. Alcorn's Bill in whole or in part.

Mr. MACLEAN: I have no recollection of the Bill introduced by Mr. Alcorn.

All laws respecting corrupt practices, now upon our statute books, are designed to prevent or discourage such practices. It may be said, with some degree of truth, that we now have very stringent provisions, but the question arises whether these pro

visions are successful in preventing or minimizing the evils they are aimed at. I regret that my experience and observation leads me to conclude that our laws in this respect are more honoured in the breach than in the observance; I regret to say, that in my judgment, unfortunately, corrupt practices at elections are very prevalent in Canada. I doubt if there is any portion of the British Empire in which corrupt practices in elections are so prevalent as they are here. It is my opinion that in this respect matters are in such a deplorable condition as to call for a remedy from the representatives of the people in this Parliament. Almost every election brings forward the usual charges of corrupt practices by one party against the other, and inevitably counter-charges follow. I think I may safely postulate the statement, that corrupt practices in elections are undesirable from every standpoint, and that it should be the desire of every good citizen, particularly of all men engaged in public life, who should be the leaders in reform, to provide legislation which will prevent, or at least minimize, this evil. Democratic institutions must be a failure if the electorate fail to express their opinion in a pure and incorrupt manner, and elections are a needless expenditure of money and labour if they be not a free and honest expression of public opinion. Government of the people, for the people, and by the people of which we in Canada boast, is impossible of accomplishment in any country where corrupt electoral practices extensively prevail. The evils which spring from corrupt electoral practices are not only felt within the constituencies, but beyond. Political corruption in constituencies will lead to corrupt lobbies in Parliament; to corrupting influences in public life generally, and gradually to a lowering of the plane of the whole social and commercial life of the country. I do not intend to elaborate this view, but it must be obvious to hon. gentlemen that corrupt practices cannot prevail in elections in individual constituencies or in the country generally, without giving rise to analogous conditions in our commercial and social life.

By the elimination of corrupt practices in elections, I believe we would eliminate also a great deal of the bitterness and acidity which obtains in the political life of this country. In respect to our laws as we now find them upon the statute-book, it may be truly said that there are very stringent provisions against the practices to which I am now objecting, but I think it can also be successfully contended that these provisions can be so amended as to make them much more effective.

I desire to refer very briefly, but in a general way only, to some of the provisions of the statutes of Great Britain in reference to this matter. There we find the provisions of the statutes relating to corrupt practices in elections to be much more effective in practice than they are in this country, although in principle they are very much alike. Still, there we find some provisions which assist very much in the prompt and effective administration of the laws in respect to elections, and which I think we might very well enact in this country.

I would like to invite a brief consideration of some of the provisions of the English statutes in reference to this matter. I do not propose making an analysis of all the provisions of these statutes; I desire merely to invite the House to consider two or three of the most important of them. For instance, I find in respect to expenses incurred in elections that the provisions of the English Act are very much more effective and comprehensive than they are in this country. In Great Britain a candidate is compelled to file within two months a statement of all expenditures made by him or on his behalf by agents. Accompanying this statement there must also be a declaration of the candidate. It is true that under the Canadian statute a candidate is obliged to file a statement, but this even is rarely observed by candidates. There is nothing, however, requiring a declaration on oath to accompany the statement. At least that is my recollection of the statute.

Mr. MARCIL: In England are agents appointed by the candidates in writing?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, I think so. I think that the provision requiring that a declaration or oath must accompany the statement by a candidate, or by an agent on his behalf, showing the expenses for any election is quite effective, and that a similar provision should be inserted in the election laws of this country.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman will remember that under the Dominion Act not only has a statement to be furnished, but the accounts themselves all have to be left in the hands of the returning officer so that either party can see what has been spent.

Mr. MACLEAN: The point I am making is that there is not any sufficient penalty

provided by our statute for failure to file and publish the statutory statement of election expenses. The result is that such a statement is rarely, in this country, published as required by the statute. Further, my recollection of the statute is that no declaration need accompany the statement. The form of affidavit as required by the British statute is as follows:

And I hereby further solemnly and sincerely declare that, except as appears from that return, I have not and to the best of my knowledge and belief no other person, nor any club, society or association has on behalf of the said candidate made any payment, or given, promised or offered any reward, office, employment or valuable consideration, or incurred any liability on account of or in respect of the conduct or management of the said election.

Mr. BORDEN: If I remember correctly, in Great Britain the member elected is not permitted to take his seat in Parliament unless the statement has been filed; and if it is irregular in any way, he must go to a court and get relieved from the effects of that irregularity before he can take his seat.

Mr. MACLEAN: The Prime Minister is right in that respect, and I intend referring to that. Not only must the statement be accompanied by the declaration which I have read, but until that statement with that declaration is filed, the member is disqualified from occupying his seat in the House and from voting therein. If the candidate for any reason is unable to make that declaration, he is still disqualified from taking his seat in the House and from voting therein until the prohibition has been removed in some way or another, as provided by statute, by an order of the court.

Mr. BURNHAM: Is not that assuming that the man who has made the declaration will tell the truth? Is not that also assuming a great deal?

Mr. MACLEAN: That is a fair assumption; and if it proved incorrect, the man making the declaration would be liable to a severe penalty, either in the loss of his seat or in some other form. I therefore submit to the House that these two provisions of the English Act are well worthy of consideration and of adoption in this country.

The English Act also provides for a limitation of expenditure according to the number of electors in any constituency, and the amount which any club or any person may expend on behalf of any candidate. Upon this point, of course, we have an apparently very stringent provision in our Act, namely, that section which requires the payment of all accounts or expenses incurred in any election to be made through the statutory agent appointed by the candidate. The section in the English Act appears to me to be much more effective, and I would like to read it to the House, particularly in so far as it is referable to the matter of contributions by other parties towards the liquidation of election expenses.

It is as follows:

Except as permitted by or in pursuance of this Act, no payment and no advance or deposit shall be made by a candidate at an election or by any agent on behalf of the candidate or by any other person at any time, whether before, during, or after such election, in respect of any expenses incurred on account of or in respect of the conduct or management of such election, otherwise than by or through the election agent of the candidate, whether acting in person or by a sub-agent; and all money provided by any person other than the candidate for any expenses incurred on account of or in respect of the conduct of management of the election, whether as gift, loan, advance, or deposit, shall be paid to the candidate or his election agent or otherwise.

This section also gives the definition of the word 'person' so as to include:

—an association or body of persons corporate or incorporate and where any act is done by any association or body the members of such association or body who have taken part in the commission of such act shall be liable to any fine or punishment imposed for the same by this Act.

Mr. MARCIL: If that would invalidate the election, that would mean that candidates must suffer from the action of parties who are not their agents.

Mr. BORDEN: They are their agents in one sense though not in another.

Mr. MACLEAN: A great deal might be said in favour of the provisions I have just given to the House, but it is not my intention to argue the matter at greater length, as my desire is simply to submit the suggestion to the House. Another provision in the English Elections Act which is particularly referred to in the motion, and to which the present Prime Minister frequently referred in the discussion of this matter in the past, is the appointment of a public prosecutor to conduct election petitions or proceedings, or to interpose therein whenever he deemed it proper. I do not propose expressing any personal opinion upon the efficacy and propriety of inserting such a provision in our statute, but desire merely to refer to it in order to invite the attention

of the House to the same. I have no doubt that it is found very effective in the administration of the law in England. I apprehend much greater difficulty would be found in this country in administering such a provision, but the idea has a great deal to commend it, and on the whole should have our very best consideration. The provision in the British Elections Act with respect to a public prosecutor is as follows:

> On every trial of an election petition the director of public prosecutions shall by himself or by his assistant, or by such representative as hereinafter mentioned, attend at the trial, and it shall be the duty of such director to obey any directions given to him by the election court with respect to the summoning of any witness to give evidence on such trial, and with respect to the prosecution by him of offenders, and with respect to any person to whom notice is given to attend with a view to report him as guilty of any corrupt or illegal practice.

Then, under another section of the English Act, it is provided that upon any motion to withdraw an election petition, copies of the affidavits are to be delivered to the director of public prosecutions, who can attend and cross-examine upon the affidavits, or take any course which seems desirable, if he has any suspicion that the proceeding is the result of any corrupt agreement between the parties to an election petition. There is much to be said in favour of such a power being granted to a public official, because I am sure it is the experience of many hon. gentlemen in this House, if not of all, that petitions are filed with a knowledge, or almost a certainty, that they are to be later on discontinued, being initiated for protective or retaliatory purpose. This brings about the inevitable result—and I have no doubt it has been the practice to some degree at least in this country—that after the commencement of election petitions wholesale compromises are effected. Then, there is this other virtue about the appointment of a public prosecutor, that he would be in a position to carry on to a conclusion petitions that have been commenced, no matter what be the desire of the parties to the petition. It does frequently happen that in an election court admissions are made of one or two violations of the statute which generally end the proceedings, and the seat is declared vacant. If there existed a public prosecutor, he would have the power to carry the proceedings further should he think it in the public interest to do so. Respecting the provision of the English statute providing for the public prosecutor, I merely repeat what I have already said, that it is worthy of our best consideration. It is quite evident that a similar provision in our statute would assist very materially in putting into force the provisions of our law against corrupt practices, and in the event of this resolution being referred to a committee, I trust that this matter will have their best consideration.

When the present Prime Minister was discussing this resolution in 1909, he quoted from an article which appeared in the North American Review written by Mr. Arthur Bottow, evidently a man of much experience in the conduct of election trials in England. For the purpose of giving to the House a summary of the English statute and showing its power as a deterrent of corrupt practices in elections, I will read briefly from this article. The writer pointed out that, up to a certain time, conditions had been very unsatisfactory. He proceeds:

> The end came through the law of 1883, and ever-blessed let me call that law. For, under its benificent powers, the knife of the public prosecutor cut deep down into the very roots of the political ulcer, and the scandal which originated in the lax morality of the court of King Charles II, and had in the two hundred years of its orgy permeated the very vitals of the body politic, ended its pestiferous life. All previous legislation had been half-hearted, ambiguous or narrow; the drag-net of Sir Henry James caught the whole breed of corruptionists and its provisions left no loop-hole but cessation on the jail. If for no other reason, it would mark a new era inasmuch as for the first time it brought under discipline political clubs and associations; but it has many other claims to everlasting gratitude.
>
> It may assist in suggesting some points to our present day reformers, and I make no apology for summarizing some of its most novel and drastic provisions.

I may say that, to all intents and purposes, this is still the statute in England.

> It starts by defining bribery and treating and extending these offences to periods before, during or after any election, and in making the receiver as well as the giver guilty of a corrupt practice, punishable by one year's imprisonment or $1,000 fine. It makes the aider, abettor, counsellor and procurer of personation as guilty of felony as the personator punishable by a term of two years' imprisonment with hard labour. Its next blows are at long-established abuses, never before unlawful. It makes it an illegal practice, punishable by $500 fine on summary conviction, to hold any committee in public houses or saloons; or to pay for the use of any house or other premises, for the purpose of exhibiting posters; to pay for any bands of music, torches, banners, ribbons or other marks of distinction, or to pay for the conveyance of voters to the poll.
>
> It disfranchises every person employed for money by the candidate, and cuts down the number who may be employed to one agent, one polling clerk and one messenger for every 500 voters.

It defines the purposes—so much for printing, so much for this and so much for that—for which alone money can be spent; and it limits the total maximum to $1,750 where voters number 2,000, and $750 for each 1,000 voters above that number; a subject never before touched by law.

It prohibits a single cent of this expenditure being incurred by any other person than the agent. Whatever aid any club or association may desire to give must be in cash to the agent, of which hereafter the spending agent has to make an itemized account with the names and duties of every person employed or bills incurred, confirmed by their vouchers. Within thirty-five days after the election, the agent is compelled to file a statement of all moneys received by him from the candidate or from any other person, with the name of every person, club or association from whom the same was received. Both the candidate and the agent are charged with actual personal knowledge of all the details of these receipts and payments, and each of them has to declare solemnly and sincerely that, except as appears on the returns, they have not, nor to the best of their knowledge has any other person, nor has any club, society or association, on behalf of the said candidate, made any payment or incurred any liability on account of it, or in respect to, the conduct and management of such an election.

To clench the whole legal fist, and to bring it down swiftly and mercilessly; if there be a petition against the member the director of public prosecution is to attend it, and it shall be his duty, without any direction of the court, to prosecute persons guilty of corrupt or illegal practices before any court competent to deal with the offences.

Whether any enactment providing for the appointment of a public prosecutor in Canada such as they have in England, would be practical useful legislation, may be open to question. At any rate it is desirable and urgent that some reform be made in our law in order to ensure the prompt and effective trial of election petitions. I think there can be little doubt but that in England the existence of such a public official ensures an early trial and conclusion of election proceedings. If we can bring about the same results in any other manner, it would, perhaps, be just as acceptable, but some radical change is necessary. In discussing this matter in 1906, the Prime Minister spoke as follows:

A very radical change should be made there so that an immediate inquiry could be had, the attendance of a judge procured at once, an investigation held immediately, possibly the candidate not allowed to take his seat until that summary and prompt inquiry had been held; if that could be brought about I think it would be a very desirable change. Certainly the law as it stands at present does not accomplish very great results. The withdrawal, the abatement, the pairing off of elections are undoubted evils, and whether or not the suggestions which I make be approved by the Minister of Justice, at all events greater simplicity of procedure and greater expedition in disposing of these cases ought to be ensured.

I think that is a very complete summary of the conditions now prevailing in this country in respect to the conduct of election petitions. The suggestions made by the Prime Minister on that occasion were certainly most proper, particularly those wherein he pointed out the great

4 p.m. necessity for simplicity of procedure and greater expedition in disposing of election trials in our courts.

There are one or two other matters to which I desire to refer briefly, just by way of a suggestion to the House. In the statutes of several states of the United States, provisions have been introduced requiring publicity respecting election campaign contributions. As these provisions have not had a very long trial, perhaps it is too early to demonstrate their efficacy. However, I think that in the United States these provisions have accomplished some reform, and that they are worthy of the consideration of this House. It is true that such a provision does not afford direct evidence which is accessible to any party in conducting any prosecution or legal proceedings wherein it is sought to prove a corrupt expenditure of public money. However to some extent, it does afford some assistance; for by tracing the expenditure in any district or constituency it can be ascertained whether the contributions as made public were complete, or whether some were eliminated. I desire to give to the House the opinion of Senator Clapp, of the United States, who was chairman of a Congressional committee appointed in 1912 to inquire into corrupt practices and campaign contributions in that country. The article which I am about to read appeared in the Montreal Daily Mail not many months ago, and in it Senator Clapp, specially deals with the results of the provisions requiring publicity in campaign contributions. He says:

Whatever may be said on the subject of campaign expenditures, I think the evidence taken by the committee shows a marked improvement during the last few years. The fact that a report now has to be made and preserved, thus insuring at least some degree of publicity, is in itself an improvement not only in the recognition of the right of the people to know what is done, but while we cannot close our eyes to the fact that there is still a great deal of money collected and expended which does not find its way into the public reports of the national committees, still the degree of publicity now required has beyond doubt lessened contributions of a questionable character, assuming that some contributions are to be recognized as proper.

An examination of the abstract of contributions and expenditures will show another

marked improvement. In this, formerly committees depended more or less upon a few large contributions from great financial interests. Whatever the motive for such contributions might be, the effect is obvious. Of late, the tendency has been to depend less upon such contributions and more upon small contributions gathered generally from the country at large.

A change for the better.

This change may be due in part to the growth of sentiment which recognized the obvious evil of depending upon a few great contributions, and it may be due in part to the necessity for dependence upon small contributions as the making of large contributions by great financial interests was, in a measure, checked by publicity. It may be due in part to the fact that those in charge of campaigns realized that small contributions received from the country at large were sure to result in an increased interest and activity upon the part of such small contributors.

Whatever may be said of partisanships, the great majority of voters have, or may have, if properly developed, a feeling toward party akin to a sense of loyalty based upon the things for which the party stands, and such sentiment really partakes of patriotism. This feeling is lessened in proportion as the voter feels that the contributions his party receives are made by a few great interests, and increases as he feels that his party, instead of depending upon a few large contributions, depends upon a vast number of small contributors of which he is one.

This is the opinion of one having some experience upon the effect of that particular provision in the American law requiring publicity of campaign contributions. There is a great deal to be said in favour of it, and it is one well worthy of our consideration. The election law of this country lacks another provision which I think should be found there. I refer to the matter of simultaneous voting in by-elections—a matter which has been discussed in this House on previous occasions. In fact I think the Prime Minister introduced a Bill a few years ago dealing with this very matter. My suggestion is against the idea of permitting by-elections to be held upon dates to be selected arbitrarily by the administration of the day. I do not wish to provoke any discussion upon this matter particularly, but I may be permitted to say that I understand—possibly I am mistaken—it was the practice of the late Government to hold elections in all vacant constituencies upon the same day, and I was led to believe that in this respect we were in practice living up to that which might be well inserted in the statute. However, during the last year, several federal by-elections took place, but on different dates, and in one constituency a vacancy existed for, I think, over seven months, notwithstanding the fact that by-elections had taken place in other constituencies which became vacant much later. I allude to the constituency of South Lanark. I think that the provisions of the English Election Act—and our practice was in accordance with that for some years—should find a place in the laws of this country. In Great Britain when a seat becomes vacant the machinery is set in motion automatically. In the recent Reading by-election, which may be cited as an example, the seat was vacated on October 22nd. The London Times of October 22 contained a formal notice that six days after October 22 the Speaker would issue a writ for an election in the constituency of Reading, in the room of Sir Rufus Isaacs, who had been appointed Lord Chief Justice of England. The election followed in the course of a few days. I admit that it would hardly be possible or practicable for us to adopt exactly the same provisions in Canada, but I venture to express the opinion, and I believe it will meet with the approval of hon. gentlemen in this House, that the bringing on of by-elections should not be a matter to be arbitrarily dealt with by the Government of the day, but that there should be some statutory provision dealing with such a matter. I would say that it is an eminently fair provision of the law to compel simultaneous polling in by-elections. Just a word or two more, before I conclude my remarks. Whatever may be the defects in our statute regarding the several matters referred to in my motion, the gravest are to be found in the Act respecting controverted elections, and that of course has reference to the conduct of election petitions or trials. There should be some provision in that Act whereby it should be possible to commence and conclude an election petition within a very reasonable time. There should also, I think, be some provision whereby the Government of this country could see to the conduct and conclusion of that trial, if the petitioner was financially unable to bear the expense of the same. Whether this can be accomplished by what is known in England as a public prosecutor I need not say, but I think there are many strong reasons why changes should be made in our statute in respect to election trials, so that they may be determined speedily when once commenced. I have nothing further to say to the House on this motion at the present time. I trust that the motion will meet with the favourable consideration of the Government, and that they will be pleased to recommend the appointment of

a committee to take into consideration this question, and that such committee shall be given power to hear testimony and make such a report to the House of Commons later as in the circumstances may seem fitting.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word or two on this subject, especially as I regard it not only as my privilege but my duty. Those who remember the history of affairs in England prior to 1881 will remember that England had become so absolutely rotten politically that it was almost impossible to carry on a system of government there. The consequence was that they brought in Sir Henry James' Bill, which was carried out so well and so thoroughly that political corruption amongst the masses—I do not mean amongst the titled classes—was very largely stopped. In the United States, as the Rev. Dr. Rainsford has lately said, they are at least twenty years ahead of us in grappling with corruption. I do not think that in either of these countries the people are better inherently than we are, but it is because there has grown up in Canada a certain cynicism as terrible as it is pathetic, which affects pretty nearly every one and which regards as a joke the man who stands up for clean elections. The only hope in all this is that when things get so bad that they cannot get worse and have to be reformed, necessity makes it imperative that we shall reform them. Therefore, if things have not reached that stage in Canada yet, they shortly will be there, and from the very necessities of the case we shall have to reform them if from no higher motive than that.

I would like to say also that it is well understood, by the risen as well as by the rising generation, that men who will condone or practise one form of crookedness will condone and practise every other form. The gentle art of lying requires, on their behalf to be carried out in its entirety. As for saying that people shall, by declaration and otherwise, file certain statements, I have only to remark that such a proposition is absurd. We know that some people would file anything under heaven and stop only as near as possible to the margin or limit at which they are likely to be found out. I have had plenty of painful experience in this regard and I know whereof I speak without presuming to know too much. I think the remedy is not to encumber the statute book with further provisions, which make it a long, weary and expensive task for those who would undertake to vindicate the law, but that a simple remedy would be found by adding a clause, if necessary, to the Criminal Code stating that each individual offence as it arises may be treated before a magistrate or two justices of the peace. If you make that change in the law you have the difficulty solved. Instead of waiting to make a long bill of complaint with one, or two, or four, or five hundred charges in it and watching your witnesses, you could deal at once with the persons who had perpetrated bribery if necessary by that method. You could carry out your plan at once upon the material provided. The petitioner under the present circumstances when the list of charges is served, in the hands of an unscrupulous and cunning opponent, might as well put his head on the block and have it chopped off at once and save a lot of expense and trouble. If, however, he could get a constable, if he could go before a magistrate and promptly state his case, lay an information if necessary, and, if the gravity of the offence warranted it, swear out an information or get a warrant, if he could not get a summons, or vice versa, have the accused individual brought before the magistrate and have each individual case treated in this way it is my opinion that it would prove the most effective method of putting a stop to these corrupt practices. Then, instead of waiting for an election petition to be tried, the material is provided at hand, the case is really settled before any one can get away and before the hostile forces have been collected for the killing. I know myself that we would have saved several thousands of dollars, a lot of time, a lot of worry, a lot of abuse and a lot of absurdity if we had had the privilege of going before a magistrate with our men, one by one, and making our charge then just as if it were a case of common assault. If we had had that privilege we would have nailed the whole lot without waiting.

But beyond and behind all this little remedy li s the fact that such a condition of cynicism, of apathy, has taken possession of the people of the country that we, I believe, simply wait for the deluge. It is a well recognized fact, so well recognized that no one denies it, that corruption is rife, that it fairly smells to heaven it is so rank. Yet a country that will send missionaries to convert the heathen will not take time to convert itself. It would be a

good thing if we should devote a little of our time, a little of our leisure, to introspection. Everybody knows that men who spend money must be recompensed that they must get it back in some way, that they must get it back from somebody, and the result of this admirable practice is found in the frightful scandals that we have from day to day; so much so that when I use the word 'scandals' now I am reminded of the story of the man whose wife had wakened him over fifty times to tell him that there were burglars in the house. He said: Burglars be blowed; let me sleep; let them rob the house. The people of Canada believe that a great many people are in public life for what they can get out of it. This was the principle recently enunciated by a gentleman who was remonstrated with in the United States for having perpetrated some political crime. He said: Why, robbing the country? What is the good of the country if you cannot realize upon it? It will not be long until that will be the idea of patriotism in this country unless we can imitate the older and more highly civilized countries more closely.

The responsibility rests upon ourselves—upon Parliament and upon this Parliament. The time is ripe. A great public duty has been performed by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in bringing the matter forward. We cannot escape our duty. We cannot escape the fact that the people are crying out against this tide of corruption, and unless something is done that will allow people inexpensively, as in other cases, to proceed to law and to proceed to the vindication of their rights as citizens, we might as well dissolve Parliament and let everybody have a free hand. The law is only there to restrain honourable men. Since a dishonourable man can avoid it, it serves simply to keep honourable men out of public life. It would really serve a better object to do away with this law and let men cry havoc and let loose the dogs of war, a fair field and no favour. But these things are far from being a matter of merely casual complaint; they are serious things, and they affect the honour of every Canadian and the vital well-being of this country.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): We can all sympathize with the desire to make more secure, purity in the conduct of elections, and having that feeling we may well congratulate the hon. member (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for calling this important matter to our attention in the manner in which he has. I may say that we have had under consideration for quite some time the desirability of improving our election law, and perhaps more especially the desirability of improving our Controverted Elections Act. I need not say that the subject possesses very great difficulties. There has to be considered the importance of the end in view, namely, the enactment of such laws as shall, in the first place, require that our elections be so conducted as to enable us to obtain by their means an absolutely impartial and honest verdict from the electors, and, on the other hand, one has to bear in mind the danger there is of overstepping the mark and making the law so severe and so restrictive that perhaps public sympathy might be alienated from its enforcement. While I am not disposed to take a pessimistic view of the character and conduct of the Canadian people in regard to their liability to be improperly influenced in elections, I think we must all agree that there is room for the exercise of improper influences, and that no doubt to a greater or lesser extent those influences are sometimes put into operation, and probably do in some cases affect the results of elections. To the extent that it is so, there exists an evil which we should strive to overcome. I entirely sympathize with the hon. member in so far as he insisted on the importance of free and pure elections to the proper carrying out of our institutions and system of government.

This question, as I have said, has been under consideration, and I myself have given some thought to it. I welcome the proposition of the hon. member (Mr. A. K. Maclean), because I think the appointment of a committee of this House, composed of members of both sides, willing to meet and put their collective experience and judgment into the shape of a proposed Bill for the consideration of Parliament, is a wiser and better course in respect to such a matter, than to leave the responsibility to any one minister, even though he can avail of the assistance of his colleagues in the Cabinet. At all events, a Bill prepared by such a committee would come to this House entirely free from the suspicion that it was inspired by any party political consideration. In such legislation, the co-operation of members, without distinction of party, is to my mind most valuable, if not absolutely necessary. I think we are all disposed to approach the consideration of this matter having in mind to aim

at results which would secure absolute purity in elections, or which would at least, help towards bringing about that very desirable object. If we were to judge by past experience, we might be somewhat discouraged as to the effectiveness of committees of this kind. In 1903, this House appointed a committee for practically the same purpose as this committee is now asked for. The appointment of that committee arose out of the introduction of a Bill proposing to introduce certain amendments to the then existing Elections Act, and to that committee were referred one or two other Bills with a similar object in view, introduced during that session. That committee appears to have given a great deal of time and consideration to the subject. and its labours resulted in the production of a report in the form of a draft Bill, which contained a number of amendments to the Elections Act. Most of these amendments seem to have met with the approval of the House at that time, but the Bill failed of adoption, principally, if not entirely, because the House did not look favourably upon what was described as compulsory voting, which was one of the proposals favourably reported upon. The draft Bill provided that any person entitled to vote at an election, and failing to exercise his franchise at least to the extent of going to the poll and depositing a ballot, should be deprived of his right to vote for a period of, I think, six years. This proposal met with a great deal of opposition and the effect of that opposition was that, the discussion of the Bill being very protracted and I believe the session nearing its end, the Bill was for the time being dropped or I think withdrawn. There were some other reasons for that action; there was some criticism of the form in which certain of the provisions were drafted, and the House at that time seemed to have reached the conclusion that the whole matter had better be left for further and more deliberate consideration. At all events, whatever the reasons may have been, the work of that committee, although I must say that it would appear that they went at their work with energy and that they devoted time and study to the important question with which they were dealing, resulted in nothing.

My hon. friend referred also to a motion made by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) in 1906, a motion which was in the terms of the second paragraph of the motion which is now before us, and the hon. member has given us the advantage of very considerable citations from the speech of the present Prime Minister in support of his motion. The result of that motion was that the Minister of Justice of that day himself presented a motion for the appointment of a committee. A committee was appointed, but its labours produced no result. It would appear that that committee never reached the stage of making a report. What number of sittings it had I am not in a position to state, but towards the end of the session of that year I find that upon the question being asked as to the result of its labours, it was stated by the then Minister of Justice that for different reasons, particularly because he had been exceedingly busy in connection with meetings of the Railway Committee, it had been impossible for him to attend the meetings of this select committee on election laws, and because the work of the committee was so extensive it would not be possible to bring down a report at an early date, and he added:

> I cannot say any more except that it has occurred to me that no great public interest would suffer if the work of that committee were left, without concluding it, to another session.

That seems to have been the end, so far as I have been able to gather, of that committee and of the matter submitted to it.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER: What year was that in?

Mr. DOHERTY: That was in 1906. While we are speaking of committees upon questions of this kind, I may say that in England in 1897 a committee was appointed for a purpose similar to that for which it is asked that the present committee be appointed. That committee carried on its work during the session of 1897-98; and it made a report in 1898 which contains very valuable suggestions looking to the improvement of the English Act. I am not in a position to say whether the suggestions made by that committee were subsequently adopted or not. They had before them and examined certain judges who had experience in the trial of election petitions and also counsel who had experience in the trial of such cases, and they heard from them such suggestions as their experience led them to deem desirable.

As I have said, with the motives that inspire my hon. friend who has made this motion I am in entire sympathy, and I feel that we may hope for more practical results from the work of the committee that

may be now appointed. If it would meet with his approval, I am disposed to follow the course that was adopted in 1906. At that time, upon the motion of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice of that day himself agreed to introduce a motion proposing a committee. That was done with the result that the committee came into existence. If the hon. member sees no objection to that manner of procedure. I would propose that it be followed in this case.

Inasmuch as the purpose of this motion is to have a committee before which all suggestions looking to the improvement of our Election Act and Controverted Elections Act may be submitted and considered, I will not this afternoon go into any discussion of those improvements or those respects in which the hon. member has suggested that our present legislation is susceptible of improvement. I think that the fact that it is so susceptible of improvement, and perhaps one might say that it calls for improvement, is sufficiently established by what we have before our eyes all the time, that is to say that to a very large extent the dispositions of our Election Act are inoperative. We all know how few election contestations are carried to an ultimate determination; and we all see, I fancy with regret, that that number is so small compared with the number of contestations that are instituted. Perhaps also, sometimes it may seem surprising that out of the number of elections that take place, in view of the statements that are made in public, so few contestations take place.

As regards our election law itself, I am not quite sure but that it might perhaps be said that in some respects its very severity tends to defeat its purpose. As I have said, I do not propose this afternoon to discuss the particular improvements that might be made in that Act, in the sense of expressing and supporting by argument any opinion one way or the other. The proper time for that would be before the committee which is to be appointed. I would like, however, to say a few words with regard to some of the questions that might arise and that call for consideration.

Perhaps the first question that might arise is whether or not our election law does not by reason in some respects of its extreme severity tend to defeat its own purpose. I am not at all suggesting that anything in the nature of a corrupt act be looked upon as a matter of trifling importance, but I think there are dispositions in our present legislation which proceed upon the assumption that acts that may be perfectly innocent in themselves, because they are done during an election are to be assumed to be done with corrupt intent.

We have acts of that kind declared to be corrupt acts, and we have attached to their commission by the candidates themselves, or by other persons who are, or are held to be, agents of the candidate, the result of annulling the election. It will perhaps be thought that there are no acts so treated which ought not to be designated corrupt acts, but I think the committee might well consider the wisdom of continuing to treat these acts as corrupt acts while making a greater difference between the consequences attached to acts of different kinds. You may have conduct that is deserving of condemnation and punishment, but yet it may be wiser not to attach to that particular fault the sanction of the annulment of the election. I am disposed to think that it is a mistake, that possibly our present legislation fails through placing a large number of offences of different degrees of importance and gravity in one category entailing the same consequence. You bring about the result that the candidate who may commit a minor offence, or whose agent, either actual or so-held, may be guilty of some minor offence, is placed in the same position, as regards affecting the validity of the election, as you place the candidate who through his agents—limiting it to cases where he is guilty through agents—of the very grossest form of bribery. If our present law produces that result, I think it a matter for serious consideration whether it should not be so altered as to make a discrimination between these two classes of offenders and a difference between the consequences of their acts.

Some reference has been made to the frequency of arrangements under which, after election contestations have been instituted, they are dropped or abandoned as the result of arrangement. I would suggest that the committee might well give serious consideration to the question whether you would not do a great deal to reduce that evil—for it is an evil—if you so modified your law as to place the man who had made an honest endeavour to carry on an honest election, but whose agent, actual or constructive, had been guilty of some minor

offence, in a different position from the candidate on whose behalf the grossest bribery and corruption had been carried on. And yet, under our law as I understand it, these two men, in regard to the annulment of their elections, are placed upon the same footing. I think that situation must necessarily tempt men engaged in political contests to be more regardless of the law and to go to greater extremes than they would otherwise do. It does present to the man willing to do it, an opportunity by means of a contestation of the election of some other man, to place himself in a position where he has the means to bring about pressure tending to the suppression of the contestation of his own election. And the fact that, though the offences charged against one as compared with the offences charged against the other may be of a very minor character, yet they entail the same consequences—the annulment of the election—tends, it seems to me, to render those who may be disposed to act without regard to the law, ready to act in a more reckless and extreme fashion than they otherwise would. I do not put that forward as an expression of final opinion on the question, but it is a consideration, which, I think, presses itself upon the mind of any one who considers our law and existing conditions, a consideration which, I think, might very well form the subject of thought, and possibly of action, on the part of the committee to be appointed.

I think also that the committee might very well give serious consideration to the methods which, under our present system, are necessarily used to bring voters to the polls or induce them to come to the polls; I am not referring for the moment to corrupt methods. As things stand at present, it is, in effect, upon the candidates and their friends to see to it that the electors come to the polls. Without taking it upon myself to express any final opinion, it would seem well worth consideration whether the law should not provide that it shall be the duty of the voter to go to the poll. I am not suggesting anything in the way of compulsory voting—although that also is open to this committee. I believe in a man's absolute liberty to vote as he pleases or not to vote at all, and I can conceive of cases where a man for absolutely sufficient reasons does not wish to vote. But I think the committee may well consider whether it would not be proper and desirable, and no undue interference with the liberty of any man, to impose upon the voter the duty of presenting himself at the poll and having registered the fact that he has presented himself there.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He might be given a white ballot.

Mr. DOHERTY: He might have a white ballot, or he might have no ballot. I am not suggesting this at all with a view to compelling the man to vote; I am only suggesting whether it would not be practicable for the law to transfer the burden of bringing the voters to the poll from the shoulders of the candidate and his friends to the shoulders of the voter himself.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In connection with the penalty that might be imposed in the case of a voter's not presenting himself at the poll, what reasons would be considered as valid excuses for his being absent?

Mr. DOHERTY: No doubt there are many things that would be valid excuses; that is a detail for the committee to consider. We have a law which compels any man who is believed to know something about his neighbour's case, to appear in court. He may come to court, and he may know nothing about it, but he is subject to a penalty if he fails to attend.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about the juror?

Mr. DOHERTY: Perhaps that is a more applicable illustration. In the case of the voter, the performance of the duties that the privilege of voting imposes upon him is a duty to the public just as much as the time the juror gives to his duties is a duty to the public. I would not suggest that because it is the duty of a man honestly to use his judgment with regard to the exercise of his franchise, that we should go so far as to say that he must vote, or even, speaking for myself, that we should go so far as to say that he should pretend to vote. But I think it is no hardship to say to him: You shall come to the election; you shall give so much of your time as that duty involves. It may be considered, of course, that that from the point of view of any action on the part of the individual, is a useless proceeding. That may be perfectly true, but his doing that would do away with the necessity for the providing by the candidate or his friends of the means of bringing the voter to the poll. It would by so much diminish the expenditure a candidate or his friends must make and which expenditure though in itself it may be legitimate, very frequently furnishes the occasion for, or helps in the concealment of, corrupt expenditure.

In the second place, I believe it would

tend very materially to hamper the operations of the personator. I am not quite sure whether there is not, in some localities at all events, a greater danger of obtaining an untrue verdict in an election through the operations of the personator than there is through the actual bribing of the genuine voter. It certainly is a very great, and, I believe, in some localities, a very prevalent evil. If a man is determined to obtain success by corrupt methods, it may perhaps appeal to him that it is simpler, by the impersonation practised by somebody who is not a voter at all, to poll the votes of ten, fifteen, or twenty people, than it is to go out and hunt for those people and buy their votes when he finds them. I do not pretend to have considered this sufficiently to warrant my committing myself here to-day to an opinion upon it, but it is a matter, I think, to which a committee such as has been suggested might very well give consideration. I think it might serve as a remedy for what I consider to be a serious evil, and it might, after full consideration, be found not to constitute any undue interference with personal liberty to require of a man that once in four or five years, or once in a couple of years, as the case may be, he should take the trouble, on a particular day, to go to the polling place and register his name. As to the penalty that ought to be imposed, I have no sympathy with the suggestion that it should be disfranchisement. The purpose is to induce people to perform their duty of voting. I think that in a large number of cases, if a man felt that he had to go to the poll, he would, perhaps, give more serious thought to the matter, and in most cases he would find that there was some reason appealing to his judgment why he should vote for one person more than another. Of course, the more complete the expression of the voice of the entire electorate we can obtain, the better and more effective the result of the election.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In such large centres as Montreal or Toronto, would it not be a great boon to the people, especially the working classes, to provide that the day of election shall be a holiday?

Mr DOHERTY: There is very much to be said in favour of that proposition, and if such a system as I am thinking of were adopted, I think it would become absolutely necessary to make the polling day, in whole or in part, a holiday. You would be imposing an obligation of attendance at the polls, and in so doing, you should make such provisions as would cause every voter to be at liberty to attend.

Mr. GERMAN: Would my hon. friend extend that principle to municipal elections?

Mr. DOHERTY: This House has no power to regulate municipal elections, so I would rather not enter into a discussion of what ought to be done in regard to them. As to the penalty, that is a matter for the committee. For myself, I would not suggest that as a consequence of absence from the poll, the voter should be disfranchised. In any event, the hon. member for Rouville, in mentioning the case of the juror, has suggested a method by which you could enforce the fulfilment of the obligation.

Mr. GERMAN: The juror is paid to attend court; the voter is not paid to come to the poll.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The juror is fined if he does not come.

Mr. DOHERTY: He is fined if he does not come, but so far as my experience goes, the payment of the dollar that

5 p.m.

the juror gets is, at all events as regards a very large class of jurors, something that would not tempt him to spend his time in the courts at very great loss to himself. However, as I have said, I am not expressing any opinion. I have given some thought to the subject, and I think it is a subject that calls for consideration on the part of the committee. The more you do towards reducing the expenses which it is legitimate for a candidate or his friends to make, the more you diminish the possibility of covering up corrupt expenditure. I think that what calls for the most earnest consideration and improvement is not so much the Election Act itself as the Act dealing with its enforcement. Whether it will be possible, as the hon. member says is done in England, for us to have a public prosecutor charged with the supervision of the carrying on of election cases, is a question which certainly gives room for serious consideration on the part of the committee. There would be manifest advantages resulting from the creation of such an office, always assuming the person selected was a proper person, and I see no reason to doubt the possibility of finding proper persons in this country just as they have found them in England. Of course it would be an innovation, some-

thing to which we are not accustomed in this country, and therefore before we adopted it we ought to carefully consider the matter. There are some other considerations from the point of view of the man who has been willing to serve his country and has become a candidate. As the first result of the voting, if he is chosen a member, he is subjected to all the disagreeable incidents that usually attend being made a defendant in a petition in contestation of an election. Looking at it from the point of view of the general interest that the law, in cases calling for it, should be enforced, and looking at it from the point of view of protecting the man who may be subjected to unfounded contestations, the most important thing that presents itself for consideration in connection with that is how we are going to secure a more prompt method of carrying on the proceedings and bringing them to a termination. Under our present method the petition dies unless proceeded with within six months, but there is a power to extend that period when causes justifying that extension arise. Preliminary exceptions may be taken, and there is the right of appeal on these preliminary exceptions. Then there is the provision, proper in itself, that where the presence of a member is required at the trial of a case, it shall not go on during the session of Parliament. The reasons for the extension of delay are so many, and the occasions for the exercise of this power so many, that I doubt if it operates very much in hastening the termination of cases to which it may be applicable. The provision of this delay of six months has also, I am afraid, in some cases been availed of as a means for facilitating the dropping of contestations, without inquiry as to the motives for such action. I think that the committee might very well devote much of its time and attention to the consideration of how we can best bring into existence a system which would render the proceedings in cases of contested elections more prompt. I think, too, in that connection that serious thought ought to be given to the manner in which petitions are now allowed to be made. Suppose a man finds his election contested. He reads the petition served on him and finds it a copy of the sections in the Act enumerating all the possible causes for which an election may be annulled, and charging him with being guilty of them. I think that in all fairness a man should have, I do not say every detail, but there should be in that petition such information as would indicate what it is that he is supposed to have done. It would be almost as fair to indict a man and present him as an indictment with the Ten Commandments, and charge him with having violated them all. So far as all other legal proceedings are concerned, as I understand it, the plaintiff is asked to tell the defendant in some manner what is the charge against him. Now what would be the hardship in asking a petitioner who has had forty days to gather information to specify the particular charge he brings against the member? Another point that should be considered, is the fact that today in support of a petition a petitioner is required to make an affidavit that he is credibly informed and that he believes all these things. It has been held that the making of such an affidavit fulfils the requirement—and the respondent is not entitled to raise the question of its truth. I think that it is hardly possible that it is not practicable to make such provisions as to require not only an affidavit but a true affidavit. It is worth while considering the question whether there can be found some possible method of requiring from the petitioner some guarantee of a more substantial character that he is acting in good faith.

With much that was said by the hon. member for Halifax as regards the desirability of more detailed statements of election expenses and especially of a provision compelling the publication of statements that are required, I have a great deal of sympathy. Those are matters to which a committee might very wisely direct its attention. The advantages that might come from the publication of electoral contributions are apparent. I shall not detain the House at any greater length. I do not know whether these particular things that I have mentioned as being worthy of consideration are the most important but they strike me as being things that are worthy of serious consideration and things the consideration of which, even if they stood alone, would make it quite worth while that the committee asked for by the hon. gentleman should be granted. Following the proceeding adopted in 1906, I shall, with the hon. gentleman's consent, substitute for his motion a motion of my own looking to the appointment of a committee. In connection with that I notice that the hon. gentleman asks for a committee of nine. It is not quite clear to me that a com-

mittee of a smaller number might not be more effective. I do not want to insist upon it, but I think that the experience of such things shows that when you have a small committee every member of it has a more realizing sense of the necessity of his actively occupying himself with the duties of the committee than if you have a committee that is too large. In 1906 the committee which was appointed was a committee of five. I would be willing to adopt that number, or, if the hon. gentleman thinks that seven would be better, I would be willing to accept that number.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Seven.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma): The junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has brought to the attention of the House in a very broad resolution a very important matter which ought to receive the attention of the people of Canada and which has excited the people of Canada during past years as the hon. member for Halifax very well knows. The different subjects which call for reform as regards electoral purity requiring the amendments of the electoral law are dealt with generally by the hon. member for Halifax within the four corners of his resolution. I would that the hon. member for Halifax had been able to show outside of the four corners of this resolution something of the spirit, something of the intensity of earnestness, which characterized a few of the remarks which he made to the House.

Amongst other things, the hon. member for Halifax, in the long speech which he delivered, outlined a woeful condition of electoral irregularity calling for a reform of the law in order to make more effective provision to punish bribery and fraud at elections, to ensure thorough publicity as to expenditures for political organization, to prevent the accumulation of funds for corrupt purposes and to prohibit all contributions whatever. I regret that I cannot, as I should like to, congratulate the hon. member for Halifax upon bringing these matters to the attention of the House in the way that he has done. I will be frank about it. I cannot congratulate him because I do not believe in his sincerity and if I did believe in his sincerity to-day I can only say that his sincerity to-day is of a very recent origin indeed.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not permissible to question an hon. member's sincerity or to impute anything other than proper motives.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Mr. BOYCE: Well, then, I will say that the expression of my hon. friend, as contained in his speech and as contained in the wording of this resolution, is not consonant with the attitude, or the want of attitude, of my hon. friend in this House in the past. I am constrained to make these few remarks simply by reason of the fact that my hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) has touched the crux of this whole question of electoral corruption in the short speech he made, in which there was a great deal that might well appeal to the judgment of this House, and that is the want of sincerity in dealing with a matter so potent and so nearly affecting the rights of the people in order to secure the purity of elections.

My hon. friend from Halifax, amongst other things, asks expressly for a greater and more complete disclosure of election accounts by candidates and a disclosure of the contributions to political funds. My hon. friend sat in this House in the session of 1907-08, and he was a great admirer of the then able Minister of Justice, Sir Allen Aylesworth. When the Dominion Elections Act was introduced into this House, heralded by the Speech from the Throne in language almost word for word that of my hon. friend's resolution, and purporting to be aimed at preventing all these acts which are complained of, a resolution was offered to the House along the very same lines that my hon. friend's resolution now follows, and it was rejected by the then Minister of Justice, whom my hon. friend supported and with whom he agreed on that particular occasion without one word of dissent. More than that I find that the then Minister of Justice stated that he had never heard any complaint, such as was set forth in the amendment moved by the then Opposition, which called for the strictest possible enforcement of the principle of disclosure in regard to contributions, the very thing that my hon. friend asks for now in this resolution. If I am permitted I will quote from 'Hansard' of 1908, page 11,886:

My hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) wants to reform all that. He wants more particularity in several respects. He wants the vouching of accounts, the making of affidavits and the greatest fulness of minute details in the statements that are to be made out, supported by statutory declaration which are the equivalent of affidavits. He provides the candidate may not take his seat until these returns and declarations are made. He provides a penalty for failure on the part of the candidate to comply with the requirements of this section; also a special penalty in case

there be anything untrue in the declaration; and so on, through an elaborate set of sections, to provide for a condition of things in regard to which I have not heard at any time of any grievance existing under the system which has been so long in force in this country.

My hon. friend from Halifax sat in this House during that session when the electoral law was under consideration for the best part of three months, and I have searched and searched in vain for one word spoken by the hon. gentleman for or against the proposed changes in that law. When that amendment, moved by the Conservative party then in opposition, and calculated to bring about a reform in the Elections Act, was negatived by the then Minister of Justice, the hon. gentleman supported his minister, or, at all events, never, during the whole of that session, raised his voice upon the subject of that Bill, or to protest against election corruption. I would that I could congratulate the hon. gentleman upon his sincerity; I would that I could believe he means all he says in his resolution. But I do congratulate him and those who sit with him upon a circumstance that will appeal to the better judgment of this country, and that is, that although the hon. member be not sincere, he has been met to-day, by the Minister of Justice, with a very much more cordial reception, and in much better faith, and with a much more evident desire to remedy the evil, than ever was extended by the Liberal Government to any mover of a resolution, having for its object the securing of purity in elections. I congratulate the Minister of Justice upon the course he has taken to-day, and I earnestly commend to him the consideration of the whole question from a generous point of view, having regard to the making of such changes in the electoral law as shall moderately, and at the same time firmly, provide for the removal of existing defects.

The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) spoke about making polling day a holiday; but he was Postmaster General in the late Government when my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) introduced a Bill to make election day a public holiday, and he entered no protest when that Bill was rejected by his government. These things go to show the insincerity of hon. gentlemen opposite in now displaying anxiety to remedy electoral corruption, when, notwithstanding that they were in power for fifteen years, they took no measures towards that end. These hon. gentlemen opposite, when in office, rejected every resolution which tended to reform, and they aggravated their rejection by the statement that they never heard of any such thing as political corruption existing in the country. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) says that these evils are of long standing in the country, but he made no protest in 1908 when the Minister of Justice in the Liberal Government declared that he never heard of them. According to the contention of my hon. friend, political corruption prevailed in 1908, and he came to this House in the general elections of that year, elections which under the Liberal Administration was bristling with irregularities and corruption,—but he kept silent on the subject.

I do hope that something will be done in consequence of the broad-minded action of the Government in leaving this question open for consideration by a committee, and I am satisfied that the action of the Government in this matter will meet with the approval and the plaudits of the people of the country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It would have been surprising indeed if in this discussion we did not hear the tu quoque argument, which is the standard argument of gentlemen opposite. Whenever any question of this kind is brought before the House, the answer of hon. gentlemen opposite is: We are no better than you are, and you are just as bad as we are. My hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) says that when he and his friends were in opposition they brought to the attention of the House the laxity of the electoral law such as it was then, and such as it is now, and that the Liberal Government failed to amend it.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: 'Hear, hear,' says my hon. friend; then why do you not amend the law, now that you have the power to do so? The Conservatives proclaimed that if they came into power they would remedy these evils, and indeed they made that one of the planks in their Halifax platform. This Government has been two years in office and nothing has been done. The Prime Minister was in favour of reforming the electoral law once he got into power, and I recall to his mind these words in the Halifax platform:

More effective provisions to punish bribery and fraud at elections, to ensure thorough publicity as to expenditures by political organizations, to prevent the accumulation of campaign funds for corrupt purposes and to prohibit contributions thereto by corporations, contractors and promoters, to expedite the

hearing of election petitions, to provide for a thorough investigation of corrupt practices, and, if necessary, to appoint an independent prosecuting officer charged with that duty, to simplify the procedure thereof, and to enforce the laws so amended.

If hon. gentlemen opposite question our sincerity, what are we to say of their sincerity when, although two years in office and having the responsibility of carrying out that programme on which they sought the support of the people, they have done nothing?

The only thing to the point in the speech of the Minister of Justice—a speech in which in some respects I would largely concur—is that, in his opinion, if the electoral law is not as satisfactory as it might be, it is because in some respects it is too severe. I think I heard him so express himself. So that even with the opinion of the Government to-day that the law is too severe, we are very far indeed from the position taken by my right hon. friend when he laid down the programme which he placed before the people at that date. It is no use bandying accusations from one side of the House to the other upon this question. Let us try to deal with it in a fair manner. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has to-day given us an example of moderation in the manner in which he has presented the question to the House. He has done it in a very moderate manner, more moderate than I perhaps might have expected. He has abstained from all recrimination, although the temptation might have been great to him to go into some matters in which he might have had a wide field to attack the party now in power. Instead of that, he has asked Parliament to throw aside all other considerations, and to approach the question simply from the point of view of formulating principles so as to deal with what is admittedly an evil. He has been moderate in his speech and moderate in his conclusions. After the statement in which he recalled the speech of my right hon. friend, he might well have called upon the Government to implement the promise which they made when they were soliciting the suffrages of the people. Instead of taking that position, he has simply taken the very moderate course of asking that the matter be investigated by a committee of the House so as to report what, if anything, is to be corrected. Certainly no more moderate course could have been pursued by my hon. friend, and I do not know if I had been in his place that I would have been as moderate as he has been. Perhaps I would have been more tempted to call upon the Government to do what they have promised to do, and to bring on the legislation which they have promised.

Since my hon. friend has asked the two parties in this House to lay aside all recrimination and to look upon the question in its broader aspect of the national honour and safety, I am disposed to follow along the same line. If we were to follow the bad example—if my hon. friend will permit me to speak my mind—which has just been given by my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Boyce), I would not speak as I do now; but I think that my hon. friend on reflection will come to the conclusion that the speech which he delivered was not called for or in keeping with the question now before the House.

Let us deal with the matter simply as it is. So far as corrupt practices in elections are concerned, I do not know that there are any gentlemen on the other side of the House who are in a position to cast stones at members on this side. There has been great temptation and I do not know that the party to which I belong is without sin in that respect. I do not wish to make any political capital out of this question; I rather approach it from a broad point of view, admitting that there are offences against the law; that the law is not so perfect as it ought to be, and that there is room for improvement.

When my right hon. friend the Prime Minister laid down his Halifax programme, he made with the public a very large contract, one rather greater than he is in a position to implement even now that he is Prime Minister. But there are some suggestions there that are worthy of consideration, and that the committee which may be appointed may well consider; amongst other things the advisability of ensuring thorough publicity as to expenditures by political organizations. The American people have adopted this system. The law of this country also at this moment provides to some extent for publicity as to expenditures; but in that, as in many other things, the law is a dead letter. What is the reason of that? If we are to speak with absolute candour, I think I agree to a large extent with my hon. friend the Minister of Justice that the law to-day is too severe; but whilst it is too severe in some respects it is too lax in others. The law can be amended in these two respects, to lessen this severity and at the same time to ameliorate the laxity which may exist.

I will give two cases in point. In controverted elections men have been unseated and disqualified for the most trivial offences. I remember a case of a young friend of mine who many years years ago was a member of this House, whose election was protested, and who was unseated and disqualified because he had paid the sum of $2 to a cabman for having taken him a certain distance, and the court thought that it was excessive. If that money had been paid outside of an election, nobody would have thought anything of it, and I do not believe it would have been questioned. The young man gave the $2 to the cabman perhaps because he had no coin in his pocket at the time. I am sure that he had no thought of corruption in his mind; but owing to the fact that it was during an election the judges were very severe upon him.

On the other hand, there have been cases in which, from the information which I have had, outrages of the most damnable character have been committed in the elections and nobody has been examined at all and no evidence offered. In the case I have in mind, the sitting member resigned his seat and the judges thereupon declared that they had no jurisdiction, and that therefore they would not go into those allegations. To-day the law is such that a man can be unseated for a trivial offence of which he may not have been personally cognizant in any way whatever; if done by his agent. On the other hand, another man who has been elected, simply through an abuse of the law, through corruption unlimited, can escape the consequences merely by resigning his seat, upon which the court can say that it has no jurisdiction. In this respect the law can be amended and improved, and there is room for investigation. If the committee goes into its work as it should be gone into, simply to find what are the faults of the law and what are the appropriate remedies, I think it will do a good work; but I have my doubts as to the advisability of having a committee upon this question. The matter, however, has been decided upon. I hope that the committee will report during the present session, and that it will make a report upon which legislation can be based and action taken.

There are one or two suggestions which have been made as to which it might be just as well for me to give my views. My hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Boyce) a moment ago stated that the late Government had rejected an amendment of the law to make the polling day a holiday. For my part I question very much the advisability or wisdom of making the polling day a holiday.

If you make election day a holiday, you will invite many offences against the law. We must not forget than when polling day comes, public opinion is often wrought up to an almost feverish point. If you make such a day a holiday and prevent people from working at their usual avocations, the temptations to disorder will be very great. I believe, on the contrary, that polling day should be a working day as usual. But I should welcome a provision in the law that every man shall have an hour, or two hours, to record his vote. I know of cases, as everybody must, for these cases are not isolated, of working men being restrained from the exercise of their franchise, perhaps not actually prohibited, but impediments placed in their way. If the law should provide that every man could get from his employer at least an hour to record his vote, I should welcome such a reform.

Then, as to compulsory voting: I have not very strong views on that point. I am far from being sure that compulsory voting would effect the reforms expected of it; at the same time I should not object to it if it were enacted in the law. Suffrage is not a right but a privilege, and if the voter does not choose to exercise the privilege, it is his own misfortune, and I do not know how you can remedy it. If you bring him to the poll I do not know that that will insure his having better judgment in the matter. There are circumstances, we all know, where men have conscientious scruples against exercising their voting privileges, having no sympathy with any of the candidates. I do not see how you can compel a man to vote against his conscience. But, it is said—bring him to the poll, even if he only casts a blank ballot. I think it would be better to leave it as it stands and let it be a matter of conscience for every man to vote as his judgment tells him.

But these questions are of little consequence and minor usefulness. The great thing is to prevent corruption and bribery in election. The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) says that this country is awfully corrupt, that our offence in this respect is rank and smells to Heaven. I do not share that pessimistic view. I know that there is in every election some corruption. Unfortunately, it has been so ever since there were elections, and I am afraid that so it will continue. The most

that we can do is to remedy the evil so far as posssible by providing punishment for curruption, and proper machinery for enforcing that punishment. We must recognize that the machinery we now have has been for some years almost dormant; election petitions have become almost a farce. I think that in this matter the Minister of Justice has a worthy field of operation, and should propose such amendments to the law as will make the Controverted Elections Act more effective than it has been in the past. That is the primary reform, in my judgment—to provide that the trial of elections shall be speedy, that they shall be based upon facts and not upon general allegation of facts as at present, and when the facts are alleged, there should be a most thorough investigation.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister): I remember very well the occasion when I moved in this House a resolution very much along the lines of that proposed by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean). Let me say at once, I find nothing in the manner in which my hon. friend has presented this matter to which I desire to take the slightest exception.

When I proposed a somewhat similar motion, I remember, gentlemen who at that time were members of the Government inquired of me, before the motion was to be reached, whether or not I proposed to take advantage of the occasion to engage in controversial discussion as to election corruption in the country. I told them that I had not the slightest intention of saying one word of a controversial character, as my object was to bring about some reform in the laws which, I thought then—and still think—desirable. The gentleman who was then Minister of Justice, now Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, told me that under the circumstances there would be no objection to the motion. He informed me that it was the proposal of the Government to introduce a resolution itself, whereupon I at once consented that my motion should be dropped and his take its place. That was done, but owing, if I remember well, to the fact that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick shortly afterwards became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, and another succeeded him as minister, no action, so far as I recollect the matter, was taken upon the report of that committee.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has alluded to some observations of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and seems to conclude that the only object of the Government is to bring about a relaxation of the election law. I do not think my right hon. friend put that quite fairly. The Minister of Justice, as I understood his observations, stated that in some respects the law as it exists at present oversteps itself, that it is not enforced for the reason that it does not command the sympathy and support of public opinion. Laws of this character, like sumptuary laws, must depend on the respect and support which they obtain from public opinion throughout the country, and in any particular community in which they are invoked. It is not the desire or intention of the Government to relax the law, but to give to the country an election law which will be properly enforced.

My right hon. friend has alluded more particularly to the operation of the Controverted Elections Act, and I am entirely at one with him in the opinion that the committee might find very good scope for its activity in bringing about some reform in that respect. On more than one occasion in this House, and on the public platform as well, I have called attention to the very great expense, and especially the very great delay, involved in the operation of the Controverted Elections Act as it stands at present, and by reason of the interpretation placed by the courts upon certain provisions of that Act.

Owing to a decision, which I do not intend to criticise, made by the highest court in this country a good many years ago, we find ourselves confronted with this situation. A petitioner files a petition against a candidate at a particular election. It is immediately urged against him that, under section 271 of the Dominion Elections Act, he had not the right to vote, by reason of the fact that he had paid for the conveyance of some voter to the poll. The result is that the court, instead of proceeding to determine whether or not the candidate is guilty of an infraction of the election law, occupies months, sometimes years, in determining whether or not the petitioner has been guilty of an infraction of the election law. That sounds like a story from some comedy, but in the sober recital of legal proceedings in the various courts of Canada such instances will be found. As a matter of fact, I think the proceedings upon what are known as preliminary objections have obtained a scope and been

permitted an operation altogether beyond what was the intention of those who framed the statute in the first instance, and I hope that the labours of this committee may result in some improvement of the law in that regard.

My hon. friend the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has alluded to the fact that candidates in this country are subject to the consequences of the actions not only of those whom they appoint as their agents, but of those who, within a certain construction placed upon their acts by the courts of the country, are deemed to be their agents, although they had no actual authority. It will be borne in mind that any person who actively works or canvasses for a candidate, although without his request but to his knowledge, becomes his agent and renders him responsible for the consequences of his acts to the extent of voiding the election. Some amelioration of the law was made in 1892 or 1893, I think, when Sir John Thompson was Minister of Justice, in this respect: If the candidate could show that he had taken certain precautions to avoid the commission of offences by his agent, and if the improper acts committed by the agent were of a trivial character, the candidate might not be unseated. I would like to remind the House that the English law goes far beyond our own in that regard, because, if I remember correctly, an offence by a certain class of agents in Great Britain, although committed without the knowledge or consent of the candidate, renders the candidate, for the remainder of the parliamentary term, ineligible to sit in the House of Commons.

The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) alluded to the importance of summary proceedings. If I am not mistaken, under the election law at the present time, summary proceedings can be taken against any person.

Mr. BURNHAM: I do not think in that way.

Mr. BORDEN: They can be taken, I think, before a magistrate. I speak with all deference to the hon. gentleman; I have not examined the question closely, but there is a provision in the Dominion Elections Act for the taking of summary proceedings against persons who are guilty of infractions of the law, and it is a very common custom, in hotly contested elections, to have persons watching the proceedings in order that they might take the summary proceedings alluded to with the least possible delay, and prevent any repetition of them. However, if there is any defect in the law in that regard, I certainly agree with the hon. member for Peterborough that it should be remedied.

The statute in regard to expenses, the provisions of which are contained in sections 263 and 264 of the Elections Act, goes pretty far if it is observed. I think most members of this House have been careful to observe it, but I would like to point out that those who do not observe it render themselves liable to a penalty of $20 for every day during which they fail to make the necessary declaration within the prescribed time. Further than that, any candidate who makes a statement of the expenses incurred in his election which to his personal knowledge is untrue, is guilty of an indictable offence. We will admit that those are fairly stringent provisions, but, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), the difficulty is that the law does not seem to be enforced in that regard as it should be.

I would like to say to the hon. member for Halifax that I investigated the English election law and its results very carefully some years ago, particularly at the time when I made the motion to which allusion has been made this afternoon, and I can say that there are difficulties in Great Britain just as there are in this country. In England the judges have had a good deal of difficulty in endeavouring to prevent evasions of the election law through what is known as the nursing of constituencies by means of payments, adroitly spread throughout the constituency, and effected in such a way that they do not come within the exact terms of the election law. We must all realize that no matter how stringent we make our election law in this country, fraud has manifold devices at its command, and we must, after all, depend to a great extent on the force of public opinion. The subject of compulsory voting, which was alluded to by my right hon. friend, has been the subject of discussion in this House on more than one occasion. I recall that one of the committees made a report on the subject, in which it was suggested that any man having the right to vote, who did not exercise that right at a particular election should, unless he could show good cause to some court for having abstained from voting, lose his right to vote at the succeeding election. I agree with my right hon. friend that de-

vices of that kind would be very difficult to carry out in an effective way. I also agree with him that we are liable, perhaps, to exaggerate the extent to which actual bribery of the electorate is carried on. Personally I do not believe that it is carried on anything like the extent to which is represented in some quarters. Undoubtedly the offence of personation, particularly in large cities, is of very wide-spread extent, and the offence of conveying voters to the poll is one common not only to the city constituencies, but to all the electoral districts of Canada. There was grave question, when this subject was discussed here some ten years ago, as to whether the law should not be modified in that regard, because public opinion does not respect it very much. I remember very well that when a most worthy organization to enforce purity in elections was established in the Maritime provinces during the election campaign of 1908—and this organization performed excellent work—it did not attempt, if I remember correctly, to exercise any supervision over offences of that kind, because it did not consider that the law in that regard was sustained by public opinion. I realize fully the difficulty in that respect; on the one hand if you do not have some law governing cases of that kind you leave the door wide open for bribery of a certain character and, on the other hand, if you make provisions too stringent, you bring about a condition of affairs which public opinion does not respect. The suggestion made on a previous occasion was, if I remember correctly, to permit the conveyance of voters at an election under certain restrictions and subject to certain safeguards. Whether or not any change in the law in that regard could be advantageously brought about I do not know; that would be a matter for consideration by the committee.

I do not intend to enter into any controversial aspect of the subject, nor to deal with what has been alleged as to our supposed delay or neglect. If we had thought that a general election was so imminent as some of our friends on the other side seemed to think, we should have taken up the subject before; but we considered that reform would be brought about before the next general election. The subject has been under consideration for some time by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, and would have been brought forward at an early date in this session; but as my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax had placed his motion upon the Order Paper at the very commencement of the session, it was thought desirable to give him an opportunity of bringing the subject under discussion upon his motion, rather than to intervene before that motion had been reached. I must apologize to the House for having trespassed a few minutes beyond the hour for recess. I move now that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

At six o'clock the House adjourned with question put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, February 19, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

PROTECTING WALL AT LAPRAIRIE.

Mr. R. LANCTOT:

1. Was there a contract made between the Government and Messrs. Noé Poupart and Duranceau of Laprairie, for the erection of the protecting wall at the town of Laprairie, at the highlands of St. Lambert?
2. Were tenders asked for that purpose? If so, in what papers were the notices published?
3. At what date were they asked for, and when did the time for the reception thereof expire?
4. Did the Public Works Department at Ottawa ask that 1,400 feet be completed during last fall, that is the part between St. Jacques river and the high lands of St. Lambert, in order that the road called Boulevard Edward VII, which was completed last November by the provincial Government, be utilized?
5. What are the names of the parties who have sent in tenders and the amount of each tender?
6. Was the lowest tenderer awarded the contract and to whom has it been given?
7. Is the contract signed by the contractors? If so, is it the intention of the Government to see to it that the works start next spring?
8. Is the Government aware that those works are said to be absolutely necessary, particularly the 8,000 feet of road forming part of Boulevard Edward VII?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Contract sent for signature on 16th January, but not yet returned to the department.

2. (a) Yes; (b) Montreal: Gazette, Star, La Patrie, Standard, Moniteur du Commerce, Tribune, Canadian Jewish Times, L'Araldo del Canada, Financial Times, L'Opinion; Quebec: Chronicle, L'Evene-

ment, Le Travailleur; Lachute, Watchman; St. Joseph de Beauce, Le Raillement; Chicoutimi, Le Progrès du Saguenay, Le Travailleur; Joncquières, L'Avenir de Joncquières; Cookshire, Compton County Chronicle; Grand'Mère, La Semaine; St. Lambert, South Shore Press; Victoriaville, La Gazette d'Arthabaska, L'Echo des Bois Francs, Gleaner; Joliette, L'Etoile du Nord; Buckingham, Post; Thetford Mines, Le Mineur; Montmagny, Le Peuplé; Shawville, Equity; Sorel, L'Eveil, Warning, Le Sorelois; Richmond, News; Rimouski, Le Progrès du Golfe; St. Hyacinthe, Le Courrier, La Tribune; St. John, News and Eastern Township Advocate; Sherbrooke, Record; Granby, Leader Mail, L'Echo de Granby; Waterloo, Le Journal de Waterloo; Magog, Enterprise; Fraserville, L'Action Canadienne; Shawinigan Falls, L'Industriel; Three Rivers, Le Courrier.

3. Tenders advertised 21st August, to be received up to 23rd September, 1913.

4. Yes.

5. E. J. Rainboth, $70,051.60, approximately; A. Duranceau & N. Pouport, $72,676.73; F. C. Jackson, $110,326.23.

6. Lowest tender was withdrawn, on a misunderstanding of the specification, and the contract awarded to the second, Messrs. Duranceau & Pouport.

7. (a) Answered by No. 1; (b) yes.

8. The department has been so advised.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—DETECTIVE SKEFFINGTON.

*Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Has George Skeffington, a former detective officer on the Intercolonial railway been employed at any time since January 1, 1912, in the service of that railway? If so, what were the services rendered, and what was the amount or amounts paid him for such services, if any?

2. Was he during the period named employed by any department of the Government? If so, what services did he render, by whom was he engaged, and what was the compensation allowed and paid to him?

3. Is the said George Skeffington now in the employ of the Intercolonial railway either permanently or intermittently? If so, in what capacity and at what compensation?

4. Is he now in the employ permanently or intermittently of any other department of the Government? If so, in what capacity, and on what terms as to compensation and the period of employment?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. He was employed as special inspector as follows: 9 days, July, 1913, amount paid $27.50; 1 month, August, 1913, amount paid $82.50; 1 month, September, 1913, amount paid $82.50.

2. He was employed by Commissioner Adair gathering information relative to investigations being carried on by the commissioner. He was paid $877.39.

3. No.

4. The Department of Railways and Canals has no information.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What is the rate per ton for first-class freight from St. John to Halifax?

2. What is the rate that is being paid by the Canadian Pacific railway to the Intercolonial railway per ton for freight carried by the Canadian Pacific railway between St. John and Halifax?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. First-class rate St. John to Halifax, which includes cost of loading and unloading and terminal charges, is $7 per ton that is the rate as applied to shipments of the highest class moving locally between St. John and Halifax in less than carload quantities.

On such traffic the railway assumes the responsibility for loss or damage to the freight, the cost of handling in its freight sheds at both St. John and Halifax, of loading into and unloading from cars, of way billing, collection of charges and sundry accounting expenses.

2. No freight is carried by the Canadian Pacific railway between St. John and Halifax.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CHANGES OF GRADES.

*Mr. GRAHAM:

Has the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company approved of the changes of grades on the Transcontinental railway between Quebec and Winnipeg since October, 1911? If so, in what terms, and on what date or dates?

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

EMPLOYMENT OF WILLIAM F. SLACK.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Was Mr. William F. Slack, of Ottawa, appointed as clerk of works in the Department of Public Works, in July, 1911?

2. Was he appointed by the Minister of Public Works or by the Civil Service Commission?

3. At what salary was he appointed?

4. Were there any charges made against him in 1911 or 1912? If so, what are said charges, and the names of the persons who made them?

5. Were these said charges investigated by Mr. Hector Chauvin?

6. Was a report of that investigation made by Mr. Hector Chauvin? If so, what were his findings?

7. After above-mentioned report was made, was said William F. Slack reinstated? If so, why, by whom, and on what date?

8. After the above report of Mr. Hector Chau-

vin, were there any further charges made against said William F. Slack? If so, what are said charges, and what are the names of persons who made them?

9. Were said further charges, if any, investigated by Mr. R. V. Sinclair, K.C., of Ottawa? If so, when?

10. Did any witnesses appear for complainant or complainants? If so, what are the names of the persons who appeared at said investigation before Commissioner R. V. Sinclair, on behalf of the complainant or complainants to support said charges?

11. At the said investigation before Commissioner R. V. Sinclair, was the said William F. Slack heard, or allowed to be heard, in his defence, or were there any witnesses heard, or allowed to be heard, on his behalf? If not, why not?

12. If any witnesses were heard on behalf of said William F. Slack at said investigation, what are the names of said witnesses?

13. Did Commissioner R. V. Sinclair make any report of said investigation? If so, when and what were his findings?

14. Has said William F. Slack been dismissed? If so, when?

15. Is it the intention of the Government to reinstate said William F. Slack? If so, when?

16. Has there been any change of Minister of Public Works between the first and second investigation?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Appointed on 6th October, 1911.

2. By Order in Council, based on a certificate from the Civil Service Commission.

3. $1,200 a year.

4. Yes; J. Jolicoeur, A. Franche, A. Mousseau and J. R. Lamontagne. (See answer No. 8.)

5. Yes.

6. Yes; no evidence was submitted.

7. Yes; by the chief architect, on 29th May, 1912.

8. Yes; abusive and blasphemous language to Dr. J. L. Chabot, M.P., making false statements to the latter, and drunkenness while on duty.

9. Yes; 26th September, 1912.

10. Yes; Dr. J. L. Chabot, M.P., J. R. Lamontagne; Wm. Hollington; A. Mousseau and Wm. Orton.

11 and 12. Yes, but he did not desire to call any witnesses.

13. Yes; 17th December, 1912; that the charges preferred have been proven.

14. Yes; by Order in Council of 25th January, 1913.

15. No.

16. There was no change of minister between the closing of the first and the opening of the second investigation.

SHIPMENT OF HAY.

Mr. EMMERSON::

1. Is there any hay being shipped over the Intercolonial railway to Halifax via the Canadian Pacific railway, which comes under the terms of the Gutelius-Bosworth agreement? If so, what quantity has passed over the Intercolonial railway from St. John to Halifax since November 15, last?

2. Is any hay being transported to points in Nova Scotia, from Quebec province, at special rates, or at rates other than those given in printed tariff of rates, by way of St. John, or otherwise?

3. Is any hay being shipped to Nova Scotia points from points west of New Brunswick at rates similar to the special rates granted to certain eastern Nova Scotia points during the autumn of 1912, and the winter and spring of 1913, on account of so-called famine districts?

4. What is the regular freight tariff rate on hay from points in Quebec province to Halifax and to Sydney?

5. What were the rates in 1912 and in 1911, and how do the rates compare as to each of said years in comparison with the present rates charged over Intercolonial railway on its own line or over Canadian Pacific railway via St. John?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. There has been no hay forwarded from Halifax by the mail steamers of the Canadian Pacific railway and Allan Line this season, and none has been handled from St. John to Halifax under the terms of the Gutelius-Bosworth agreement.

2. No.

3. No special rates were granted by the railways from points west of New Brunswick to eastern Nova Scotia points during the autumn of 1912, and the winter and spring of 1913, and current shipments, if there are any, are being made at the printed tariff rates.

4. Attached is a statement marked 'A' showing the regular freight tariff rates on hay from points on the Intercolonial in the province of Quebec to Halifax and to Sydney.

5. Statement attached, marked 'A' also shows the rates charged on hay in 1911 and 1912 to Halifax and to Sydney, and comparisons with the rates of 1913.

Statement 'B' advises the corresponding rates applicable from contiguous stations of the Canadian Pacific railway in the province of Quebec to Halifax and to Sydney.

(Statement filed with the Clerk of the House).

INDIANS OF KITSILANO RESERVE.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Has the Government any knowledge of payment by the Government of British Columbia to the Indians of the Kitsilano reserve, to secure their removal from the reserve?

2. Is the Government aware that the buildings which had been occupied by Indians on the Kitsilano reserve, are said to have been destroyed?

3. Has the Government any knowledge at whose instance the buildings were destroyed?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. It has been reported by an inspector of the department that the buildings were destroyed under instructions of the provincial government.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—COST PER MILE.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. What is the estimated cost per mile, when completed, of the Mountain section of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

2. What is the cost per mile of the Prairie section of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Government Chief Engineer's estimate of cost of Mountain section of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway per mile, $97,035; Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Chief Engineer's estimate per mile, $102,775.

2. Estimated cost of the Prairie section of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, per mile, $45,180.

COAL FOR DREDGES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Were tenders invited in 1913, by the Department of Public Works, for supplying coal to Government dredges in British Columbia?

2. If so, when were such tenders received?

3. What are the names and the post office addresses of all parties who tendered?

4. What is the amount of each tender?

5. When and to whom was the contract awarded?

6. What price was paid for the coal required to supply said dredge between the date when said tenders were received and the date when the contract was awarded to the successful tenderer?

7. Has any coal been purchased for this service from any party or firm other than the successful tenderer since the said contract was awarded? If so, how much, and what price has been paid for same?

8. How much coal was supplied up to December 31, 1913, under the said contract so awarded to the successful tenderer?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. Tenders were received in Vancouver, B.C., on April 19, 1913, by the Superintendent of Dredges, and were forwarded to Ottawa, where they were received on May 7, 1913.

3 and 4. 'A.' For Victoria, B.C.—Contract M. F. (delivered in Victoria harbour, alongside dredge, wharf or other place).

	Best lump.	Washed nut.
Victoria Fuel Company, Victoria	$5.50	$5 00
J. Kingham & Company, Victoria	5 25	4 75

Contract M. H. (Delivered in Victoria harbour, on board dredge, tug or other floating plant).

	Best lump.	Washed nut.
Victoria Fuel Company	$6 00	$5 50
J. Kingham & Company	6 50	6 00

'B.' For Vancouver, B.C.—Contract M. G. (Delivered in Burrard Inlet, First Narrows or False Creek, alongside dredge.)

	Best lump.	Washed nut.
Evans Coleman & Evans, Ltd., Vancouver	$5 25	$5 00
Macdonald Marpole Company, Vancouver	5 65	4 65

Contract M. E. (Delivered in Vancouver harbour, or First Narrows, alongside dredge or wharf).

	Best lump.	Washed nut.
Evans, Coleman & Evans, Ltd.	$5 25	$5 00
Macdonald Marpole Company	5 65	4 65

(Delivered on board dredge or other floating plant).

	Best lump.	Washed nut.
Evans, Coleman & Evans, Ltd.	$6 00	$5 50
Macdonald Marpole Company	5 95	4 95

'C.' For New Westminster, B.C.—Contract M. (Delivered in Fraser river at or below New Westminster alongside dredge or other floating plant or wharf.)

	Best lump.	Washed nut.
J. W. Pike & Company, New Westminster	$5 20	$4 70
Joseph Mayers, New Westminster	5 50	4 50
Gilley Bros., Ltd., New Westminster	5 65	4 55

Contract M. B. (Delivered on board dredge Fruhling at New Westminster.)

	Best lump.	Washed nut.
Gilley Bros., Ltd.	$6 50	$4 70
J. W. Pike & Company	6 60	6 10

All prices per ton of 2,240 pounds.

5. Victoria, B.C.—Contract M.F., J. Kingham & Company, Order in Council August 2, 1913.

Contract M. H., Victoria Fuel Company, Order in Council, August 2, 1913.

Vancouver, B.C.—Contract M. G., Evans, Coleman & Evans, Ltd., by Order in Council, June 10, 1913.

Contract M. E., Evans, Coleman & Evans, Ltd., by Order in Council, June 10, 1913.

New Westminster, B.C.—Contract M., J. W. Pike & Company, by Order in Council, June 11, 1913.

Contract M. B., Gilley Bros., Ltd., by Order in Council, June 11, 1913.

6. Victoria, B.C.—Dredges Ajax and Mudlark, $7 per ton.

Tugs Point Ellice and Petrel, $7.50 per ton.

New Westminster—Dredge Fruhling, $6.65 per ton.

Dredge King Edward, $7.50 and $6 per ton.

Vancouver—Tug Point Ellice, $6 per ton.

7. Victoria:

Tons.	Per ton.
834	$7 00
35	7 50
77	6 50
13	5 75
85	6 60

New Westminster:

Tons.	Per ton.
765	$6 00
100	5 65
8	8 00

Vancouver—Forty-five tons at $5.50 per ton. On account of the strike in British Columbia and the scarcity of coal, extra high prices were paid as it was absolutely necessary to provide fuel for the dredges.

8. Victoria—Contract M. H., 140 tons.

New Westminster—Contract M. B., 291 tons.

Vancouver—Four hundred and twenty-two tons. All dredges and tugs, excepting those at Victoria, have been equipped with oil-burning apparatus, and in future such large supplies of coal will not be required.

WEST BRANCH MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who is the mail carrier between Scotsburn Station and West Branch river John, Pictou county?

2. Has the carrier signed any contract for the service?

3. If so, what is the time of said contract?

4. How much is being paid him for the service?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Hugh R. Ross.

2. He has signed a temporary agreement.

3 and 4. Dating from the 1st February, 1914, and terminable at the pleasure of the Postmaster General, at $2 per trip amounting to $626 per annum. New tenders will probably be invited.

[Mr. Rogers.]

VALCARTIER ARTILLERY CAMP.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Department of Militia and Defence recently purchased any land at Valcartier, P.Q., for a proposed artillery camp?

2. How many farms have been secured and what is their total area?

3. What was the amount paid for same?

4. What are the names of the different owners of said farms, and what is the amount, paid or agreed upon in each case?

Mr. HUGHES:

1. No.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

PICTOU COUNTY RURAL MAIL.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Have any petitions been received asking for the establishment of a rural mail delivery route between Pictou and Saltsprings, county of Pictou?

2. If so, when were they received and what routes are sought to be established?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2. A petition was received on the second of June, 1913, for rural delivery between Pictou and Saltsprings, but it was found on inquiry to be impracticable on account of connections. Moreover, the route applied for was not a circular one, being on one side of the river only. A petition was received on the seventh of February, 1914, for a rural mail delivery service over a route running between Saltsprings, Green Hill, Lovat and Lime Rock, which route, if found satisfactory, will cover a portion at least of the country between Pictou and Saltsprings, and is now under inquiry.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY COAL SUPPLY.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Have tenders been called by the Railway Department for the supply of coal for the Intercolonial railway for this year?

2. If so, what is the date for receiving tenders?

3. If not, when will tenders be called?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.

2. Up to and including Monday, February 23, 1914.

3. Answered by No. 2.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. What are the dates and amounts of the contracts awarded for the contruction of the Hudson Bay railway, and the names of the contractors to whom each was let?

2. What time limit was fixed for the completion of each of the said contracts?

3. What deposit was required in each case?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Le Pas to Thicket Portage (approx. 185:5 miles): (a) Date of contract, September 25, 1911. (b) Amount based on schedule rates $3,078,354.50. (c) J. D. McArthur.

Thicket Portage to Split Lake Junction (68 miles): (a) Date of contract, September 20, 1912. (b) Amount based on schedule rates, $1,811,285. (c) J. D. McArthur.

Split Lake Junction to Port Nelson: (165 miles). (a) Date of contract, December 17, 1912. (b) Amount based on schedule rates $3,668,128. (c) J. D. McArthur.

2. Time limit for completion of section from Le Pas to Thicket Portage was December 1, 1912, but was extended to December 1, 1913, and further extended to December 1, 1914. Time limit for completion of contract; Thicket Portage to Split Lake Junction is December 1, 1914. Time pletion of contract, Thicket Portage to Split Lake Junction is December 1, 1914.

3. Security deposit on contract for section, Le Pas to Thicket Portage is $200,000. Security deposit on contract for section, Thicket Portage to Split Lake Junction is $150,000. Security deposit on contract for section, Split Lake Junction to Port Nelson is $150,000.

WELLAND CANAL CONTRACTS.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. What are the dates and amounts of the contracts so far awarded on the new Welland canal, and the names of the successful contractors in each case?

2. What is the time limit for the completion of each contract?

3. What deposit was required in each case?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1, Section No. 1: (a) Date August 1, 1913. (b) Amount based on schedule rates; $3,487,725. (c) Dominion Dredging Co., Ltd., R. Gordon Stewart, president; E. A. Larmonth, secretary-treasurer. Section No. 2: (a) Date December 31, 1913. (b) Amount based on schedule rates; $5,377,185.75. (c) Baldry, Yerburgh & Hutchinson, Ltd., per W. H. Hutchinson. Section No. 3: (a) Date October 4, 1913. (b) Amount based on schedule rates; $9,540,050. (c) O'Brien & Doheny, Renfrew. Section No. 5: (a) Date December 22, 1913. (b) Amount based on schedule rates; $1,945,788. (c) Canadian Dredging Co., Ltd.

2. Time for completion of contract on section No. 1 is April 1, 1917. Time for completion of contract on section No. 2 is April 1, 1917. Time for completion of contract on section No. 3 is April 1, 1917. Time for completion of contract on section 5 is April 1, 1918.

3. Security deposit on contract section No. 1, is $200,000. Security deposit on contract section No. 2, is $150,000. Security deposit on contract section No. 3, is $400,000. Security deposit on contract section No. 5, is $100,000.

EAST JEDDORE DREDGING.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Who was the inspector of the dredging carried on at East Jeddore, Halirax county, N.S., in the year 1913?

2. What remuneration did he receive?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Arthur Webber.

2. $80.

PAYMENTS TO GEORGE LONGHURST.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

What amount was paid during the years 1912 and 1913 to George Longhurst, a fishery guardian in the county of Shelburne, N.S., for salary or allowance, travelling expenses and other disbursements respectively?

Mr. HAZEN:

	1912.	1913.
Wages..	$258.75	$367.50
Expenses (travelling) ..	None	None
Other expenses	None	None

HALIFAX COUNTY MAIL CONTRACTS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Who is the contractor for the mail service between Black Point and Ingram Port station, Halifax county, and what amount is paid therefor?

2. Were tenders asked for the said mail service? If so, who tendered and for what sums respectively?

3. Who was the preceding contractor, and what amount did he receive?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Amos N. Hubley, at $175 per annum.

2. The contract was arranged with the former contractor without inviting tenders, as the price asked was considered reasonable and the amount was under $200 per annum.

3. Amos N. Hubley, at 14½ cents per trip, amounting to $90.77 per annum.

FENIAN RAID BOUNTIES.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Was any authority given to James L. Hattie, of Caledonia, Guysborough county, N.S., or to Arthur H. Macdonald, of Sherbrooke, in said county, by the Minister of Militia and Defence, or any officer of his department, to take up and forward claims of Fenian raid veterans to said department?

2. If any authority was given in writing, what is the date or dates of same?

3. Was any authority given at any time by the said minister, or any officer of his department, to the said James L. Hattie, or the said Arthur H. Macdonald, to charge the said veterans a fee for their services in connection with taking up and forwarding all such claims?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES:

1. The department has no record that these men, or any of them, professed to have authority from the department to take up and forward claims of Fenian Raid veterans to the said department. The Militia Department gave no authority to any one in Canada, except its regular commission, to deal with any claims.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

UNION LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. PERLEY: On February 12, when the Civil Government Estimates were under consideration, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) asked the following question:

Is the Finance Department acting with the Attorney General of Ontario in the prosecutions that are being carried on against the directors and manager of the Union Life Insurance Company?

Upon making inquiry I find that the answer which I gave at that time was not strictly accurate, and I wish to take this opportunity of substituting for it the following:

The investigation of the affairs of the Union Life Insurance Company was undertaken on the instructions of the Minister of Finance and it is understood that the evidence brought out at that investigation has formed the basis for the prosecution of the directors. The prosecutions, however, as is usual in such cases, are entirely in the hands of the Attorney General of Ontario and the Department of Insurance is not acting with the Attorney General in the matter.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I wish to ask the Minister of Railways for an explanation. On the 3rd instant I called the attention of the minister to the increases in the freight rates on the Prince Edward Island railway, and the minister answered me as follows:

I think the hon. gentleman is trying to mislead the people when he makes the statement that the cars on the Prince Edward Island railway do not carry over half what the cars on the main line do. This, I say, is not true, more than that, the hon. gentleman has never told the House and the country that we have cut out the third rate for the ferry across. This has never been done before, and is more in the interest of the people of Prince Edward Island than anything else we can do, until we get the ferry established.

What does the hon. minister mean by 'We have cut out the third rate?' Would that mean that the traffic to and from Prince Edward Island is free of charge? The minister spoke in the past tense, as if it were something that had already been done.

Mr. COCHRANE: I understood that it had been done, and I learned only to-day that it was not done. The instructions were that it should be done immediately.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The one-rate shipment will come into existence when the ferry is established?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes. Instructions were given to cut out the third rate immediately, so as to apply the same as when the ferry is running.

COMMISSIONER DUCHEMIN.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. SINCLAIR: I draw the attention of the Secretary of State to the answer given yesterday to question No. 39, which refers to a statement made by Commissioner Duchemin with respect to investigations held in Nova Scotia. This commissioner reported that he had refused on certain occasions to permit counsel to act for people who were being prosecuted, and he said that his action in that respect was confirmed by the department for which he was acting; but he did not name a department. My question was:

What department of the Government confirmed the attitude of Commissioner Duchemin in refusing to permit counsel to act for parties accused of partisanship?

The answer I received from the Department of Customs was that the Department of Customs did not give any confirmation. That is not an answer to my question. I do not care what the Department of Customs did; what I want to know is what department of the Government approved of Mr. Duchemin's action, in not allowing counsel to act for those accused of partisanship. I hope the Secretary of State will take the matter up. I have again put the question on the Order Paper.

Mr. CODERRE: I will do so.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Borden for the second reading of Bill

No. 62, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, resumed from Tuesday, Feb. 17.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, when the debate was adjourned two days ago, we had under consideration whether the committee should consist of seven members, as in 1903, or whether it should consist of nine members, as suggested by my hon. friends opposite. I adhere to the view I expressed before, that seven is a better number than nine. It seems to me, notwithstanding all that has been said by my hon. friends, that the reasons for increasing the number from seven to nine are more fanciful than substantial. The object of establishing the committee was, that a certain number of gentlemen on each side of the House should be able to meet and put forward, in respect of all questions that might arise before that committee, the views entertained on one side or the other and safeguard the interests of the country from their several standpoints. Therefore, so far as my own individual opinion is concerned, I cannot say that I have been very much impressed by the considerations which have been urged for the increase in the number of the committee. However, it is a matter upon which there might be a legitimate divergence of opinion, although, in my judgment, the smaller the number forming a committee such as this the more probability there is that it will accomplish satisfactory and effective work. My hon. friends on the other side are desirous of increasing the number beyond that which was agreed upon by both sides of the House in 1903, and, although they seem to attach to it what I consider undue importance, I am not disposed to be unreasonable on the subject. Therefore, when I come to move that the Bill be referred, I shall move that it be referred to a committee of nine and not to a committee of seven.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. BORDEN: I beg to move:

That Bill No. 62 be referred to a committee composed of Messrs, Béland, R. B. Bennett, Buchanan, Macdonald, Pardee, Pelletier, J. D. Reid, Rhodes and Rogers, with instructions to consider and report upon the same and to prepare schedules to define and describe the several electoral divisions entitled to return members to this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I appreciate the courtesy of my right hon. friend in assenting to our views that the committee should be composed of nine instead of seven members. I agree in principle with my right hon. friend that large committees are not desirable, and, as a rule, I think more work is effected by a small committee—by one of five or even of three—than by a large one. But this is a very special matter, and, apart from the main work of the committee, that is to say, setting down the principles upon which the redistribution is to be made, there must be a large proportion of technical work to be done in the mapping out of constituencies in the several provinces. I have asked my right hon. friend to agree to a committee of nine, so that the different groups of the population might be represented—the Maritime provinces, Quebec, Ontario and the Western provinces. The ninth member will be the umpire, and if he succeeds in reconciling the differences that may arise, he will be worthy of all honour.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply. Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

Trade and Commerce—Imperial Trade Commission, $5,000.

Mr. FOSTER: When we were in committee the other day, my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) intimated that some information would be welcome on the item under consideration, because not much had been heard, and nothing said in this House, with reference to the work of this commission. I shall make a very brief statement as to the construction and the work of the commission. The resolution out of which the commission grew was passed in the Imperial Conference in 1911—I am not going back further than that to inquire into the genesis of the commission. In pursuance of that unanimous resolution, a Royal Commission was appointed consisting of eleven members, six being appointed by the British Government and one by each of the overseas dominions. The members of that commission at the present time, although death and other circumstances have caused a few changes, are: For Great Britain, Sir Edgar Vincent, who represents particularly the financial side; Sir H. Rider Haggard, who is a poet and farmer and represents very largely the rural interests, which are not unpoetical by any means; Mr. Tatlow, who represents the railroad interests in a special way; Mr. Lorimer

of Glasgow, who represents the great industrial interests particularly in the line of iron and steel and machinery made therefrom, and Mr. Garnett, who represents the large cotton manufacturing industries of the central part of England. For South Africa, Sir Richard Solomon was the trade commissioner who worked with us at the two earlier sessions, but unfortunately for the commission, and for South Africa, he succumbed to a sudden illness and passed away. In his place, when I left England, no one had yet been appointed; but, as the commission is at present in South Africa or very close to it, there is little doubt but that a South African member has been added to the commission. Australia was represented from the first by Mr. Donald Campbell, who is prominent in public life, and who adds to his general all-round knowledge the fact of having been a labour member and identified closely with labour interests in the Commonwealth of Australia. Newfoundland is represented by Mr. Edgar R. Bowring. The Dominion of New Zealand is represented by Mr. I. R. Sinclair, a member of the Upper House. I myself have the onus of conducting the work so far as Canada is concerned. At the conference of 1911 it was pretty strongly represented by some members of that conference that Cabinet ministers or men of Cabinet rank should be appointed to that commission, and I think Mr. Fisher's idea was to carry that out. Possibly the great separating distance between Australia and the mother country militated somewhat against that idea, taken in connection with the fact that the elections were pretty nearly due in Australia, and that since the appointment of the commission there has been a somewhat spectacular and arduous political contest in that country.

It is sometimes a matter of criticism that a member of a government should take a position of this kind, and the objection is plausible that he should have enough work to do in his own department without being absent in other countries for a somewhat long period. The criticism may go for what it is worth. I am extremely glad that I have had the privilege of being upon that commission, and that during the later period of a somewhat long political life I have been enabled to realize what I have always had an ambition to accomplish—a wide, and to as large an extent as possible, intimate acquaintance with the British Empire in all its important distributed parts. I have tried not to neglect my department, whilst at the same time giving my attention to the work of that commission. If further years of public service are allowed me in Canada, I am quite sure that the knowledge I have obtained and the widening of my views in connection with my work in this respect may not be without some advantage to the work of my public life and to the work of Parliament as well.

The commission was organized in the early part of 1912, and during a portion of the year took evidence in London. Then the summer holidays intervened, and two months of the autumn were taken up in a second session of the commission in London. The commission works in two ways. First, it works through the medium of collected statistics, for the furnishing of which it relies on the dominions themselves. All the treasures of statistical information which bear upon the general subject matter of the commission's investigation are requisitioned from the dominions and from the Government of the United Kingdom. These statistics are collected and tabulated, and, as luminously as possible, used to illustrate the objects aimed at in the pursuit of information, and, ultimately, are considered in the recommendations made by the commission. That is a very large and important part of the commission's work. The second part, however, is none the less important. One of the most important features of this part of its work is the opportunity that is given to the commission to take in what you may call the atmosphere of the different dominions and of the United Kingdom itself. Sitting at your desk in your office, you may have all the statistics of all the portions of the British Empire piled about you, and, though you may go through them with the utmost diligence, they are dry bones compared with what they become after you have travelled through and inquired into, and, as it were, taken on a portion of the active thought and life, commercial and otherwise, of the countries whose statistics you are studying. This living and vital atmosphere which the commission takes in during its travels through the different dominions, forms the most important part of its investigations, and will give, I am sure, a determining tendency to the recommendations which the commission may ultimately make. In addition to that, and, in fact, to make that more effective, sittings are held consecutively in the important centres,

where men who are experts in the different areas of information which are to be explored by the commission are, in good time beforehand, notified to prepare and have ready to submit, in answer to questions or as a memorandum, their knowledge, which is put into print and goes into the hands of the commissioners before they visit that country. So that all these important memorandums and answers to questions by officials, and by experts in various lines, are placed in the hands of the commissioners and studied by them. From that study and knowledge there comes the third process of their work, which is the actual bringing out and making clear, by questions upon abstruse or not well-understood points, the information suggested by the memoranda and briefs and answers to questions which have been tabulated as I have stated, and put in the hands of the commissioners. That will furnish the committee with an idea of what goes on, but that is not all. Travelling as they do, the commissioners, of course, have access to the best sources of information, and are continually in communication with men from whom they glean knowledge which could not otherwise be obtained. To all that they add the final touch of visiting personally and looking into the different activities, industries and productivities, (if there be such a word), which form the basis of their inquisition. In all these ways, therefore, it will be seen that men who are intelligent and capable and fairly well up in their different lines have an unexampled opportunity of becoming acquainted intimately with the resources, the capabilities, the possibilities and the currents of trade of the countries visited, and of furnishing themselves with such information as will enable them to make recommendations by which and through which all these matters may be better developed, better co-ordinated and all worked together for the common imperial uplift and development.

After having, not finished, but mostly carried out their investigations in Great Britain, the commission last year visited Australia and New Zealand. They visited every state of the Commonwealth and all parts of the Dominion of New Zealand and carried out their work as I have detailed. The evidence taken in Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand has now been printed, and the first interim report, which is simply a covering report, and the second interim report, which deals particularly with special subjects in Australia and New Zealand, have been printed and presented to the Imperial Government. As quickly as possible these will be furnished to members of this House, and distributed as widely as is reasonable throughout the country as a whole.

One advantage that Canada will have in the matter is that all this evidence and the interim report will be placed in the hands of those who are to prepare their briefs and answers to questions in Canada. They will therefore have the benefit, if they choose to use it—and it is a somewhat arduous task to use it fully—of all the evidence and the opinions that have been gained in the preceding part of the travels of the commission.

On the 7th of this month the commission left England for South Africa. Returning from South Africa, after a short interval, they will, during the present year, make a tour of Newfoundland and Canada, beginning in Newfoundland somewhere about the latter part of the month of July, and from there make their way through every province to the coast. That itinerary is now being considered and laid out. The length of time which will be given by that commission to Newfoundland and Canada will be about three months. I think I have now given a resumé of the constitution and the general work of the commission. I shall be glad to answer any questions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The committee have no doubt listened with very great interest to the explanations which have been given by my hon. friend of the work of this Imperial Commission. The graphic and even feeling way in which he has presented his observations, is certainly an evidence, if evidence were needed, of the very great importance he attaches to it. I agree with him, that this commission can be of the greatest possible importance; and I have no doubt that in view of the able men who compose it, the final report must be of great service and must link together, commercially at first and otherwise also, the British Empire. Trade, after all, is perhaps the greatest bond of union to-day amongst civilized nations and if, as a result of this commission, there is developed within the British Empire a greater amount of trade and a greater appreciation of it, the work of the commission will be amply justified.

I have taken exception to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) being a member of this commission. I stated so in a casual way when he was absent and I have to repeat it in

his presence. No one would question the ability of my hon. friend to serve as a member; no one even discusses his qualifications in that respect. But, Sir, the very argument that my hon. friend has given in favour of his presence on that commission is the best argument in support of my contention that he should not be a member of that commission. He has stated that he attaches great importance to and has been able to realize a long-cherished wish in being able to become acquainted personally with all portions of the British Empire. My hon. friend has visited Australia and New Zealand, but this commission will sit in a few days in South Africa and my hon. friend will not have the advantage of being present in South Africa, so that he might know the advantages of South Africa and the manner in which trade could be developed with that country. My hon. friend has his parliamentary duties to perform and those parliamentary duties keep him here in Ottawa while the commission is sitting in South Africa. This is the only exception I take to the presence of my friend on that commission. When we were in office we had made a recommendation to the Imperial Government as to the Canadian representation, but when my hon. friends came into office this recommendation was cancelled. I do not wish to go into that part of the subject to-day. The Government thought that they should be represented on the commission by a man of their own political creed and for this there may be some justification. This office was, to a certain extent, not devoid of political considerations, and, therefore, if the Government wished to have a man of their own faith as a member of that commission I do not question this decision and I shall pass it by now. But I have to repeat to my hon. friend that whilst I do not hesitate to say that he is as well able as any man in this country to perform the work of that commission, I cannot help regretting that at the present time he cannot do his work on the commission because his duties as a minister of the Crown keep him here in Ottawa. That fact alone is a justification of the criticism I have ventured to offer, that he should not have accepted a post on that commission. Do I understand that my hon. friend has placed an interim report of the commission on the table of the House?

4 p.m.

Mr. FOSTER: Yes, I placed the report, and the evidence, on the table of the House.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I sent for it to the office, but they told me it was not there.

Mr. FOSTER: I shall see that my right hon. friend gets a complete copy. I might say that I have about seventy copies, but these are not sufficient for distribution to each member of the House. It is intended to use these copies for distribution to those who are to be contributors of papers and so on. I have sent five copies to the Parliamentary Library. As soon as we get other copies, the members will be looked after.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will the report be printed here?

Mr. FOSTER: All of this matter is set up and printed in London. They are pretty bulky volumes, and it is just a question whether we shall obtain them there, if we can get them at about the cost of printing and paper, or set up the type ourselves, which, I think, would be very much more expensive. I am now communicating with the Colonial Office to know whether we can get our supply from them at first hand.

Mr. DEVLIN: Who will act for Canada on the commission in South Africa?

Mr. FOSTER: It seldom happens that all the members of the commission are present in any one of the dominions. For instance, last year in Australia and in New Zealand, South Africa was not represented. But I shall promise my right hon. friend that as I get, from week to week, the evidence taken in South Africa, I shall read it carefully and possibly not lose too much. I may not get that peculiar atmosphere I spoke of, but I shall get all the rest. Now I think my right hon. friend is a little bit to blame for my not going to South Africa. I understood that he expressed a great desire to have me present in the House this year, and so I cut out South Africa.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am always glad to have my hon. friend here, and that was partly the reason for my request. But I not only wanted him for my own satisfaction; I wanted him to do his duty.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Might I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce if this commission is seized of the question of ocean freight rates?

Mr. FOSTER: I will venture to make a short statement with reference to that. During the recess the Government took

up the question—it was pressed upon them from many sources—of heightened freight rates, and discrimination in freight rates as between different grades of articles between Canada and the United Kingdom; and in the end Mr. Drayton, chairman of the Railway Commission, was sent over to confer with the British authorities and with the shipping companies. The prominent question at that time was as to the control of freight rates on the ocean. We had gone, as everybody knows, to a very large expense to facilitate transport through the different districts of the country, and from ocean to ocean, and we constituted a board which had the ultimate controlling power over rates to be charged on that whole inland system of transport. When, however, goods leave our country, or come into our country from over seas, they traverse the ocean where we have no control outside of our own limit, and where it is impossible for any one country to exercise control. One idea that underlay the sending over of Mr. Drayton was to confer with the British Government as to what might be done towards establishing a joint control over freight rates between the United Kingdom and Canada. Mr. Drayton took up the subject there with his usual ability. He had a great deal of knowledge when he left home, and gleaned a great deal more when he was in England. He conferred with the Board of Trade, the Colonial Office and other permanent bodies. The idea was to have a joint commission appointed by the United Kingdom and Canada to take the whole matter into consideration, and for them to make an investigation and then recommend some measure for the control of ocean freight rates. The British Government did not favour the special commission for some reasons, one of which—and it was a reason which appealed with force to the Canadian Government—was that no such commission could be effected without getting first the sanction of their parliament, which would take time. The Royal Commission was already sitting and it had powers wide enough to take up that subject. In Australia, New Zealand, and partially in Great Britain, it had already taken evidence with reference to ocean freight rates, discriminations, bills of lading and such like, and the British Government proposed that this matter should be turned over to the Dominions Royal Commission and that they should make the investigation. Canada agreed to that, and the matter was placed in the hands of the commission. The commission has taken the initial steps for an investigation in Great Britain. They will also carry on a somewhat cognate investigation in South Africa, where this complaint is also rife; and when the commission comes to Canada next year a full opportunity will be given to the interested parties to state their case and give their evidence before that commission. That, I think, is a short answer to the question of my hon. friend from South York.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I cannot quite endorse that way of dealing with a matter of such vital importance to the people of this country. This ocean combine is operative to-day. The increase of ocean freight rates is the greatest tax that has been placed on the Canadian farmer. The mode of dealing with it outlined by the Minister of Trade and Commerce will take a great deal of time. From the deliberative way a British commission goes about its work, five or even ten years is a reasonable period for them to take, in hearing evidence and making a report. This is a matter that affects the welfare of our whole Canadian west and interests the whole country, and we are now told that that question which so vitally affects Canada is to be dealt with by a Royal Commission and out of the jurisdiction of this House. I do not believe in the Parliament of Canada abdicating a function that belongs to it and handing it over to a Royal Commission. The hon. gentleman in his lucid explanation said: We have a railway commission in this country but it has not jurisdiction over ocean freight rates. I dissent entirely from that statement. I say we have jurisdiction over ocean freight rates, both in our Railway Commission and in this Parliament, and in other ways, and I maintain that a cure of this grievance can be immediately effected. I can imagine it to be possible, if we are to uphold that doctrine, that there will be no cure in the matter of this ocean combine for several years. I believe that our Railway Commission has jurisdiction over freight from its origination in the West, and its transport through Canada and across the ocean, to the place where it is landed; at least we have jurisdiction over the people who are handling our commerce and who have put this unjust tax on the farmers of this country. And to show how unjust it is, I wish to say that a commission —a quick-acting commission—was appointed by the Government of Saskatchewan to investigate what it cost the western farmer to raise his grain and other products, what it cost to market it, and what profit there

was in it for himself. A report of that investigation was presented the other day, the outstanding features of which report were, first, that there had been an immense increase in the freights paid for river and lake transportation to the seaboard, and, secondly, there had been 100 per cent increase in ocean freight rates; so that, as I gather, this unjust combine on our lakes and on the Atlantic has taken almost ten cents a bushel from the net receipts of the western farmer for his wheat. The hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce, has established a very good law in connection with a special board of our own for the inspection of wheat and other grains, its storage and the way in which it is shipped. This board has more or less jurisdiction over the products of the West. It has been a first-class law.

This Parliament is committed to an enormous expenditure for ports, canals, and ocean terminals and we are giving great subsidies to railways in order to give the Canadian farmer the cheapest possible transportation for his products to the consuming market. But the more we appear to do and the more money we spend, the higher are the charges that are put upon the farmer. Whatever may be the saving, here at home and by our own efforts, somebody is going to take it all away from us or from the farmer, and put it in his own pocket. That is being done by this Atlantic combine. The head of the Atlantic combine is the Canadian Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern railway, the Grand Trunk railway, and the Inland Lake and River combine that has been formed. These people are all within our jurisdiction, and every one of them is constantly coming to us for favours, for legislation of one kind and another, and yet we do not propose to deal with them. We do not even deal with them through the Railway Commission, which, I say, is seized of jurisdiction. We do not propose to deal with them when they come here and ask for favours. For instance, we gave a great favour to the Canadian Pacific railway the other day when we granted them rights over the Intercolonial railway, and we are giving other railways favours over our railways as well as the use of the ports that we are building. The improvement of the St. Lawrence, the lighthouse service, everything that we do for the benefit of the farmers of Canada in order to better the price they may get for their products, is all being made nugatory by the action of the ocean combine, composed of people who are within our jurisdiction.

[Mr. W. F. Maclean.]

It is not good national policy to turn this question over to an Imperial Commission which is seized of a great many other things, which is not likely to be able, by reason of the many other matters engaging its attention, to get to the bottom of this question and to make a report which will be satisfactory, and which will be subject to co-operative legislation in the various portions of the empire. If there is a reference to that commission I see no remedy for the people of the West in regard to this ocean combine, for the next ten years. Yet we are going ahead and spending money hand over fist in developing our transportation facilities, while at the same time allowing the railway companies and steamship companies that we have created, to have the advantage of all these things and to take all the cream by means of this unjust ocean combine. Is that good policy? Is it a fair thing to tell the people of Canada that there is to be no relief now from these unjust charges? Again I say that the increased charges on ocean traffic represent one hundred per cent above what they were three years ago. There is talk of a dispute between some of the larger companies not doing business with Canada in regard to passenger service. They are having a row over that, but they do not row over the transportation of grain, apparently. They are all in—I will not say as thick as thieves—but they are all as close as they can be together to uphold these exhorbitant rates. And they are exhorbitant. Any carrier that in one year doubles its rate by means of a combine, is doing an unjust and an unlawful thing, and those who do it, in my mind, are outlaws.

Before this House I arraign these men for conspiring against the people of Canada, and I say it is up to the Parliament and Government of Canada to have no more negotiations, or to grant no more favours to any of these people who are parties to this unjust combine. The people of the West are asking—perhaps they are always asking; perhaps it is the nature of the animal always to be asking for something—but the people of the West are asking for improved transportation, and we are doing our best apparently to give it to them. But we shut our eyes to those who take advantage of everything, and instead of the advantage going to the farmer it goes to the transportation company.

Not only is there this ocean combine, but the worst combine that was ever formed in connection with transportation is the inland combine in the lakes, canal and river navigation. The same people are in

it. Every vessel that is owned in Canada, and doing business on the Great Lakes, is in that combine. They made a great flotation of bonds the other day to carry it out. Yet we say that we are unable to reach them. They have put up their freight rates. To show how close the combine is right at the present time, I have been informed, and I believe it is true, that the rate from Port Arthur to the sea is exactly the same by boat as it is by rail. Formerly the great check we had on the railways was the competition of navigation. Now that has ceased. Not many years ago I put to an old member of this House, now dead, the question: Who holds up the canal enlargement in Canada? He said: Don't you know? It is the railways. It is a fact that for twenty-five or thirty years the improvement of canal and river navigation was held back by the railways within our own border. They were persistently opposed to inland navigation, but now that we are going ahead and propose to have canals capable of passing through even ocean steamships, what good will it be if the steamships and the inland boats are in the hands and under the control of a combine that controls the ocean and our inland waters and which also controls our railways? It is three in one; it is a trinity and it is a most unfair trinity and one that it will require the greatest courage and the highest policy, and a policy of immediate action, to grapple with. The railways would not want a better proposition than that this question should be held up for several years before a royal commission.

The same question is up in the United States, and they are now passing legislation to deal with it. They have appointed commissions to disassociate the railways from navigation propositions, and they are gradually working out the problem. Who is it that has been holding back the construction of the Panama canal?

The United States railways tried to get control of all the steamship lines through the Panama canal, and this unholy alliance has been found out and is being dissolved. The United States Government are taking precautions to ensure that the canal will be absolutely free to all nations; they are taking action against this alliance, and they are doing so by means of legislation within the United States. My contention is that we can do the same in Canada. Let us not abandon the jurisdiction that this House, this Government and our Railway Commission have in connection with this matter. Jurisdiction is not altogether a matter of law; it is also a matter of policy, especially when these corporations are coming as suitors for favours at every session of Parliament. We have jurisdiction both by law and by policy that ought to be able to bring these corporations to time. I hope and trust that the question will not go to the Dominions Commission, but even if it should, that does not exonerate this Parliament or the Government or our Railway Commission from trying to effect an immediate cure of that substantial grievance.

We are spending millions of money; we have created at an enormous cost a commission that was to give relief to the people, but now we confess that we are not ourselves able to remedy grievances. We are told we have to go across the ocean to enlist the co-operation of England, of South Africa, of Australia, and of the rest of the British dominions. It is not good policy; it is not national policy; it is not parliamentary policy for this Parliament to abandon its jurisdiction or to plead that we are unable to deal with a grievance inflicted on us by a creature of our own, in the shape of a corporation. We cannot afford to make any such confession of inability before these corporations that we have within our own bounds. If they over-ride Parliament in this, what next will they attempt to do? They fight us at every turn; they antagonize our own national railway; they do not wish to see us establish parcel post. If we now confess that they are not within our jurisdiction, why make all this fuss and feather about trying to improve transportation in this country? We might as well throw the money into the sea if we do not retain jurisdiction over these corporations, and if we do not keep absolute control of the rates on freight, not only through our own country, but until it reaches its destination.

I think some hon. gentleman in this House made the statement that, rather than pay $35,000,000 for dreadnoughts, we ought to put that sum into a state-owned ocean steamship line. I would sooner put $35,000,000, or whatever the sum was, into a Canadian owned ocean steamship line than wait for this Dominion Commission to find out the facts or to confess that we have no jurisdiction over the greatest grievance that we have in Canada to-day. I appeal to the members from the West that they have a substantial grievance to-day, and that it is no answer to that

grievance to say that it must go to an imperial commission. I am for Canada first, every time; I am for national policy every time, and I am for the jurisdiction of Canada over every citizen, and over every creature she has created in the way of corporations.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am glad my right hon. friend endorses that idea. I think that national policy will also be endorsed on this side of the House and by every Canadian. I brought this question up in another form the other day, and I intend to bring it up whenever the opportunity arises. The opportunity is here to-day. The people are watching what Parliament is doing. Something has been done, but as fast as we improve the situation, along come these creatures of ours and they claim everything, and defy us, and leave the farmers of this country without a reasonable profit.

Just one word more. We want to settle the Canadian West. We are inviting immigrants from the United States and from all over the world to settle in that country. We have built all the railways in the West and we are building all these interior and terminal elevators. We have subsidized steamship lines; we are building harbours; we have the Intercolonial railway as a regulator of railway rates, and we intend to have it extended in a proper manner. Yet doing all these things, we are not able to give the farmers of Canada a single advantage in the way of transportation. We shall not succeed in building up this West if we have to wait for five or ten years to abolish this ocean combine. It must be cured now or the people will not go to the West. I ask the hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to study what the profits of the Canadian farmer are on the wheat he is raising in the West, and they will find they are almost nil.

Mr. BRADBURY: The profit is very small indeed.

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, they say that the cost was, if I remember well, 62 cents, and the market 67 cents. I do not quite agree with that, yet I know that these men gave the most careful consideration to it. The commission went abroad, and the two things that they ran up against were the combine on the inland waters and the combine on the ocean. But are we to tell the people of the West that they have to wait all this time to cure that grievance? If so, I say, it will give a black eye to the Canadian west, and I do not want to see that. But greater than that is the question whether we are to abandon our rights and the jurisdiction we have over the corporations that we create and say, 'non possumus.' Think of it! After forty-five years of the establishment of this Confederation, after combining half the North American continent into one for the purpose of progress and good government, we are supposed to confess to-day that the control of freight charges on the main products of the country has passed out of our hands and that we must go outside our country to seek for redress. I cannot accept that doctrine.

Mr. DEVLIN: May I ask the hon. gentleman, what would be his concrete remedy for the situation? Would he have Parliament hold up the steamship and railway subsidies until these companies agree to a satisfactory rate?

Mr. MACLEAN: I am a great believer in 'Putting in the probe,' as they say in the United States. The question that came up here to-day is that we have no organization for investigation under federal law. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) told me, when he was the head of the Government, to go to Mr. Foy for the enforcement of federal laws.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I will not tell the hon. gentleman to go to Mr. Foy in relation to ocean combines.

Mr. MACLEAN: No, but I brought up the question of the enforcement of Dominion laws and showed that we have no machinery for the sufficient enforcement of those laws. On a former occasion when I brought this matter up, the present Prime Minister admitted the strength of my argument. If we had to-day an Attorney General whose duty it was to enforce the federal laws—and I am not casting any reflections on the present occupant of that position, but am criticising the condition of the law—if we had an attorney general authorized to put in the probe and to employ the necessary officers for that purpose, and if we had the machinery which the Americans have in their Grand Jury system, then we could send for these people and have them explain the facts. We could send for Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, put him in the box, and ask him to explain to us this ocean freight rate combine. The people of Canada would be

wise in one day to the condition of affairs, and this Parliament could find a way to meet the difficulty. I am not going to give the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) the exact details of how I would proceed against these people; but I would convince them that they were in the hands of Parliament and that we intended to find a way to meet any difficulties that arose. For instance, for every cent which they added to the freight rate on the ocean, we could take off one cent of the freight rates on land, and for every cent the inland navigation companies overcharged—and it is not pretended that they are not within our jurisdiction—I would regulate them; and I would not go to England, or Australia, or South Africa to find a remedy, but I would find that remedy here. First of all we need to have an Attorney General backed by legislation which will be really effective. Oh! it is absurd to say that we in Canada, after forty-six years of Confederation have not the machinery for the enforcing of our own law. I have pointed out to this House, time and time again, what is the significant feature of every important Bill passed by the Congress of the United States. It is a provision that the enforcement of any law rests with the Attorney General of the United States and his sub-attorneys, and that so many thousands or hundreds of thousands of dollars are appropriated annually for the enforcement of the law. I say there is a cure for this ocean freight rate combine, and it is not to be found by going to England; it is right here, through our own Attorney General or Solicitor General. Here would be a fine opportunity for the young Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) to distinguish himself with the people of the West. Give him power to send for Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, for the representative of the Allan Steamship Company—a contractor with the Government for the transport of mails, and owned, I believe, by the Canadian Pacific railway —to send for Sir William Mackenzie—and he was in town yesterday; we could have served notice on him to come before this officer of the Government—and the representative of the Grand Trunk Steamship line, whoever he may be. Let us have before us these men whose ships tie up at our docks. If the Kaiser had this matter in hand, do you suppose he would let any one tie up at a dock in Germany who was an outlaw or an unfair dealer with the people of Germany? He not only would not give them a contract for the transport of the German mails, but he would not even let them tie up to the dock; nor should we. We have every one of these sinners within our jurisdiction, we can administer proper punishment, and we can get immediate relief, if we undertake to do it, and do it within Parliament. But we cannot obtain it by a roundabout way. I am talking on this line especially to impress my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) with the idea that what he proposes to do before that very busy commission will not succeed, but that if Parliament will this session pass a law giving jurisdiction over this matter and will appoint an official with the powers of an inquisitor—and the hon. gentleman himself spoke of inquisitions that they were to have under this commission—

Mr. FOSTER: I was not speaking historically.

Mr. MACLEAN: 'Inquisitions' is a very good word, and I use it not in the historical but in the dictionary sense, to wit, investigation. If we should this session pass a little Act empowering our Solicitor General to send for these offenders against the law in the way of transportation, and, as they say in the States, put in the probe, the evil would cease the next day or, if publicity did not do it, we could find another way. I think it is up to the Government to revise its policy in regard to this ocean rate combine and to proceed immediately, directly, and by all means within our jurisdiction, to break that combine, to expose the men who are in it, and to show that they are a Canadian organization, and within our law; and to compel them to do justice, or else confession. And, I do not want to confess—I will never confess—that there is not a cure within the Canadian Parliament for every grievance of this kind that exists in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER: I am afraid that if we continue the discussion on this line we might cover the field of the world's affairs and not get our items through. I do not rise to object to what my hon. friend has said, for I always listen with a great deal of pleasure to him. In a way, he is an outlaw himself, and he exemplifies his doctrine by his practice. However, while I do not intend to discuss this question which has been raised in the House by my hon. friend, I want to take just a moment or two to allay some of his fears.

In the first place, I do not believe that the

Government of Canada, in agreeing with the British Government to have this commission inquire into and report upon the control of ocean freights, has divested itself of one particle of its jurisdiction. Within the bounds of Canada, the jurisdiction of this country is ample; it begins to fail when you attempt to stretch that jurisdiction across the ocean and into other countries than your own. Because this matter of ocean control is one over which no one power in the world has or can have jurisdiction, except through the agency of an all-powerful fleet, or through a joint agreement made between one country and another, it has been referred to that commission. Canada has not parted with one single iota of its jurisdiction, and is as free to-day as it was before this reference was made, to take any measure to modify or correct, in so far as it can be done, the evils which have been complained of by my hon. friend, in respect to some of which I entirely agree with him. I want to allay his fears in regard to another point by intimating that I do not think ten years will elapse before the report of this commission is submitted. The report is due at the end of 1914, or at most in the early part of 1915, as the purpose of the commission is to present its report for the consideration of the next Imperial conference which takes place in the summer of 1915.

My hon. friend said it was his belief that we have jurisdiction over ocean freights, and, if I understood him aright, that the Railway Commission also has jurisdiction. I am not as good a lawyer as he is; I believe he is master of a great many trades, but I think when he comes to talk to legal men he will find that there are some doubts as to whether the jurisdiction of Canada extends to ocean freight. Before the freight which goes into the vessel leaves our port, we have a great many different strings on it, but when it gets away from our own country and outside the three-mile limit, our jurisdiction, in a great many cases, falls entirely, or, in others, can only be mediately exercised.

The Chairman has been very generous in allowing this discussion to go so far. This is an item for certain expenses, printing and otherwise, in connection with the work of the commission, and whilst I do not want my hon. friend to think I wish to shirk the discussion, I should be very glad to join in and help him along with it in certain respects at the proper time. I do not say that his discussion at this time will not bear fruit. Every time he drops the seed of suggestion, if its germinating powers are good —and there is fruitful soil all around on both sides of the House—it will commence to sprout and grow, and we will be all the better able to reap the harvest when the proper time for consideration of the matter arrives. I want to plead, however, Mr. Chairman, that we be not allowed by you to go too far astray in the discussion of these items.

Mr. NEELY: Surely this is the proper time to discuss the matter which has been brought to our attention by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean). I think the minister should be gratified at the manner in which the hon. gentleman has brought this very important matter to our notice, because it is a matter in which the people of this country are surely very deeply interested. It is alarming that the history of transportation in Canada during the past few years gives indisputable evidence of the fact that the more we improve our transportation facilities the more advantage is taken of these improvements, not by the people but by the transportation companies themselves. While the price of wheat may go down, the freight charges on the wheat we export from this country constantly increase. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has, during the past twelve months, in his tour of certain parts of the world, undertaken the very commendable object of promoting the interests of the trade and commerce of this country. While the hon. minister has been trying to find new markets for Canadian produce, our transportation companies have been so increasing the charges on the produce we have to export that any good the minister may have accomplished or attempted to accomplish has been nullified. The hon. member for South York said something about the West always wanting things. Perhaps that is the nature of the animal; if so, it is a commendable nature. I may tell the hon. member for South York that the western people are a progressive people; they are not satisfied to let well enough alone. They want to keep on doing better all the time, and they certainly are not satisfied with present conditions so far as the export of their surplus produce is concerned. They are not content with the fact that the charges made for the transportation of their produce by the inland and ocean navigation companies have been increasing during the last few years, although the price of wheat has been going down. This Government has, I was almost going to say, penalized the farmers of the West;

perhaps that is too strong a term. At least they have adjudged that the farmers of the West may not sell their surplus wheat in the nearest market, just across the line; they must send it to Liverpool, and other foreign markets. I trust that one of the results of the minister's visit to China will be the shipping of Canadian wheat eastward as well as westward.

As a result of the position taken by this Government, we are compelled to use these means of transportation in getting our wheat to the markets of the world; and we are confronted by this situation, that year by year the freight rates are increasing. We may deepen the Welland canal, as the hon. member for South York said, we may undertake great expenditures, if we please, for the improvement of our transportation facilities, but no matter what we may do, under present conditions, we are not benefiting the producers of Canada by these expenditures.

Mr. NESBITT: What is the increase in the last five years?

Mr. NEELY: About fifty to one hundred per cent in inland navigation, and in ocean navigation, I believe, more. The grievance calls for a remedy, and we are asked by the minister to be patient and wait for the report of this commission, which will decide as to who has jurisdiction and by what method the solution of this difficulty may be arrived at. I must say that I agree entirely with the hon. member for South York that this House should not have the patience to wait for the report of a commission which may be indefinite or may be conclusive, but which in the end may devise no way by which we can arrive at a satisfactory settlement of the problem. It is quite true that the bulk of the inland navigation companies that do business in Canada, as well as the lines that carry our exports to the old country, are controlled by the railway companies of this country. We surely have jurisdiction over the railway companies, and we can and should have jurisdiction over the inland navigation companies; and by indirect, if not by direct means, we can surely exercise some influence over the ocean steamship lines. I was going to ask the hon. member for South York if he does not think there are one or two very useful indirect ways by which the rates of the ocean steamship lines could be lessened. It is my recollection that in 1897, when the British preference was established, that it had a very marked effect on ocean freight rates, the reason being that the ships carrying our exports to the old country had a return cargo owing to the increased trade between Canada and the mother country. As I understand, it is the great object of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to promote trade between the component parts of the British Empire. How better could we increase this commerce between the mother country and Canada and the other parts of the empire than by increasing the British preference so that the ocean going ships that carry our produce to the British markets and the other parts of the British Empire, would have the privilege of bringing back a full cargo instead of half a cargo. That surely would have an important effect in lessening ocean freight rates. As to the question of jurisdiction, the hon. member for South York did not arrive at a definite conclusion as to how we could devise a remedy. I do not think we ought to be asked to wait until this Imperial Commission gave us an answer to the question. I think that this House has within its confines enough legal ability and talent to take this question into consideration and devise ways and means by which it can be settled. I wonder if the hon. member for South York would not think it advisable to propose to the Government and to the House that a special committee of this House be appointed to deal with this question, to sift out, to discover the ways and means by which Canada, through legislation, can have jurisdiction not only over our inland shipping companies but over the ocean lines as well, in so far as those lines do business with Canadian ports. I give that suggestion to the hon. member for South York.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: That is better than going to England.

Mr. NEELY: I give that suggestion, confident that in the personnel of the Government, including that new member of the Government to whom the hon. member for South York has referred, the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen), there is sufficient ability to solve the problem. We read some months ago in the newspapers that the Solicitor General proposed to deal with this very question of ocean freight rates. I do not know how he is dealing with it, but I think that he and other members of the Government and of this House might very well be appointed a special committee to give this question their consideration and to devise ways and means to bring about

legislation by which we shall have jurisdiction over this question of inland and ocean navigation tariffs. I appreciate the position taken by the hon. member for South York on this question. He certainly is speaking in the interests of the farmers of the West, and I would assure the hon. member for South York that in the days to come—and they are not very far away, I trust—when there is a change of Government in this country, if his remarks are not taken as seriously as they should be by the present Government, I personally would very strongly endorse the view that no man in this House would be better fitted to take charge of that department, the Attorney General's Department, which would deal with this question, than the hon. member for South York.

Mr. OLIVER: I am quite prepared to support this vote for the Imperial Trade Commission, and am quite prepared to believe everything that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has said in regard to its value. While it is unfortunate that the hon. gentleman cannot be in this House and in South Africa at the same time, we are glad to have his presence and assistance here. That, however, is not to be understood as endorsing the idea that because we have an Imperial Trade Commission,—no doubt composed of good men and having large powers and authority, and a commission which will do good work,—we should not pay attention to the problems which are pressing upon us most closely and most seriously, and which can be attended to, in a measure or altogether, without calling in the services of that commission. If the vote for the Imperial trade commission is to be given as a reason why we should not give every attention that lies in our power to the problems that are pressing upon us, immediate and direct, I would be strongly in favour of striking the vote out. It is the problems that are pressing most closely that require our attention rather than those which are at a distance. We are glad to have the distant problems attended to in due course, but not at the sacrifice of attention to the problems close at hand. To show how pressing the problem of trade and transportation is, let me take the liberty of bringing to the attention of the House the matured conclusion of a commission of inquiry appointed by the Saskatchewan Government. The commission was composed of practical men of that province, who travelled in Europe where they were given every opportunity to acquire information.

[Mr. Neely.]

Only a preliminary report has so far been issued, but it contains matters of such vital importance to this country that I desire to bring it to the attention of the House. All matters in this country, whether trade, finance or any other thing, finally come down to the question of the production of wheat and the price of wheat, and the conclusion of that commission is that while the cost of wheat production has increased by 12·15 per cent since the year 1909, the cost of marketing the wheat has increased by about 15 per cent. That is to say, while it costs the farmer 12·15 per cent more to produce his wheat, it costs him 15 per cent more to market it than it did in 1909.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: And the price has also gone down?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. The Liverpool quotations fell from $1.23 in 1907 to 98 cents per bushel in 1913: a difference of 25 cents a bushel on the market price, a difference of 12·15 per cent in production and a difference of 15 per cent in the cost of marketing. The figures are arrived at by making a calculation on the handling of a thousand bushel carload. To quote the report:

> The services enumerated are those performed in connection with 1,000 bushels of No. 3 Northern wheat shipped through a country elevator in Saskatchewan, hauled to Winnipeg, there sampled and graded by the Government, sold on commission to an exporter, hauled to Fort William, unloaded, weighed, received in store, cleaned and insured at a terminal elevator, inspected out into a lake steamer before the close of navigation, carried to a Georgian bay or lake Erie port, unloaded through a transfer elevator into a railway car, hauled to Montreal, unloaded from the car into a transfer elevator, loaded thence into a steamer and carried to Liverpool or London. This procedure and route are selected because more grain has been handled by this procedure than by any other and more has been exported via this route than by any other Canadian route.
>
> The charges may be grouped naturally under two heads:
>
> 1. Charges paid directly by grower and shipper of consigned grain.
> 2. Charges paid directly by purchaser of consigned grain, but indirectly by grower and shipper because deducted from the price the grain realized.

I will not trouble the House with the details but the conclusion is, that in 1909 it cost $304.60 to market a carload of wheat from the province of Saskatchewan, and in 1913 it cost $346.60.

Mr. WRIGHT: Might I ask whether that additional charge is entirely attributable to additional freight rates?

Mr. OLIVER: I was just going to give the details of the increases. It is not necessary for me to give the whole details. All the charges remain the same in 1909 and 1913, except those I will mention: the rates of interest has increased; the estimated increase in interest on 1,000 bushel carload valued at $700, is $2; the increase in lake carrying charges is from $10 in 1909 to $20 in 1913. That is just double. The ocean steamship charges have been
5 p.m. increased from $40 per 1,000 bushels to $75. Those are the only increases. The increase in bank interest is trifling but it may be counted. But the increase in cost of lake transportation is serious; it has been doubled and the cost of ocean transportation has been almost doubled, and this cost, as the report points out, necessarily is deducted from the price the producer receives.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: What was the lake rate per bushel last fall and in 1909?

Mr. OLIVER: This report does not take into account last year's rates. The summary contains only a general computation but I happen to have the figures on lake rates, and my information is that in the season of 1913 the lake rates varied from 1¾ to 3¾ cents a bushel.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Is that with storage?

Mr. OLIVER: I could not say. This responsible commission appointed by the Saskatchewan Government has declared that the cost of lake transportation doubled since 1909 and that, in conjunction with the increase of ocean freight rates and the increased cost of production, and in connection with the drop in the world's prices, has produced what may be considered as a crisis in wheat production in the western country and is a matter of such great importance as to call for every attention that can be given to it by this Parliament and the Government to relieve the conditions in whole or in part. While dealing with this question of lake freights, let me give the House some information that I am sure will interest the people of Eastern Canada as well as those of Western Canada. Of the grain that went forward from Canadian ports at the head of the lakes from August, 1913, to the close of navigation in December, 75,000,000 bushels went by United States ports as against 58,000,000 bushels by Canadian ports.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Is that mixed grain or wheat alone?

Mr. OLIVER: That is all grain. That is something that should make those members who are interested directly or indirectly in the shipping ports of Eastern Canada recognize that they too have an interest in this question of the transportation of western grain. When Canada does not handle, through her own ocean ports, half of the grain that she produces, it is certainly an indication that there is something radically wrong in connection with transportation.

Mr. WRIGHT: Is there any difference between the freight rates on the Great Lakes going by an American port, such as Buffalo, and the rates through a Canadian port?

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend can hardly ask that question because unless there was a difference the grain would not go that way. It must be of advantage to ship by way of Buffalo or the grain would not go by way of Buffalo.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: In this report of the commission the statement is made that the grain of Canada, to reach the market in Liverpool, pays more than the grain of any other country in the world. That would cover the case of the United States. and the rate is lower in the United States.

Mr. OLIVER: The condition, as it appears to my mind, is this: on account of the shipping combine on the Great Lakes, which is a Canadian combine and which controls the rates between Port Arthur and Midland, it has been necessary for shippers to take advantage of American vessels available for that trade, which vessels could not carry from Port Arthur to Midland, and, therefore, these shippers, in order to get the lower rate on their grain, had to ship by an American bottom through an American port. As a matter of fact, that is precisely what occurred during the past season. The freight rate during the past season averaged lower than it did the season before because a larger proportion of Canadian grain went by American bottoms through American ports. That is why the grain has to go that way, and that is what brought the rate down.

Mr. WRIGHT: Will the hon. gentleman give us any exact figures and not mere assumption as to the Canadian rates on the Great Lakes as compared with the American rates via Buffalo?

Mr. BENNETT: The rates are invariably the same.

Mr. OLIVER: Naturally the rates remain on a par because, when the American boats carrying grain to Buffalo come into the competition, if the Canadian boats carrying to Midland did not carry at the same rate the grain would all go to Buffalo. That is elementary. The question of interest to this House is not what the rates are but the question of interest, so far as the western producer is concerned, is that the rates are higher than they used to be and higher than they ought to be. To the eastern representative, who is concerned with eastern Canadian shipping points, the question of interest is that the freight is going to American ports. Whatever the reason may be, Canada is losing that trade. If the transportation companies are losing trade business interests in every way are losing trade, and I say it is for the Government to wake up to this situation and, instead of awaiting the report of an imperial trade commission, deal with this matter that is immediately in hand. This is a matter which ought to be under the control of this Government. My hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) desires me to read to the House a statement from the Saskatchewan report which is as follows:

> It costs the farmers more to have the exportable surplus of Western Canada's grain crop placed on present ultimate market than the farmers of any other large exporting country have to pay.

That is a startling statement and when it is taken in conjunction with the increased cost of production and the drop in prices in the world's markets, it is notice of a situation in this country that must have very far reaching effects. It has such a direct bearing on the present condition of the country that I think the country should wake up and realize what the position of affairs really is. Our farmers are producing their grain at a loss and not at a profit. Our country is not getting the benefit of the transportation of grain in such proportion as it should. One reason in large measure is the combine of the lake vessels which has driven Canadian grain to American ports.

Mr. THOBURN: Do the farmers in the Northwest pay more per bushel per mile than do the farmers in any other country?

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend asks me a question that I cannot answer, and that I could not be expected to answer. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, with all the resources that he has at his command, could not answer that question. It does not matter what other people pay; the question is, what do we pay and can we afford to pay it? That is the essential question, and if the answer is, as the Saskatchewan Grain Commission has answered, that we are not getting for our grain a price at which we can afford to produce it, then certainly there must be a change of the methods of marketing and transport, or our products must be restricted in proportion. Everybody knows that the restriction in any degree of western products is bound to have a serious, nay a disastrous effect upon the welfare of this whole Dominion. Unless production in the West can be moderately and reasonably increased from year to year for many years, there will be serious loss and injury throughout the rest of Canada, because our industrial establishments, our commercial organizations, our financial institutions have all been organized and capitalized with a view to meeting the increase of production that is expected.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: This is very interesting and important, but I would gather this inference from the report of the commission, and also from the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver), that there is a combine on the lakes so far as Canadian vessels are concerned, and that there is no combine so far as American vessels going to Buffalo are concerned. I also draw the inference that, so far as Canadian bottoms that carry the grain over to the old country are concerned, there is a combine, and so far as American bottoms are concerned there is not a combine. Are these the facts in connection with the matter? The statement that it costs more to carry our western grain to market than grain grown in any other part of the world does not sound very well, and requires investigation. The only country that you could compare with western Canada would be the western states. So far as the Argentine republic or any of the other wheat-growing countries are concerned, the traffic is by sea, and ocean freight rates are of course less than railway rates. If my inference is correct that there is a combine in Canada and not in the United States, then I think the matter can be very easily explained. I would like to know if my hon. friend can give any information on these two points.

Mr. OLIVER: On the lakes there is a combine amongst Canadian shipping interests. There is not a combine amongst American shipping interests. The latter

enter into our trade only when their trade is slack. We did not get their competition in the season of 1912 to the same extent that we did in the season of 1913, because they were busier at home in 1912 than in 1913 It was because the ore carrying trade fell off in 1913 that the American vessels came into our trade and thereby reduced the rates for 1913 as compared with the rates for 1912. In order that the western farmer shall get the benefit of that competition, the eastern port interests must lose. That is an undesirable condition.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: The proof that American wheat is carried to market at a lower rate than Canadian wheat lies in the fact, that if there were free wheat in this country to-day, the bulk of our wheat would go to market through the United States and not through Canada, unless the Canadian railways came down to American rates. So far as I can see the only people who to-day are opposing free wheat, are the railways, because, if they can keep the wheat from going into the United States, they can reap a bigger profit on their freight rates.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: The American rates are not lower.

Mr. MACLEAN: The American freight rates are lower.

Mr. STEVENS: What are they?

Mr. MACLEAN: I am taking it on the general proposition which I put before the House the other day that the opposition to free wheat comes from the Canadian railways, because they are enjoying higher rates to-day. If we had free wheat, our wheat would go through the United States unless the Canadian railways reduced their rates, and they would have to do so.

Mr. BEST: Tell us what the rates are.

Mr. MACLEAN: The rates are lower in the United States than they are in Canada.

Mr. BEST: Anybody could say that.

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver); I will give the details later on. My conviction is that the opposition to free wheat is because it entails the reduction of Canadian rates.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: So far as my part of the country is concerned, the rate from Boissevain to Fort William and the rate from Rolla, a town directly south of us and a few miles across the border, to Duluth, are exactly the same.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not questioning that at all. I am pointing out a condition that exists beyond any question. There is no possible doubt that the eastern Canadian ports lost the transportation of a large proportion of that 75,000,000 bushels of grain because of the Canadian shipping combine on the upper lakes.

Mr. WRIGHT: What cure does the hon. member suggest?

Mr. OLIVER: I am trying to arouse the interest and attention of the House and measurably of the country to a condition as it exists. Unless that interest can be aroused, there is no use proposing a remedy. Unless the country believes that it is being hurt and hurt in this particular, there is no remedy required. I wish to put it beyond argument that there is a damaging condition; that it is seriously damaging. If I can impress that upon the House and the country, then I shall be glad to go into any discussion as to a remedy for it.

The point is that there is on the upper lakes a combine of Canadian shipping interests which is detrimental to the western producer and also to the interests of eastern ocean shipping ports.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am not antagonistic to the views that the hon. gentleman is putting forward. He has my entire sympathy in regard to this question. All I desire is a little more light upon the subject.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Let us have a committee.

Mr. OLIVER: I hope the force with which I have made my statement is not construed by my hon. friend as offering any objection to his question or to any discussion that may arise. I speak strongly because I feel strongly; because I feel that the condition is serious and that the House should be thoroughly aware of how serious it is.

My hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) asks as to the conditions on the ocean. As I understand, the great lines which run to Canadian and American ports are in the one combine. The combine is the same to New York as it is to Montreal, so far as the combine is concerned; but there is this difference, that the tramp steamers which are not in the combine have access to United States ports on terms of less insurance that they have in Canadian ports. Shippers from American ports have that advantage over us, because of that that condition.

Now, in regard to the ocean rates. Every man has received within the past day or two the report of the Council of the Quebec Board of Trade for 1913, in which there is information which seems to me to be almost startling; so far, at any rate as the principle involved is concerned. The assertion is made that the Allan Line carries certain classes of freight, mentioned here, for less money to Montreal than to Quebec, and that as a matter of fact, freight is systematically carried to Montreal by steamer and shipped back to Quebec by rail. Here are some of the figures: Oilcloth in rolls to Montreal 25s.; to Quebec 27s. and 6d. Woollen goods in bales, to Montreal 25s., to Quebec 35s. Pease in bags to Montreal 20s., to Quebec 22s. and 6d.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: How about whisky?

Mr. OLIVER: I had just reached that item, and I am sure my hon. friend will be interested. Whisky in cases to Montreal 30s., to Quebec 32s. 6d.; liquor in cases, to Montreal 30s.; to Quebec, 32s. 6d. It is quite evident that there is discrimination by ocean steamships as between Canadian ports. We have got quite used to the condition on the railways under which it is as cheap or cheaper—or used to be cheaper, I am not sure but that it is yet—to ship oats from Edmonton destined to Kamloops first to Vancouver and thence to Kamloops rather than direct. It is news, however, that the same conditions prevail in regard to ocean traffic and that the city of Quebec, at tide water about 180 miles nearer Liverpool than Montreal, pays 2s. 6d. per 100 lbs., or whatever it may be, more than Montreal pays for freight landed there. I do not know whether an Imperial Trade Commission is necessary to deal with that question; I do not know whether it is a question that is considered to be of serious interest—it is certainly far removed from the locality in which I have any direct interest. But I draw attention to it to let the House know that discrimination and high charges are not peculiar to the West, but that the other parts of Canada suffer somewhat similar conditions.

The main point, however, is that so far as wheat production is concerned, there is work for the Government of Canada to do and work for this Parliament to do, in dealing with the conditions which I have shown on the authority of the Saskatchewan Commission to be so serious, not only to western Canada, but to Canada as a whole. These conditions demand immediate attention; not waiting for the report of an Imperial Trade Commission—which may be altogether useful in itself. These conditions press close home; they ought to be, if they are not, under the jurisdiction of Parliament; and they ought to be dealt with now by Parliament and by the Government.

Mr. BEST: I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the cost to the farmer of wheat-producing land had increased very much and that its producing qualities had decreased very much. Could the hon. gentleman tell us why the land has increased in price while its producing qualities have decreased?

Mr. OLIVER: I think the hon. gentleman misunderstood me; for I did not say the quality of the land had decreased, but the returns from production to the farmer had decreased.

Mr. BEST: I understood that among the causes of increased cost was the increase in the price of the land.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. BEST: If the wheat is so much cheaper and so much more expensive to produce, the producing value of the land is so much less?

Mr. OLIVER: No doubt.

Mr. BEST: Why, then, is there an increase in the price while the producing qualities are decreasing?

Mr. OLIVER: For several years the price of wheat was increasing, and while it was on the increase and before the cost of production had risen owing to the increased cost of articles that the farmer had to buy, land naturally increased in value. But under the conditions that now exist land is not increasing in value and cannot increase in value when the financial returns from the working of that land are on the decrease. The land itself must decrease in value, and that itself is a serious condition. We need not say too much about it, but we all must realize that it is inevitably the case and that it is to the last degree serious to every interest in this country.

Mr. FOSTER: My hon. friend has declared that it is time that this Government and this Parliament should 'wake up.' These are two very good words. I suppose they have been applicable at other times as well as at the present. An interesting side-light—a bit of

history which ought not to escape attention entirely—is thrown upon this discussion to-day by some documents which are at hand and from which I am going to quote to a very small extent. My hon. friend was a member of a very powerful government in this country at a time when the freight rates were going up, moving skyward, rocketing. My hon. friend was from the West then, as he is now; he had the interest of the West at heart, as he has now; the complaints poured into his ears, as he says they are pouring into his ears now. What was done by him and his Government at that time? I am not deterred in the least by the two Latin words 'tu quoque' which will be trotted out in a little time. I am bringing the matter up by way of a little historical sidelight on the position of my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER: If the hon. gentleman wants the answer, I can give it to him in a moment, and I will not use the tu quoque either.

Mr. FOSTER: The hon. gentleman may give an answer but the record speaks plainly, and though he is fairly accurate sometimes the record is a little more accurate than his assertion. So, I propose to take the record. In the early part of 1910, protests showered in upon the then Government with reference to the enhancement of ocean freight rates. The Minister of Railways took the matter up with Judge Mabee who at that time was Chairman of the Railway Board. Judge Mabee prepared what I would call an able memorandum—and he was considered to be an able lawyer. I am not going to read all that memorandum, but I wish to refer to two or three parts of it. In the first place—he states—and that contravenes the dictum of my learned friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) on the law—that the jurisdiction of these controlling bodies his own included—

> —is limited to the land or land and inland water movement. In other words the moment that an export traffic reaches the seaboard of any of those three countries, Government control over it is absolutely lost.

He discusses the matter further by saying:

> Under the present law, when these shipments reach Montreal, control over the rates and conditions of transportation is lost, the result being that for two-thirds of the total distance the traffic moves at the rates the ocean carriers choose to make.

He proceeds to say:

> The time to obtain control over the rates upon this traffic is while it is comparatively in its infancy and not after enormous development has taken place and shipping trusts of all kinds have grown up.

He concludes by suggesting that an international tribunal consisting of the English Railway and Canal Traffic Commission and the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, or certain defined members of those commissions, could by joint legislation be empowered to control all these matters.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the date of that memorandum?

Mr. FOSTER: February 12, 1910. The Minister of External Affairs at that time (Mr. Murphy) presented that report to Council, and a minute of Council was passed, pressing upon the Colonial Secretary the desirability of having a joint tribunal appointed to regulate and control ocean freights. On February 28 Earl Grey sent a copy of that Order in Council, which was dated February 26, 1910, with a covering despatch, to Lord Crewe, who communicated it to the Board of Trade on March 31. The Board of Trade took it into consideration, and on August 4 it advised Lord Crewe, in effect, that a joint inquiry be made by persons designated by the British and Canadian Governments. On August 18 Lord Crewe transmitted that communication to the Canadian Government, asking the Governor General to be kind enough to transmit, as soon as possible, any further observations that might be made by the Canadian Ministry. On August 31, Mr. Walker, a clerk in the office of External Affairs, brought this despatch to the attention of the Minister of Railways. There the matter rested until November 30, 1910, when a despatch was received from Mr. Harcourt, Secretary of State for the Colonies, asking for the minister's views at an early date. Nothing resulted, and on December 20, Mr. Pope called the attention of the Department of Railways to Mr. Harcourt's despatch. From that time on there was no response, and on March 14 the Governor General's office communicated with Mr. Pope, saying that a further despatch had been received from Mr Harcourt, dated March 14, asking again for a reply to his former despatch. All these things took place, and yet there was no action by the Minister of Railways or by the Government in power at that time. Notwithstanding the fact that in February,

1910, hon. gentlemen opposite committed themselves to the principle of a joint tribunal to investigate and control, particulars concerning which were in the hands of the Secretary of State for the Colonies by August of that year, and a communication from him, asking for further observations, received by the Canadian ministry by the last of August of the same year—and that this was followed up by three separate despatches asking for a reply to the first—nothing was done, hon. gentlemen who now, through the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) tell this Government, in tones of thunder, to wake up, at that time did absolutely nothing; nor did they do anything before they went out of office. The criticism is made that this is a matter of such importance that time is an element. If this matter had been put into the hands of a joint tribunal for inquiry and for recommendation, with the disposition of the British Government favourable and accordant action on the part of the Government of Canada, there might have been to-day a joint control of ocean freight rates between Canada and the old country. But my hon. friends did nothing, and now, two years afterwards, they come to us with that trumpet note: 'Wake up; time is very precious.' I just wish to put this matter on the records of the House to show what a most important lapse of memory has taken place and to show that hon. gentlemen opposite for twelve long months had not the time to reply to a despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Under that joint tribunal and commission there might have been an actual and substantial lowering of last year's and this year's freight rates by control of ocean transit, to the benefit of the farmers of the West, about whom these gentlemen, and rightly so, are so much concerned. When the western farmers listen to these fervid appeals for action now, in February, 1914, let them remember, and apportion their judgment accordingly, that in 1910 there was a method offered by which the Government of that day might have had control over the ocean rates upon all grains carried from the West to Great Britain during this last year and the year preceding if they had simply taken the trouble to answer a despatch and put into operation an effective control of these rates.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am sorry that the Minister of Railways is not here; I have no recollection of the correspondence to which my hon. friend refers. But there is one remark which he made to which I wish to call attention. My hon. friend said he was not going to put forward the argument tu quoque—and what has he done?

Mr. FOSTER: My right hon. friend is not quite right in that. I said I was not deterred by any assertion of the tu quoque argument from bringing this matter before the House. It is an absolute tu quoque argument, but it is an historical fact.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Certainly, and my hon. friend has had the advantage which I have not had of perusing the correspondence. He stated he had only read some partial extracts from it to the House. I do not know what are the parts he has left out. I do not know if there is anything involved which had better be put before the House, and I invite him, since he has put part of the correspondence before the House, to put it all on the table so that we may have the advantage of looking at it.

Mr. FOSTER: Certainly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In the meantime I have only to say: what is the use of having a change of government? What is the use of all the inflammatory speeches we had at one time if these gentlemen, on coming into office, are to do just as their predecessors did? Suppose we were lax in 1910 and 1911, is that any justification why my hon. friends, coming after us, should be lax in 1911, 1912, 1913 and 1914. My right hon. friend found that correspondence in the Archives of the Government. He stated that the British Government awaited our reply. Why did he not send a reply? Has he made any reply since the 21st of September 1911? Not a word. By his own confession he has not. And all he has to say now is: You have been derelict in this matter but we have not been any more derelict than you have been. Was it for this that he was put in office? We have had no excuse for this laches of the Government except: You have done as we have done. That is not what the people expect. The people are commencing to be disappointed, and they have good reason to be disappointed. They expected when a new government was in office that everything that was wrong with the late Government would be better. But by the confession of my hon. friend himself we left that matter in 1910 for him to deal with; he comes in, a new broom—and the new broom does not

sweep at all. I would remind him that in 1911 we were very busy.

Mr. FOSTER: Too busy to look after the farmers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Not too busy to look after the farmers, we were looking after the farmers at that time.

Mr. FOSTER: Looking after their votes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And the farmers have told my hon. friend again and again: Give us the United States market for our wheat. That is the best way of dealing with the freight rates question. My hon. friend will not even communicate with the English Government, and when the farmers come here asking to have a competitive rate, my hon. friend turns a deaf ear to them. That is all the explanation my hon. friend has to give. Can he say that we were at all negligent? In the midst of a stormy session in 1911 when I had to leave the business of the session to attend the Imperial Conference, in England, this very question came up, and it was I who moved at the Imperial Conference for the establishment of that very Imperial Commission for which my hon. friend is now asking an appropriation. To this commission I myself moved that this very matter of ocean freight rates should be referred; and yet my hon. friend has the audacity to say we were derelict in our duty in respect to it.

Mr. FOSTER: Just a word to clear up some of the mists that are around the mind of my right hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Better look to yourself.

Mr. FOSTER: No doubt my right hon. friend is perfectly right in saying that they were looking after the farmers in 1911; that is, they were looking after the farmers' votes. They were awfully diligent about that, but they did not show the same diligence in looking after the farmers' freight rates for nine, ten or twelve months before. It was a tremendous task, no doubt, it required much time for consideration. But what were the facts of the case? In February, 1910, they had come to the conclusion that a joint tribunal was the proper thing, and had asked the British Government if they would join with them in constituting one. They had made up their minds, there was no necessity for any time to consider, they had come to a conclusion on a point of policy and their policy was a joint tribunal, if it could be brought about, between Great Britain and ourselves, in order to control freight rates. In August, 1910, the British Government acceded to their matured opinions and the way was cleared, all obstacles to the appointment of the tribunal were swept away, except one, and that was the time that was necessary for some minister of the Government to sit down and write a despatch agreeing to have a joint tribunal between Canada and Great Britain, and naming the persons who should act for Canada. For 12 whole months no reply was sent to an acceptance of a proposal which they had made. But my right hon. friend is a little out again. He said the new broom did not sweep, meaning the present Government. Neither did theirs. But the facts are the very opposite. They made the handle of the broom; the British Government made the brush of the broom, they had the handle fitted so that one-half minute's work would have put it into the brush so that the brush would sweep; but they were so anxious for the farmers' votes that they did not want to sweep in order that the farmers freight rates might be reduced. We came into office, and to-day not only is there a proposal, but there is an accepted arrangement, by which a joint tribunal is to-day looking into this very matter of control of ocean freight rates. So that our broom has swept, and we have shown that we are looking after the farmers' interests, having got their votes. My right hon. friend looked after them, but he did not get all of them. We got our proper proportion of them and addressed ourselves gratefully to guard the farmers in that respect.

At six o'clock, the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I want to refer to some of the incidents of the debate this afternoon. I appreciate very much what my good friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce said about my being a lawyer and an outlaw. That term may be rather a compliment in this country. But it is a strange thing that any one who criticises in a reasonable way—and I think I was reasonable enough—the railways or other corporations in this country, should be called a corporation baiter, and be told that he is most unfair and does not know what he is talking about. A friend of mine in the Cabinet also spoke of me the other day as John the Baptist, because I happened to have some

original views as to public affairs in this country.

Mr. FOSTER: That is a compliment.

Mr. MACLEAN: I think it is a compliment. I am proud that I am not a lawyer, and I can say to the hon. gentleman who was Minister of Marine that perhaps he is a sea lawyer. We all know that a sea lawyer is a man who has an opinion of his own. In a very delicate way, he suggested to the Chairman this afternoon that perhaps I was an outlaw as regards the discussion I raised, although I imagine I was quite within the rules of the House. Be that as it may, I want to recall to him and to other members of the House a little incident which occurred in this House touching on my legal knowledge and which also bears on this question. A good many years ago, I was trying to call the attention of the House to an amendment that I proposed to the Railway Act, that express rates should be controlled by the Railway Commission, and the present eminent and learned Chief Justice of Canada who was then the Minister of Justice, got up in the House and gave his high legal opinion that I was unconstitutional, inasmuch as express rates concerned inland navigation, stages and railways, which were outside the jurisdiction of this House. He was backed up in that opinion by another eminent lawyer in the House, now the Prime Minister, and between the two the House was persuaded that I was acting unconstitutionally and my proposal was turned down. But, it was not long before this House adopted the principle that we had control over express rates and we made the express companies come to time. In the same way I say we have control over these steamboat companies. They load at our ports and we can get at them in that way. Furthermore, we subsidize them to carry His Majesty's mails. We build ports for them, and they are part of the railroads of this country. These railroad companies give bills of lading from the point of origination of the freight rates across to the other side, and in that way they come within our jurisdiction. We have jurisdiction over them in a great many other ways. I know that the usual way of getting by any question is to get a lawyer's opinion on it. They presented the opinion of the late Chairman of the Railway Commission who suggested that a commission go across the ocean, and the Government of that day took advantage of that. And now the same thing has happened to-day, only in a more veiled and expert way. Another commission is to go and look at conditions in the Old Country. That will not do. You can always take advantage of a legal subterfuge of that kind. I contend that this Parliament has full jurisdiction over these companies, and that we do not need to go to England for any assistance in that matter. All the facts could be elicited by a parliamentary committee of this House. We could send for all these people and find out how this combine originated, and who are the members of it, and let the people of Canada know. If we did that, we should find out that all these companies are the creatures of this Parliament, and are within the jurisdiction of Parliament; and if we made the issue as between them and the people of Canada it would have such an effect on them that that combine would be dissolved the very next day. But if we are to put off dealing with this matter until some commission reports on it, and until other countries have to be consulted, the evils will never be cured. My suggestion is, and I make it with all respect, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce take this question with him to the Imperial Commission and let him take with him all the information that can be obtained by a parliamentary committee of this House. I do not know whether that Commission has the power to summon and swear witnesses and get evidence as we have here. We could bring them all here within a couple of days and get all the facts about this ocean combine, what its object is, under what law they are organized, and why they seek to take away from the Canadian farmer every advantage that accrues to him because of the immense expenditure this country has made for the improvement of navigation. If we are going to spend, not a hundred million dollars but two or three hundred million dollars, on new ports, on deepening canals, and on the improvement of navigation generally, and a shipping combine is to be allowed to take away all this from us, then we had better confess that this is not a self-governing country, that we are not competent to deal with these questions and that the Parliament of Canada is less than the corporations it has created. This is a most serious question and it has to be settled. It cannot be trifled with, as it was trifled with by the previous Government according to the Minister of Trade and Commerce this afternoon, and it will be more or less trifled with if we send it to the commission. A parliamentary committee could get all the facts in a very

short time, and then if we found we could not deal with it we could give those facts to the minister; but I am confident that an investigating committee of this House could get the facts and force a dissolution of that combine within a month, or two at the most.

Mr. OLIVER: When the Minister of Trade and Commerce was speaking, he dealt with the condition that I had endeavoured to lay before the House and the country in regard to the grain trade of Canada. I cannot put into words how strongly I feel that the country must be disappointed at not hearing from the hon. gentleman, either a denial of the conditions or a suggested remedy for them. The hon. gentleman satisfied himself in dealing with a condition that must be admitted to be of the gravest national character, by calling in question the inaction of his predecessors in office. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the questions before Canada at the present time in regard to the price of wheat, in regard to the condition of transportation, in regard to the consequences to the trade, finances and industry of Canada at large, is not ameliorated, or remedied by any reference to the conduct or misconduct of my hon. friend's predecessors in office. I do not think it would be a useful expenditure of time to defend the position of the late Government in this matter that my hon. friend has seen fit to attack. He asserts that the late Government opened the question of ocean freight rates with the Imperial Government and carrried the matter no further. I am not in a position to give reasons for the action, or inaction, of that day, nor, do I think it is material to the discussion.

Let me draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that there is a serious change in conditions between that date and the present, and that the change of conditions emphasizes to such a degree the necessity of action by the present Government that no possible measure of shortcomings by the late Government relieves them from the responsibility. Since the late Government went out of office the price to the farmer for his product has decreased by 8 cents a bushel according to the report of the Saskatchewan Grain Commission. Assuming the marketable product of the wheat of the West to be 150,000,000 bushels, my hon. friend can see by these figures that the difference in value to the farmer for his product as between this year and the year in which my hon. friend took office is a matter of some $12,000,000. That surely is a sum of sufficient amount to show that if it was a matter of urgency then it is a matter of still more pressing urgency to-day. If the late Government may have been justified we will say, in putting something else before the question of ocean freight rates, these are 12,000,000 reasons why the present Government are not so justified in taking no other action.

It is not only the fact that the price to the farmer has been reduced by reason of the shipping combine, as well as by the operations of the world's markets, but it is also a fact that the cost of production has been increased. The reports that are published from month to month by the Department of Labour give a statement as to the increased cost of living throughout Canada. That increased cost of living affects the farmer on the prairie just as it affects everybody else throughout the country, and that makes it as necessary that he should receive a greater price for his product if he is to get an equal profit upon it as that the salaried official in the city of Ottawa should receive an increase in his salary if he is going to be in as good a financial position at the end of this year as last year. Not only is there an increase in the cost of living, but there has been an increase in the bank rate of interest. The increase in the cost of land has to be provided for and, according to the report of the Saskatchewan Commission, the farmer is to-day twelve per cent worse off in the cost of production than he was in 1909. The greater part of the increase in the cost of production has taken place in the latter two years rather than in the former two years. My hon. friend must therefore admit that if the position was urgent in 1910 it is proportionately more urgent to-day.

But instead of my hon. friend coming forward with a remedy, he comes forward with the statement that the late Government failed to take action in regard to a matter as to which they themselves had raised the question. If that is the only answer that my hon. friend has to give, if all the country has to look for at the hands of this Government is the reply, that whatever the conditions may have been in the past history of Canada no action dealing with that condition was taken and if that is a justification for no action being taken at the present moment, all I have to say is that the condition of the country is not hopeful under the administration of my hon. friend.

The condition that exists calls for

remedy, but I want to point out that I was not putting forward the responsibility of the Government in regard to ocean freight rates. I was careful not to put that responsibility forward because I appreciate very fully that with the best of intentions this Government, or any Government, must, in the nature of things, have such a limited measure of control over ocean freight rates that there can be no great results looked for with any degree of certainty from effort in that regard. We will be glad if the efforts that are put forward by the present Government result favourably in securing a reduction. We will be glad to give them every credit for their success, if success they achieve. But I cannot look with any great hope upon the prospect. A joint arrangement between the authorities of Canada and the authorities of Great Britain in regard to shipping rates across the ocean must strike anybody as a rather one-sided proposition. While Canada sends and receives a large part of the freight, the vessels are owned in Great Britain, and the dividends are paid in Great Britain. It stands to reason that British interests, looking at those interests as humanly selfish, naturally they would look for the greatest revenue that could be secured from the operations of the ships. Therefore, in the nature of things, so far as assistance from the British end of the conference is concerned, we can at best expect sympathetic consideration of the conditions under which we labour. I shall be glad if I am disappointed. I shall be pleased if the Government is able to do better than I hope, but I must say that I do not consider the outlook at all hopeful in that regard. It was for that reason, as well as for others, that I urged upon the Government attention to those matters that were within their control and under their responsibility. I protested against setting up the idea of looking for relief across the ocean, where relief might never be secured, and of ignoring the responsibility of providing such measure of relief as could be secured nearer home. In regard to the shipping combine on the upper lakes, there is no doubt that it is under the jurisdiction of this Parliament.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: What does the hon. member mean by a combine on the upper lakes? Does he mean that one company has control over the freight rates, or that the different companies are combined in order to keep up the freight rates?

[Mr. Oliver.]

Mr. OLIVER: I think the latter position is probably the correct one. My hon. friend is aware that one company has absorbed a large portion of the lake shipping, and therefore is in a very convenient position either to compel its competitors to come to terms or to make favourable arrangements with them. We need not traverse that ground again. The fact remains that, because of the existence of a shipping combine on the upper lakes, 76,500,000 bushels of Canadian grain found an outlet through United States ports last year as against 57,900,000 bushels through Canadian ports.

Mr. FOSTER: Has my hon. friend the figures of last year so that he can compare relatively what passed out by each way last year and this year?

Mr. OLIVER: I have not the figures, but my information is that just in proportion as the shipping combine on the upper lakes strengthened its position, in the same proportion Canadian grain was forced into American channels.

Mr. FOSTER: I have an impression that the facts of the case are that, as compared with the United States, a very much larger quantity went by way of Montreal this year than last.

Mr. OLIVER: I have not the figures; but it will not be denied, that not very many years ago Montreal was bulletined throughout America as being the leading grain shipping port of the continent; that it had actually surpassed New York in its amount of wheat shipments. That is not the fact to-day. Not only is it not the fact, but Montreal is not getting even half of the Canadian shipments. That is absolute evidence that something is wrong. I may be mistaken in my judgment as to the cause, but there is no question as to the fact. As I have already said and urged, a certain condition being found to exist it is the business of the Government to find out what the causes are and to prescribe the remedy. I will go so far as to suggest a remedy, a drastic one it is true, but I believe an effective remedy, only to be used in case of emergency, namely, to permit the United States shippers to carry Canadian grain from one Canadian port to another. I have some confidence that that would bring the shipping combine to a realization of the fact that they did not own Canada; that they did not own the farmer of the Northwest, and that it was

not their privilege to strangle him whenever they saw fit.

There is another means whereby the farmer could be given relief. I should not use the word 'farmer'; I should not say that the farmer could be given relief, because this is not a question of the farmer only; it is a question of the business of the Dominion of Canada.

A short time ago there was moved in this House a resolution urging upon the Government the desirability of removing the duty on wheat as a means of securing the free entry of wheat into the United States. As to the advantage of that to the Canadian farmer and to the businessman who depends upon the farmer, I quote the latest price list that I find in the Grain Growers' Guide of February 11, showing that No. 1 Northern for cash was worth 87¼ cents in Winnipeg and 91½ cents in Minneapolis. It is, however, a well known fact that Canadian grades are higher than those of the United States and that Canadian No. 2 is quite equal to American No. 1. Therefore, the comparison would be No. 2 Northern at Winnipeg, 85¼ cents; No. 1 Northern at Minneapolis, 91½ cents, or a difference of nearly six cents a bushel. With this market of Minneapolis standing at a figure six cents higher than the market at Winnipeg, if there is an opportunity to secure access to the Minneapolis market for Canadian wheat so that the Canadian producer could get the benefit of that six cents per bushel more, there is at least a prima facie case for the Government to take such action as would give that opportunity.

Mr. FOSTER: If I understand my hon. friend's argument, it is, that, because the quotations of what he calls an equal quality of wheat in Minneapolis ranges six cents a bushel higher than in Winnipeg, therefore, if there were no duty intervening between those two points, our wheat would have an increased advantage of six cents per bushel. That is the argument if there is anything in it. It may be modified a little by saying that there would be some charges midway according to the destination of the wheat. The argument is that it is the duty that causes that difference in price between Winnipeg and Minneapolis. Suppose the hon. gentleman takes two cities in the United States, perhaps not further apart, and consults the quotations, he will find time after time a difference of two cents, three cents, four cents, five cents, six cents, sometimes as much as nine cents a bushel between the two. There is no intervening duty there, so in that case it is clearly not the duty which makes the difference in price. Does not that lead the hon. gentleman to believe that there are other factors besides the duty, and that he has not quite proved his case from the one citation he has made? This matter of trade and prices is a pretty wide, round, long, deep business.

Mr. OLIVER: I am quite willing to admit that there are other factors entering into the price of wheat, and I will not urge for a moment that the removal of the duty will invariably give to the Canadian producer six cents a bushel more for his wheat. But I do say that, the conditions in Minneapolis being as they are, Minneapolis being the great milling centre of the United States, the great wheat market of the United States, and that market showing consistently a price measurably, considerably, notably higher than that of Winnipeg—that is when Winnipeg has any wheat to sell—it is evident that the removal of the duty would accrue to the benefit of the Canadian producer. It appears to me to be a clear prima facie case, and the Government is certainly not doing its duty to the country if it does not try this matter out by actual experiment.

Mr. MORPHY: Is there any reason to feel that Canada cannot be the great milling country of the world, with the wheat in our own country and the mills here or to be brought here? Would not that be worth while?

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend is asking a question which rather diverts me from the argument I wish to make, but as he has asked it, I would say that mills operate not only for the purpose of grinding wheat, but also for the purpose of selling flour; and you require a population in order to have a market for flour you grind. And as long as the United States has 90,000,000 of people and Canada has only 7,000,000, there is, in the nature of the case, a much larger market for flour in the United States than in Canada, and therefore the United States must be a better milling country.

Mr. FOSTER: Not necessarily a larger market for Canadian wheat.

Mr. MORPHY: How much flour does the United States export to the foreign markets of the world yearly?

Mr. OLIVER: I could not give the information offhand.

Mr. MORPHY: It is a large quantity.

Mr. OLIVER: I know they do export a great deal of flour. But I know as a matter of fact also that they are prepared to buy our wheat, for reasons that are well known. Our wheat is required by them for the purpose of mixing with their wheat of different quality; I will not say of lower quality, but it does not command an equal price. Therefore there is a standing demand in the United States for the quality of wheat that we raise, not only because of their great home milling industry, but also because of their export milling industry; and they are willing to pay a higher price for that wheat than our Canadian millers are willing or able to pay. As to the reasons for that I do not speak, but the facts are as they are. It is not for me to weary the House with details, but I put it on the lowest possible basis: there being a prima facie case, the Government is not doing its duty by the country and by the western farmer, under the present conditions of reduced prices and higher cost of production, if it does not give the farmer an opportunity to reach more buyers by opening an important market. Everything that my hon. friend has suggested here to-night was suggested and repeated in regard to the price of cattle. When we were discussing the advantages of reciprocity with the United States, we were told—just as my hon. friend has it in his mind with regard to wheat—that, since the United States exported cattle we could not find a market for our cattle in the United States, although the United States market prices were higher. Since that time the United States duty on cattle has been removed, and the consequence has been that the price of cattle to the farmers throughout Canada has increased very substantially, not only in the county which my hon. friend represents, but also in the county which I represent, and he knows it perfectly well.

Mr. MORPHY: Not feeding cattle, but young cattle and stockers.

Mr. OLIVER: Cattle, anyway. There is a substantial advance in the price of cattle in that part of the country since the removal of the United States duty on cattle. The United States export cattle and they export wheat; yet they buy wheat and they buy cattle, and they will give us better prices than we get to-day.

[Mr. Morphy.]

Mr. MORPHY: Will the hon. gentleman allow me another question? Under the conditions he lays down, the United States would be sending wheat back here free?

Mr. OLIVER: Sure.

Mr. MORPHY: They export somewhere about 100,000,000 bushels a year of soft wheat. That would open to the American farmer in the Toledo district the market of the Canadian farmer in Ontario, and reduce his price from ten to twenty cents a bushel. Does the hon. gentleman want that?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not think there would be any such reduction in price.

Mr. MORPHY: Authorities say so.

Mr. OLIVER: Of course, the authorities may be correct, but I say——

Mr. MORPHY: If that is true, would the hon. gentleman willingly submit the Ontario farmer to it?

Mr. OLIVER: I am coming to that. I am going to quote the deputation of western farmers and Ontario farmers who met this Government shortly after the opening of this session with a series of resolutions, and one of the first of these resolutions was a demand that food should be made free of taxes, because they said that taxes on food were a crime against humanity. And I say that if this duty on wheat keeps up the price of flour unduly throughout this industrial and manufacturing section of Canada, it is doing a damage to the success, the prosperity and progress of Canada, and it is not doing a corresponding benefit to the man who produces the wheat.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid the discussion is wandering beyond the scope of the resolution which is on the item 'Imperial Trade Commission.' A discussion on the question of free food is rather outside the item before the Chair.

Mr. OLIVER: I was only answering my hon. friend.

Mr. MORPHY: But you were not answering, that is the trouble.

Mr. OLIVER: I was trying to answer. I was doing the best I could; if I could not make my hon. friend appreciate my point of view, that is my misfortune. I was showing courtesy to my hon. friend by giving him the answer I thought best to the question he asked. I did not wish to

pursue that side of the question except in reply to him.

I assume that I shall not be out of order in having offered one or two suggestions to the minister as to improvement of trade conditions in the country by bettering prices to the farmer, I offer as well, a third. The Canadian Gazette, of London, England, has been dealing with this question of the shipping combine. That journal has given the country the benefit of its views, and, if I may, I will offer to the House a paragraph giving the conclusion at which it arrives. After pointing out the difficulties of any enforced reduction of rates on ocean vessels, the Gazette concludes:

> The densely populated towns of the motherland are the true market for Canada's produce, and the ever-expanding centres of Canada are the natural markets for the British manufacturer of goods which Canada does not and will not for many years make for herself. Let Canada buy more from England rather than from the United States and other foreign lands and the steamship facilities and lower rates will come naturally enough. The grain-growers of the Canadian west have for some years desired a gradual increase in the British preference in the Canadian tariff with a view to the ultimate establishment of freer trade, if not 'free trade,' within the British Empire.

The suggestion is that a reduction of the tariff between Canada and England would, by increasing trade between the two countries, tend to reduce the cost of shipment and thereby bring about the result that is looked for—cheapening the cost of transportation of western wheat to the Liverpool market.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would that reduced cost of living be effected at the expense of the West, or of the East?

Mr. OLIVER: I was under the impression that as everybody, both West and East, eats three meals a day and wears the same kind of clothing, anything that would reduce the cost of living anywhere would reduce it everywhere.

Mr. BURNHAM: No, it does not.

Mr. OLIVER: I am quite unable to follow my hon. friend; I was under the impression that that would be the effect. The hon. minister has declined to offer any suggestions of relief for existing conditions. I have made certain suggestions which I am sure he will not accept; I am now going to make another. He refuses to take the duty off wheat, thereby giving it free access to the markets of the United States; he refuses, I presume, to reduce the duties on goods coming from Great Britain into Canada, thereby securing cheaper facilities for trade between this country and Great Britain; I am sure he will not take measures against the shipping combine on the upper lakes. Will he, then, increase the price of the farmer's wheat by increasing the duty on wheat? If this Government believes in a national policy, a policy of high tariffs, a policy of protection of Canadian industries, now is the time for them to show their faith in that belief.

Mr. AIKINS: Does the hon. gentleman think it would be to the advantage of Canada to have a higher duty on wheat?

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend need not ask me that question; I say, certainly not. But I do say this: if this Government believes what it preaches; if it believes that a high tariff will make prosperity, that a high tariff will raise prices, now is the time for them to show their faith in that belief. Let them raise the price of the farmer's wheat by increasing the duty on wheat. Mr. Chairman, I am a protectionist.

Mr. AIKINS: Since when?

Mr. OLIVER: Always. I believe in legislation that will improve the condition of the country, and if my hon. friends, by increasing the duty on wheat, will correspondingly increase the price of wheat to the farmer, I will support them. Do hon. gentlemen believe in what they preach, or do they not? They will not reduce the duty on the wheat, because, as my hon. friend believes, it would do the farmers harm; will they, then, increase the duty on wheat and do the farmers good? This Government has been in power two years; during those two years the price of wheat has gone consistently down and the cost of living has gone consistently up. The area of cultivation in the western provinces, because of those conditions, has been at a standstill, if it has not decreased. Homestead entries have dropped by 9,000 in two years, as the result of the policy and administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. If this policy of theirs is good, if they believe that it is good, now is the time for them to take such action as I have suggested. But my hon. friends know that their policy is a sham; they know it is a fraud; they know they cannot better the prices of the farmers' wheat by increasing the duty on wheat, and they will not take that means of remedying existing conditions.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) devoted a great part of his speeches this afternoon, as well

as of his remarks this evening, to trying to prove that there was a combination in connection with freight rates on the upper lakes, and that this combination had been fostered by the present Government.

Mr. OLIVER: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I want it to be understood distinctly that in all I said this afternoon and this evening, I kept as far away as I could from any charge against the present Government or what they had or had not done, for the purpose of urging upon them the necessity of doing something in the future.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman at least encouraged the House to believe that this combination to increase prices has sprung up within the last year or two.

Mr. OLIVER: No.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman pointed out the fact that there has been an amalgamation of a series of upper lakes companies, with the result that the prices for the carriage of grain on the upper lakes have been increased. If my hon. friend looks them up he will find that the rates from Lake Superior ports, Duluth or Fort William, to Buffalo or other Georgian bay points, are invariably the same. The hon. gentleman said this afternoon that the rate last year varied from one to 3¾ cents. He forgot to tell the committee that the rate of 3¾ cents included not only carriage, but also the storage of the grain in the vessel all winter, this storage as well as carriage facilities being afforded by the vessel owner. The fact that the vessel is used as a floating elevator during the winter season throws a different light upon the matter. I wish to quote from the Buffalo Board of Trade Report—and I am sorry that it runs down only to 1908—the different prices that have prevailed on the upper lakes. In 1899 the price varied from 2½ to 6 cents a bushel, which is much higher than it was last year. In 1904, the price varied from 1 cent to 5 cents a bushel; in 1905, from 1¼ to 4 cents a bushel. So hon. gentlemen will see that the rates have very often been higher than they were last year. As to the restraining of competition and the fixing of rates by these companies, let us see what the facts really are. I hold in my hand a little book issued by a Cleveland firm, which shows that approximately the number of vessels that are on the Great Lakes, both United States and Canadian, is 1,300. I do not say that these are all grain carriers; some of them are not, but a very large proportion of them are. I do not think there are over 75 or 100 Canadian grain freighters on the upper lakes; the amalgamation of last year, to which my hon. friend referred, does not operate over 40 grain freighters. If the hon. gentleman will peruse the list he will find that the bulk of these freighters are very small vessels; they do not commence to compare with the large freighters of the steel trust or other United States companies.

Some of the American vessels carry thirteen thousand tons, while the bulk of the Canadian freighters carry not over three thousand tons. There are upwards of eight or ten different companies on the Canadian side. I do not believe there is any collusion or arrangement between these companies to preserve rates, and for the reason that it is an utter impossibility that a hundred vessels competing against a thousand could control the rates. The hon. gentleman stated this afternoon that there is always the American competition because the American vessels can carry the grain from Port Arthur or Fort William to Buffalo. He also stated that the export trade in grain of the port of Montreal was falling off. If he had looked up the annual report of the Board of Trade of Montreal, at page 52, he would have seen that while in 1909 there were exported from Montreal 11,691,000 bushels, the next year there were exported 21,500,000; the next year 21,000,000; the next year 25,500,000 and in 1913, 44,000,000 bushels. The port of Montreal last year did the biggest business it has ever done. The trouble is that we have not proper facilities at Montreal. Any man who has done business out of Montreal can tell you that the grain is delayed there, apart and aside from the question of better rates from New York to the British Empire or to Europe. But there is no question that we have not been able to get grain away from Montreal fast enough; and in these Government elevators I think a great mistake was made last year in that people were permitted to keep grain there for speculation. I am informed that vessels lay often as long as twenty days at a time unable to load, while thousands of cars were standing in the yard. We have been making advances in the past year or two in the port of Montreal, as is shown by the report that last year we exported 44,000,000 bushels from that port. It is quite true that at Buffalo they took in 150,000,000 bushels. Of course the bulk of that is not exported, but is manufactured into flour right in the United States. The

business of the port of Montreal has not been a matter of a few years but of many years, and no doubt when the trade of Montreal has increased proportionately for a few years more the larger proportion of the grain now going out by American ports will go down by our own route. To argue that any combination exists on the upper lakes among the sixty or seventy-five Canadian vessels, and that they can muzzle trade and fix prices, is absurd, because last year was the first year when a combination would have been possible. yet as a matter of fact the rates last year were lower than for several years. In November and December when the greatest volume of grain is pushed forward the rates were much lower than for many

9 p.m.

years before, and the rates from Duluth to Buffalo were correspondingly in proportion just what they are from Fort William to any port on the Georgian bay. The hon. gentleman should not despair as to the trade of Canada going to the United States. Let me tell him that twenty-five years ago only one million bushels of grain came into the Georgian bay and there were only two elevators, a small one at Collingwood and one at Midland. Turn up the records in the office of the Minister of Trade and Commerce for last year and it will be seen that they handled, at Collingwood over ten million bushels; at Midland over thirty million bushels; at Port McNicoll over ten million bushels and at Depot Harbour over ten million bushels, so that in twenty-five years the trade of the Georgian bay in grain has increased from one million bushels to over fifty million bushels, something that, I think, we should be very thankful for. The whole crux of the position to-day is that the Government must advance to the work of Montreal sufficient money to equip elevators there. Whether that is done by the Government direct or through the Montreal Harbour Commission is unimportant, but the trade has increased so that more adequate elevator accommodation should be provided. In addition to that there should be more stringent rules to compel people to pass the grain through those elevators, rather than store it with these improvements the trade of the port of Montreal would be very much increased.

On the question of the ocean freight rates I believe a great wrong is being done and it is to be hoped by everybody that the rates on the ocean liners will be decreased very materially in the next few years. How that is to be done I know not, but I think the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) and any other hon. gentlemen who endeavour to keep this reform to the forefront are conferring a benefit not only on the West but on the whole of Canada, and I hope that these rates may be reduced very materially.

Mr. McCREA. I think that excessive freight rates, rail and ocean, not only affect the wheat trade, and the western trade, but affect the whole of Canada. They affect everything in the shipping line, and what affects trade affects everybody. I was somewhat surprised a minute ago when the hon. member from Edmonton stated that the ocean freight rate on a thousand bushels of wheat, was formerly $40 but had increased to $75 in the last few years. The original rate would be four cents a bushel and the present rate would be seven and a half cents. When you compare that with existing rates and past rates on lumber you will conclude that the lumber dealers have a great deal more occasion to complain than the wheat dealers, although I believe the wheat dealers have sufficient ground for complaint. In 1910 the ocean rates on lumber were anything from 32 shillings to 36 shillings per standard, or about $4.50 a thousand, from Quebec or Gaspé ports to Liverpool. The rate last year on the same class of lumber was about 65 shillings a standard, or, in other words, a little over $8 a thousand feet board measure. If you get down to actual weight per hundred, a thousand feet of lumber, if at all dry, weighs less than three thousand pounds. A standard of 1,980 feet, approximately 2,000 feet or 6,000 pounds at 65 shillings or $16, which is a little over 25 cents a hundred. That is the rate that exists to-day on spruce and lumber to Liverpool, London and other points. On square timber the rate in 1910 was 52 shillings a standard, or equal to about $10.50 a thousand. If there is any class of freight that, comparing the weight with the value, ought to have a low rate it is lumber. Nothing less the freight quoted by the steamship people to-day from Portland or even from West St. John is seventeen cents a hundred pounds—equal to $10.50 a thousand feet. The first question to be considered is, does a grievance exist? I was a little surprised at the Minister of Trade and Commerce retorting: When your party was in office what did you do? That does not seem to me to be the right way of dealing

with this matter. The next question is, have the Government any power to remedy that grievance, and if they have, what are they doing towards remedying it? It is not a question of, what one government did when in power. Gentlemen opposite did not talk that way in 1911. Then they said: the Government is not doing its duty; put us in office and we will conduct the affairs of this country in a businesslike way. But we are now in the third session under the new Government and nothing has been done. If the Government have not power to remedy that grievance, is there any machinery by which they could remedy it. If there is let them get busy and do it. The whole country is suffering. To give a concrete case: in 1912 a shipper with whom I am pretty well acquainted, wished to ship timber in the winter months, but during the winter months the railway company could not supply cars. When navigation opened in Montreal, the steamship company gave a through Bill of lading for the cargo but at that time there was a strike in Liverpool and it was eighty-two days from the day the timber was loaded until it was landed at Liverpool. Timber when dressed and in shipping condition is about as perishable as fruit. If it is exposed to the sun and weather it becomes suncracked and weather beaten, so that it is unsaleable when it reaches the market. This timber reached the market in that condition, was rejected by the buyer and had to be sold at cull timber prices. When he asked the shipping interests to compensate him for this loss he got no satisfaction and he could not reach them. I am not blaming anybody especially, but that is the condition that exists. I believe that the high cost of living and high wages have something to do with these heavy ocean rates, but they are, I maintain, out of all proportion and some remedy should be found so that the shippers of this country will not suffer as they do at present.

Trade and Commerce—Census and statistics, $75,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is the state of the census at the present time; how near is it to completion?

Mr. FOSTER: As to the work completed and published, there is volume 1, containing the tables of population of Canada by provinces, census districts and sub-districts; volume 2, tables of religions, races, birth-places, citizenship, illiteracy and infirmities; and volume 3, manufactures by provinces, districts, cities, towns, and incorporated villages of 1,500 and over in population, with comparative tables. Three volumes of the census are completed and published. Eighteen bulletins have been issued dealing with manufactures, dairying industry, agriculture in the different provinces, illiteracy, ages, and infirmities. That leaves to be completed two volumes, and the tables of volume 4, comprising the natural products of the country, namely, agricultural products, mines, forests, and fisheries are nearly all ready for the printer. Volume 5 will contain the following tables: school attendance (that is completed), dwellings and families (completed), churches (partly compiled), schools and colleges (partly compiled), charitable and penal institutions (partly compiled), immigration (partly compiled). Occupations and wage earners have yet to be compiled. To sum up, three volumes are completed and published, and of two others, one is ready for the printer, or nearly so, and the other has a large number of its material already compiled.

Mr. SINCLAIR: When does the minister expect the work will be completed.

Mr. FOSTER: It is being carried forward as rapidly as possible; I do not know exactly when it will be completed, but sufficient help is being given to the officers to carry on the work of compilation just as rapidly as it can be done.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How many are there on the staff at present?

Mr. FOSTER: I could not say exactly, but outside the permanent officers I think there are about 75 on the staff.

Mr. OLIVER: At the last redistribution a map of the western provinces showing the population of the townships was prepared with the assistance of the Census Department. It was very convenient for us in outlining new constituencies. I would like to ask if such a map is being, or will be, prepared for the forthcoming redistribution; or, if not, would it be possible to have such a map prepared?

Mr. FOSTER: I will take a note of it and make inquiries. The map would be made in the Interior Department, we furnishing the population statistics.

Mr. OLIVER: It is only by means of such a map that it would be posible to get a really accurate knowledge of the population.

Mr. FOSTER: I will inquire about it.

Mr. MICHAUD: Mr. Chairman, I desire to give a word of explanation with reference to the fact that in the last census the average attendance of children at the schools of New Brunswick was reported to be very low. Under the laws of the province of New Brunswick children are not allowed to attend school until they have reached the age of six. In other provinces it seems that children at the age of five are allowed to attend school. The average attendance in New Brunswick is lower than in some of the other provinces on account of the fact that children are not allowed to attend school before they are six years of age.

Trade and Commerce—West India cables, $38,933.33.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has there been a reduction of cable rates?

Mr. FOSTER: For a long time—I do not know how long, but I suppose from the inception of the cable service into the West India Islands—the rates have been very high and they formed a veritable impediment to trade between Great Britain, this continent, including Canada, and the West India Islands. There were different companies in the West India Islands. One was the Panama Company, which worked through United States territory and through the territory from Key West and along and in conjunction with some other cables through different parts of the Islands. Then later, there came a direct cable from Halifax to Bermuda, and shortly afterwards an extension was made from Bermuda to Jamaica and Turks Island. That brought about a notable reduction as far as Jamaica and Bermuda were concerned. But the West India Direct Cable Company, terminating at Jamaica, found itself up against these cable companies that went around to the other islands, and were under certain contracts and agreements with which I will not trouble the committee. The result was that cables that went by the Direct Company through to Bermuda and Jamaica were not forwarded by the other companies. They refused to give them right of way except upon their own terms and at their own charges. Competition was not gained at all so far as all the West India Islands were concerned with the building of the Halifax, Bermuda and Jamaica lines. The rates were very high, higher than in any civilized countries in the world, and there has been an attempt in various ways to reduce them. When the West India delegates were here that matter was taken up, and as hon. gentlemen know who have read, and I suppose all have read, the Minutes of the Conference, the result was that an agreement was reached by which Canada was asked to represent to the British Government the nature of things and endeavour to bring about a reduction of the rates. Canada at that time offered to share with Great Britain whatever was necessary, in addition to the subsidy paid by the West India Islands, which was all they could afford to pay, to bring about an amelioration. When I went to England afterwards I took up the matter with the Postmaster General and with the two companies. To make a long story short, after a year and a half or so of negotiations the Postmaster General came to an agreement by which the West India Panama Company undertook to better its service, to give right of way to all cables which went through from Halifax to Jamaica via Bermuda, and to reduce the rates in all just about one-half of the former rates. These rates are now satisfactory to the business people of Great Britain, Canada and the West Indies.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the rate per word?

Mr. FOSTER: There are different rates to the different islands.

Mr. LEMIEUX: From Halifax to Bermuda?

Mr. FOSTER: I think I had better finish my explanation before I answer that question. The arrangement made was that this Panama Company should receive a subsidy of £16,000 for ten years, £8,000 of that to be provided by Great Britain, and £8,000 by Canada, and in addition it was to receive £10,300 or £10,500 to be contributed by the West India Islands. This subsidy is to be given without reduction for four years. After four years all of the revenue, beyond a certain calculated amount, is to be placed in a fund and payments are to be made in reduction of the subsidy given by Great Britain and by Canada in proportion as the revenue surpasses that fixed sum.

Mr. NESBITT: The West Indies do not participate in that rebate, if any?

Mr. FOSTER: The West Indies do not participate in the rebate. The rates per word were formerly:

Halifax to Bermuda, 48 cents a word; British Guiana, $1.44 a word; Antigua, 81 cents a word; Barbados, 91 cents a word; Dominica, 77 cents a word; Grenada, 89 cents a word; Trinidad, 98 cents a word; St. Kitts, 89 cents a word; St. Croix, $1.02 a word; St. Lucia, 85 cents a word; St. Thomas, 96 cents a word; St. Vincent, 86 cents a word.

The reduction that has been made amounts to about an even half of these rates.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Could the hon. gentleman give us the present rate?

Mr. FOSTER: The present rates are just about half of these rates. My table gives the old rates in dollars and cents, whereas the new rates are given in shillings and pence. The amount of revenue taken as a basis for division of the surplus after four years is £74,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does it take in Porto Rico?

Mr. FOSTER: No. These rates are for the British West Indies and British Guiana.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Has any new arrangement as to cable rates been made since a year ago?

Mr. FOSTER: About a year or more ago some reduction was made before this negotiation came to an end. This negotiation resulted in an arrangement which I think came into force not many months ago, about the first of the year if I remember rightly. According to the practice in England, the arrangement had to go before the Treasury Board and receive the assent of the Lords of the Treasury.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—steam service between Canada and the West Indies or South America or both, $340,666.66.

Mr. FOSTER: This is the service which was put into force the latter part of last year. There was entered into with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company a contract, the particulars of which are pretty well known to those of the committee who have followed the service. Probably my hon. friend from Halifax has some questions or remarks to make upon this, or would he rather that I should make a general statement with reference to it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, regarding the nature of the contract.

Mr. FOSTER: The contract has a history which was discussed last year and the year before in the committee, and was the consequence of two or three attempts to procure a satisfactory service between Canada and the West Indies. In the first place tenders were called for these services, giving an option to tenderers for a variety of itineraries, and a variety of speeds and capacities of vessels. When the tender time came to an end, it was found that no satisfactory tenders were in. The tender time was extended until the end of December, 1912, when several tenders were in with varying prices and with different conditions of speed, of size, and of capacities of vessels. At that time negotiations were taken up with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, and a provisional or prospective offer was made by them. In the end, however, when all these came to be considered, some were impossible; others were withdrawn and the Government decided to enter into a contract with Pickford and Black, who proposed to associate with themselves certain foreign steamship companies, or owners, and to put on a service such as was described in their offer. Messrs. Pickford and Black, after the contract had been signed by them, were not able to get that co-operation which they expected. As a consequence the whole matter seemed to be confined to two lines.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What amount was discussed at that time with Pickford and Black and their associated English companies?

Mr. FOSTER: That was for the sum of $200,000 per annum for a twelve day twelve knot service. However, this did not come to anything, and it appeared to me that we were reduced to one of two things. As my hon. friend knows, charters were very high at that particular time; I think the highest that they have been in the period of heightening charters. The construction of new vessels was difficult, and costly, and, besides that, required time. When the possible arrangement with Pickford and Black fell through, there were just two alternatives. One was to have recourse to a very large and influential steamship company, enter into negotiations with it and make the best arrangements possible, and the other was to go on with the old and inefficient service that we formerly had with Pickford and Black. I took up negotiations with the Royal Mail Steamship Company, and after some time received an offer from them for the service which they are now rendering. They entered upon this service in the latter part of last year. This offer was for a fortnightly service with vessels of the description given in the con-

tract, and with an average speed of eleven knots kept up at sea.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What was the Pickford and Black contract agreement as to speed?

Mr. FOSTER: The actual speed of the vessels under the old arrangement was from eight to eleven knots, and more frequently under the ten knots than up to it. The vessels under the present arrangement are good freight boats in the first place, and good passenger boats in the second place. They are fitted up with modern conveniences of travel—wireless, electric light, cold-storage, good cabins, plenty of deck space and every other accommodation of a good, serviceable ship. The contract price was £70,000, which was more than the company had offered to give a somewhat similar service for under the old offer from which they had receded. The rise in charters and operating charges in the meantime resulted in higher prices having to be paid than would have been paid if they had been closed with at once under their former offer. The period of the contract for these vessels was fixed at five years. That period was fixed for two reasons. One reason was to carry out the service under the best possible conditions affording time to demonstrate whether that class of vessels was the best for the peculiar trade to be carried on between Canada and the West India Islands. The other was that the West India Islands themselves—those that are able—are paying now very considerable subsidies for services between those islands and the United Kingdom. These subsidies fall in in 1916 and 1917. The whole of our present subsidy is paid by Canada. The different West India Islands are willing to contribute towards the service, but they are not able to contribute and at the same time to carry on the subsidies which are now running. The term of the contract will enable us to try out the quality and kind of service that is best adapted to the trade. If it is the best, we shall find that out; if it has defects, we shall find these out; and we shall then have the co-operation and help of the West India Islands, financially and otherwise, towards the establishment of the service which is to succeed that which expires five years from the present time.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Do I understand that at the expiration of the steamship service which is now subsidized by the West Indies, and which I suppose are inter-insular services, they will co-operate with Canada in establishing a trunk line service with inter-insular service? Is that the idea?

Mr. FOSTER: There are several ideas as to the kind of service that would be best. There are those who advocate a trunk line with inter-insular service. This is advocated more by the large islands than by the small ones. But there are very great difficulties as my hon. friend knows in carrying on a service of that kind so far as Canada's portion of it is concerned, both receiving and sending out, because of the difficulties and damages of transfer from the trunk line vessels to the others in ports where almost all of the work has to be done by lighterage. There are two or three ports where the dock is approached and the service is completed over the dock, but in all the rest of the West India Islands lighterage has to perform the work of transfer both ways, and these lighterages are of varying lengths from half a mile, to two or three miles long.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Do I understand that the minister hopes that some day the West Indies will contribute to the subsidy for this particular service we are now discussing?

Mr. FOSTER: Yes, that is the intention of the islands themselves, and the hope we both entertain.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What did Pickford and Black receive under the contract which expired two years ago?

Mr. FOSTER: Somewhere about $89,000 or $90,000.

Mr. MACLEAN: I have very little to say about the West India steamship service contract. I must say, that personally, I should have preferred if some arrangement had been possible with Pickford and Black of Halifax, in connection with this West India service. They were the originators of the steamship service between Canada and the West Indies and naturally were obliged to devote a great deal of money in developing trade with the West Indies. I have always thought that, while the service was hardly up to the requirements, still it gave to the West Indian ports and to Canada a fairly substantial service. It is true that a superior service was frequently suggested, but I think that frequently the public were un-

fair in the nature of the service they demanded.

In my opinion the trade hardly warranted such a steamship service as many of the business men of the West India Islands and of portions of Canada were demanding from time to time. I think the minister himself has undergone a change of opinion during the past year. When the West India treaty was enacted a year ago, I rather received the impression from the hon. minister that an exceedingly modern and well-equipped steamship service would be established between the Maritime provinces and the West Indies, and that it would at least be very decidedly superior to the service carried on by Messrs. Pickford and Black. As the minister said a moment ago, under the old contract Pickford and Black were paid about $100,000, or less, while the present contract means an expenditure of $340,666.66. Naturally the question arises whether there is a sufficient improvement in the service to justify the increased expenditure. I have no hesitation in saying that had Messrs. Pickford and Black at any time in the past been offered a subsidy of $340,000, they would have at once placed in commission steamships equally as good as those used by the Royal Mail Steamship Company in the present service. The four ships which are engaged in the present service are the Cobequid, the Chignecto, the Caraquet, and the Chaleur. Unfortunately the Cobequid was wrecked in the bay of Fundy recently, and, I suppose, has not yet been replaced. I presume, however, that this vessel will be replaced by one of about the same character. The Cobequid, Chignecto and Chaleur were built in 1893, and the Caraquet in 1894, so that they are comparatively old boats. It is true that in tonnage they are in excess of the boats of the old Pickford and Black service, although there is not a very great difference so far as some of them are concerned. The four boats of the Royal Mail Steamship Company averaged about 2,900 tons each. The tonnage of the steamers of the Pickford and Black Line under the old contract was considerably less, although one or two of the boats had a tonnage of over 2,000. So far as passenger accommodation is concerned, it would not appear that the present service is a very great improvement over the old one. It is true that the passenger capacity is greater, particularly for second and third-class passengers, but the difference is not very great, and it does seem to me that the Government is paying a very handsome subsidy indeed for the services rendered under the present contract. In my own province, particularly in the port of Halifax, the opinion prevails amongst those who understand the need of that service and the West India trade, that there is not a very substantial improvement in the present West India steamship service. I do not presume to put myself before the committee as one capable of judging of the merits of the steamships now in service under the contract which we are discussing, but I have been led to the opinion which I have ventured to give by reason of the opinions I have heard expressed by persons in the port of Halifax who, I think, are competent to judge of the matter. If the minister will compare the class of boats now in the service with those previously used under the Pickford and Black contract, and consider the disparity in the amounts paid to the two companies, he will see that one might naturally expect a very materially improved service. Certainly I hardly think this service will come up to the expectations of the people of the West India Islands. The minister will remember that when the Royal Commission visited the West Indies, evidence was heard at a great many points concerning the character of the steamship service then in operation. The complaints were numerous, and, I admit, in some respects perhaps it was justified, although not wholly so. The demands of the West Indies may have been rather exorbitant so far as the character of the service they demanded was concerned, but I submit that the service now afforded falls far short of the demands they made to the Royal Commission at that time. So far as the speed of the boats is concerned, the present service is apparently no improvement over the old one.

Mr. FOSTER: Oh, yes.

Mr. MACLEAN: Under the contract with Pickford and Black the boats were to make an average speed of ten knots; the average speed required under the present contract is but eleven knots—the difference is very slight. Besides, the present service is to be a fortnightly one; I think under the last contract there were sailings from Halifax and St. John every twelve days, so in that respect the present service is not as favourable as the old. On the whole, I do not think that the Department of Trade and Commerce has given to this country the service to the West India Islands that was promised by the minister a year ago.

It certainly is not up to the expectations of the people of the West India Islands, and I think there is ample justification for the opinion which exists in the Maritime provinces: that the service is not sufficiently superior to the old one to justify increasing the subsidy from $90,000 to $340,000.

Mr. FOSTER: The West India service, from the time of its inception a good many years ago, has been a very difficult service. Any one who understands the West India Islands and their physical distribution, their peculiarities, so to speak, as regards ports, lighterage and other different requirements, will understand why it has been and always will be a somewhat difficult matter to please everybody, in the West Indies as well as in Canada, by any service carried on between the two countries. Il may be that some people in the West Indies, taking what they would like to have as the measure, put up their anticipations very high, but I am led to believe that the sentiment of the West India Islands at the present time is fairly well satisfied with the boats that have been put on. One of the greatest complaints in the olden times was lack of uniformity and regularity and lack of cargo space. The opinion, I think, of the best men in the different islands is that we want in the first place is ships of sufficient cargo capacity. The Pickford and Black steamers did not have sufficient capacity, and great dissatisfaction was caused in that respect, not only here but in the West Indies. There is a perfect unanimity of opinion that the new service is entirely satisfactory in this respect. I have had communication with the principal men of the different islands since the boats have gone into service, and that is the information which I have, and which I believe to be a fairly true representation of the case. It is also essential that there shall be at least good accommodation for passengers, and that the first-class passenger accommodation shall be in the right part of the ship. That was not the case in the old service. The passenger accommodation in these boats is excellent accommodation. The first-class passenger accommodation is amidship, everything is modern, and is put on in a style and with a quality which makes a man who is travelling feel that he is comfortable and induces him to recommend the service to his friends. That was not the case in reference to the old service. I do not want to run down or criticise unduly, but oftentimes old services are not as good as new.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That would be determined largely by the age of the ships I suppose?

Mr. FOSTER: The ship and the service have a kinship. If you do not have passenger accommodation in the proper part of the vessel where people are comfortable you do not generally have the service to the people themselves as good as it would otherwise be. I do not want to bring up old experiences, but I think that is a generally fair statement of the case, so that as regards passenger accommodation, unless the idea is for high tourist purposes, and with the idea of extending hotel accommodation and giving to the Islands a service which will participate in the entertaining and housing of passengers and tourists in the West Indies, as well as their carriage from port to port, I believe you have a service in these boats which fills the reasonable expectations of the people of the West Indies. That is at least the impression that comes to me from what I have heard. I do not think that any service can be carried on satisfactorily with the West India Islands which would be what you might call a broker's service; chartering vessels and being dependent on charters was the great difficulty in the old service. Something would happen and then the whole sea would be scurried over to get a vessel which could take the
10 p.m. place of a vessel disabled. I think you get very far towards the solution of a good service when you get it in the hands of a steamship company which has one of the widest services in the world, and which has a fleet of vessels so large and of such different adaptabilities that the company can secure what they want for almost any kind of service. It has been that largeness of the company and the largeness of its service which has made it possible to put on four vessels which fill the requirements of the West India Islands, which, as my hon. friend knows, are peculiar; and which at the same time fill all reasonable requirements as to passengers and fully meet everything that is required with reference to freight accommodation. We get some other advantages. We have a powerful steamship company which is running its vessels in our service, but which also has lines of its own, and steamship companies with which it is in affilia-

tion which run to other West India Islands and which skirt the coasts of South America. One of the terms of the contract is that they shall make through rate arrangements so that a shipper from Ontario who wishes to send to ports in South America either on the west or east coast or on the north of South America, can send these goods on through bill of lading to the port of consignment. I think it a very great advantage and, as we have no steamship service to the ports in South America and yet there are possibilities of working up a good trade with South America, this will, to a large extent in its carrying out, obviate the necessity for a special subsidy for steamers to South America and will enable our producers and exporters to send to South America markets. I have not a list of the ports into which Canadian exporters will be able to have direct communication but it is a large and important series of ports. That we did not have with the other service and it is something to get a company of that kind interested in the Canadian service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does your control of rates extend to these different services?

Mr. FOSTER: The control of rates extends to the services which are laid down in the contract, and then the arrangements which are made for through rates have to be made as they can be made, but it gives the through line of passage. There is another thing; this company knows the West Indies better than any other shipping company in the world. It has had a service there for a great many years. It has an inter-insular service at the present time and at Trinidad and at one other port we get chances for inter-communication between the islands which are served directly under this contract and the islands of the West Indies that are served by the inter-insular line that is run by the same company. It is a fortunate thing I think that we have been able to make a trial under our new conditions with a company of the character, the financial strength and backing, and actual experience of trade in that quarter of the world, possessed by the Royal Mail Packet Company. I have had letters from passengers who have taken the trip down on the new steamers, and I have nothing but commendation as to the service, the accommodation and general agreeableness of the passage owing to the qualities of the ship and its service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: A great deal would depend upon the weather.

[Mr. G. E. Foster.]

Mr. FOSTER: I do not know that any ship can be really comfortable when there is a tremendous sea on. I know I have never found one, but there are degrees of comfort in bad weather, if you are not absolutely laid on your back by seasickness. I had an experience of that when I came from London recently. I am not here to speak on behalf of any steamship company, but I must say that the Alsatian on which I came out and which is the newest acquisition of our Canadian fleet, is the finest vessel I ever travelled on so far as real comfort, service and steadiness are concerned. I am quite willing to give that advertisement to the ship, not for the ship's sake, but for the sake of any persons here who may want a good passage either way across the ocean.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am not criticising the character of the boats in the new service, as I am the fact that we are paying $340,000 for this service, whereas formerly we were paying only $80,000 or $90,000, and the boats now in the service are not so very much better than the boats employed in the old service. I doubt if the improvement is sufficiently marked to justify the disparity in the amounts of the subsidy paid to-day and that paid under the old contract. I quite agree with my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that there is an admitted improvement in the general character of the ships as to their freight capacity and passenger accommodation. I think it is to be regretted, however, that the speed of these boats under the contract is not to be greater than eleven knots. I think it is also to be regretted that it is only a fourteen day service. I was in hopes that we would at least have a twelve day service from St. John and Halifax. I think there was under the old contract.

Mr. FOSTER: With reference to that, I have been told by people who ought to know,—in fact I had the information from the Islands themselves,—that a fortnightly service fits in with their wants better than a 12-day service, because it enables them to make connections which they could not otherwise make. I quite admit that this is a large subsidy but something had to be done.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The minister must also admit that when he was soliciting tenders in 1912 he was anticipating a service very much better than the present one, not only in reference to passenger accommodation but to cargo

capacity, as well, and I think that had a deterring effect upon possible steamship contractors. My hon. friend has changed his mind very much indeed since twelve months ago respecting the service that was actually needed for the West Indies. I must say that I am inclined to agree with what he has done rather than with what he thought should be done a year ago. Had it been known a year ago that the department would have been satisfied with a service of the character we are now having, possibly more favourable tenders might have then been received.

Mr. FOSTER: I am not sure of that. It is pretty difficult to say what would have happened, but I agree with my hon. friend in this respect, that there were thoughts then of a better speed. The passenger accommodation on these boats is pretty nearly as good as we were thinking at that time we might probably get. I could have got 15-knot boats and I could have got the extra passenger accommodation and flourish for what it was worth, but if I had, I should have had to pay certainly nothing less than half a million dollars. When you come up against a state of things like that, the disparity between these amounts tends to persuade you that you had better take the modified service and try it out for a time until you are a little more sure from actual experience than could be made certain by any amount of optimism or desire for such and such a thing. I believe that under the circumstances we have done about the best that could be done.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: How is our business going on with the West Indies?

Mr. FOSTER: Our business is increasing satisfactorily. There is this much about it, it has infused a new spirit in the West Indies in reference to Canada. There is no doubt about that. One indication of that is the very fine exhibit made at the Toronto Exhibition last year by the West India Islands, and the results that have come from that. The new service and the preference put together have made the people of the West Indies come to the conclusion that we are desirous of pushing our trade with them and they are now wishing to push their trade with us. I think that is worth a good deal, both to Canada and the West Indies, and counts as a very large factor in the development of trade. We have beyond all shadow of doubt an opportunity for a very largely increasing trade with the West Indies. Our competitor there for the products we send is the United States, and our competitor has gotten ahead of us because of better passenger accommodation and especially because of better freight accommodation and more frequent sailings, but more especially in this one thing: as I analyse it and come down to the facts, what induces the smaller West India merchant—and it is a numerous class comparatively—to favour New York, is that he can send to New York and get a small lot, say 50 or 25 barrels of flour, if he wants it, and have it sent down by the next boat. Under the old conditions, and to a certain extent yet, but it is being remedied, he would send to St. John or to Halifax for a small lot with the idea that the goods were lying there and could be forwarded by the next boat, whereas the order had to be forwarded up to the producer in the middle of Ontario, if it were flour for instance, and there was all the delay and uncertainty of a long land route as well as a sea route, and consequently these small orders could not be filled with promptitude in a fair time.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Of course, the steamship service has nothing to do with that.

Mr. FOSTER: The steamship service and the preference together have a good deal to do with it. Now that is being remedied. I was talking the other day with one of our large flour mill managers and he said that as far as he was concerned he has taken his business entirely away from New York and placed it in the Maritime provinces' ports. I asked him about the small order business. He said: I came to the conclusion—that we all must come to—that we had to have a warehouse in a Maritime province port to hold a certain amount of stock so that people can cable and get their order by direct steamer without having to wait until the flour comes from the point of departure. Gradually we are going to get that small lot, brokerage, storehouse or warehouse business, whatever you may call it, established in our Maritime provinces' ports and in the proportion as we get it established there we will stand a much better chance in the competition with New York. These gentlemen will tell you that as far as freight rates are concerned they get just as good rates from the points of production to Halifax and St. John as they do to New York and better. Freights, they say, are in their favour. There are two things which impel them to send through New York: one is the small lot business that we have spoken of, and the other is

that New York is a market for Canadian flour outside of what is sent to the West Indies and in business arrangements they find it well to make connection with New York so as to secure both sides of the trade. But I think conditions are very favourable to our developing something of an interchange between the two countries.

Mr. LAW: What is the draught of the steamers?

Mr. FOSTER: The table that I have here gives all the information except the draught, but practically the draught is light enough to enable them to do the work at the dock.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Bermuda would be the port with the lowest depth of water.

Mr. FOSTER: A difficulty is also encountered in getting in or out of the port of Georgetown, British Guiana, because of a bar which lies out. If your vessel is over a certain draught you will probably have to load at the docks and then go out beyond the bar and lighter the remaining part of your load into the vessel. That is the most difficult part of the West India Islands but these vessels are quite able to do the work at the dock.

Mr. LAW: Last year, when this matter was before the House, I called the attention of the acting minister at that time to the fact that these boats go up and down the bay of Fundy past the port of Yarmouth, and I asked him if it would not be possible, when you are making a contract with them, to have them stop at Yarmouth either one way or the other. Years ago a very large trade was done with the West Indies through brigs, schooners and the smaller class of vessels. A large quantity of fish was shipped from there. The port of Yarmouth distributes molasses and sugar to the western part of Nova Scotia and handles quite a large quantity of these products. It would not detain the boats very long if there was water enough in Yarmouth harbour to permit of them coming in. The trade during the last two years has deteriorated very much indeed on account of not having vessels to carry it. A large quantity of molasses is imported into Yarmouth via Halifax and St. John for distribution in the western part of Nova Scotia, and a double freight is paid in getting the molasses there, whereas, if it could be imported directly at the port of Yarmouth by these boats which come from the West Indies a considerable stimulus would be given to this trade. I would like the minister to take the matter into consideration and endeavour to get these Royal Mail Steamship Company's steamers to stop at Yarmouth provided there is water enough in the port to enable them to come in. Boats drawing from nineteen to twenty feet of water can easily get into Yarmouth harbour now, and with that depth of water I imagine that these steamers could get there. I am sorry that the minister has not the draught of these boats. It is a wonder that he has not that information with him. What is the tonnage draught of these vessels.

Mr. FOSTER: My hon. friend credits me with being able to remember too much when he asks me to remember what is the draft of these vessels.

Mr. LAW: I did not ask the minister to remember; but he has a memorandum before him, and I supposed that he would find it there.

Mr. FOSTER: I have not that here, but I can give my hon. friend an answer to his question as to the tonnage and the passenger accommodation. The net tonnage of the Chignecto, the Cobequid, the Chaleurs and the Caraquet would run from 2,975 to 2,999 tons, or in round figures 3,000 tons; gross tonnage, 4,746 to 4,889, the average being 4,798; capacity from 5,129 to 5,557. The first class passenger accommodation is 41, second-class 60 to 75, and third-class about 90. As to the port of Yarmouth, I would be quite willing to take the matter into consideration, but my hon. friend will see that after a contract is made, when we had some difficulty even as to the ports in the Maritime provinces which have been adopted, it is not an easy matter to make a change. If there is anything in the world which would tend to give me a sympathy with what my hon. friend suggests it is the predilection that the people of Yarmouth and nearby have for the good old-fashioned molasses of the West Indies. I remember the taste of the molasses from my boyhood days at this very minute, and I always respect the man who likes molasses.

Mr. LAW: I would imagine that perhaps those boats are a little too large, but I thought that from what the minister said about some of the ports of the West Indies they might possibly be able to get into the port of Yarmouth.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Are these steamers provided with cold-storage?

Mr. FOSTER: Yes, and electric light and wireless.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What effect does the hon. minister anticipate that the placing of raw sugar upon the free list in the United States in 1916 will have upon the Canada-West India trade in that same product, whether much will be deflected towards the United States?

Mr. FOSTER: One cannot tell what the effect will be until the test has been made; but this will be a fact then as it is now, that the West Indies will have a preferential position in this market whereas in the United States she competes with the whole world. As long as those conditions last, and particularly so long as there is sufficient market here for all of the West India products, which there is at present and will probably be for many years, I should not think that the effect would be very great.

Customs—salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Dominion, including pay for overtime of officers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $3,590,000.

Mr. KYTE: How does the hon. minister account for the extraordinary increase of $300,000 in this item??

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): The vote last year was $3,290,000, and as stated by the hon. member it shows an increase of $300,000 for this year. Last year the total yearly salaries of officers employed at the various ports were $2,728,435. The contingent expenses of the ports for the year, based on the actual expenditure for the nine months ending December 31, 1913, were $394,745; the expenditure for overtime paid for the current year will amount to $134,000. Therefore the total amount of salaries, contingencies and for overtime paid will amount to $3,257,190. This will leave $32,810 that may yet be spent for increases up to the end of the fiscal year. This shows that the amount voted last year was practically all expended. We are asking for $300,000 for this year for the following purposes:

For salaries of additional officers including new ports and outports $150,000; for increases in salaries, $125,000; for increases in overtime paid, $10,000; for increases in contingent expenses, $15,000; total, $300,000.

The hon. member will understand that it is necessary to give an increase to officers throughout the Dominion, and there is also a demand for new offices. In the opinion of my officers and of myself, after going into the matter thoroughly, we do not think this is asking an unreasonable amount.

Mr. KYTE: I am obliged to the hon. minister for the explanation which he has given; but I venture to suggest, with the utmost deference, that there are other expenses that go to account for this extraordinary increase of $300,000, that the hon. member has not given to this committee. For instance, at the last session of Parliament, I asked why Martin Johnston, preventive officer at Red Island in the county of Richmond, had been dismissed from office. The hon. minister told me that it was because there was nothing for him to do. I call the hon. minister's attention to the extraordinary circumstance that, having dismissed a man from office because there was nothing for him to do, he immediately appointed another person to do nothing in the same office. The dismissed official was in receipt of a salary of $100 a year for his services, whereas the information given me a few days ago by the hon. Minister of Customs is to the effect that Michael Edwin Gillies, the man appointed in Johnston's place to do nothing, was appointed at a salary of $250. That is a solitary instance; and I am quite sure, if the records of the department of the hon. minister were to be gone over, very many instances of a like nature would be discovered, which would go far to explain this increase of $300,000, in respect of which the hon. minister did not take us into his confidence a few moments ago.

If Martin Johnston, in the district of Red Island, was dismissed because there was nothing for him to do, I would like to know what justification the hon. minister had for immediately appointing a man to take his place. Of course, the man that the hon. minister appointed was the brother of a defeated candidate in that part of the country, and I suppose he was entitled to some consideration from the hon. minister. How he can justify the increase of this man's salary from $100 to $250, when admittedly there was nothing for his predecessor in office to do, is something that I would like the hon. minister to explain.

Mr. REID: If I remember rightly, the place where Martin Johnston was stationed is in the same place at which Mr. Gillies is stationed. I think that Johnston was on one side of the river or bay and Mr. Gillies on the opposite side. Where Martin Johnston was, there was nothing to do; where Mr. Gillies is now there is something

to do, and for the salary that Mr. Johnston was getting one could not expect a man to do very much. My information is that Mr. Gillies is at Irish Cove in a different locality altogether, quite a distance away.

Mr. KYTE: Only a few miles away.

Mr. REID: Yes, but a few miles might make quite a difference. There was something to do at Irish Cove, whereas there was nothing to do where Mr. Johnston was employed. I really think it was absolutely necessary to have the station at a place like Irish Cove, where there was something to do.

Mr. KYTE: The hon. minister is in no position to offer any explanation whatever. He says that Mr. Martin Johnston lived on one side of the bay and Mr. Gillies on the other. That is absolutely outside of the fact. Of course, I cannot hold the hon. minister responsible for any neglect of duty because he has not been able to inform himself as to the exact geography of the locality. I state to this committee, and the hon. minister of course is in no position to contradict me, that Johnston and Gillies live on the same side of the water. It is a farming community. Scarcely any import business is done there. There is no vessel owned there. There is a wharf in the neighbourhood in which Mr. Johnston lives, and there is a wharf where Mr. Gillies lives. The same boat calls at both wharfs, and carries all the freight required in that community. Therefore, there is absolutely no foundation for the statement that more business is done at Irish Cove than at Red Island. I venture to say that the hon. minister has no information in his department that would justify him in making the appointment. I have no doubt that the minister received some such information possibly from Mr. Gillies, defeated Conservative candidate in my county, the brother of the gentleman who was appointed to the office, but I venture to suggest that such information is not of a sufficiently reliable character to justify the minister in taking action upon it. This is a small matter, but it is nothing short of a public scandal that this man Johnston should have been dismissed from office because there was nothing for him to do and another man should have been appointed to office to do that 'nothing,' and at a salary of $250 a year. There is no record, there is no information, in the department of the hon.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

minister that would justify the minister in coming to this committee and stating that there is more work for a preventive officer at Irish Cove than at Red Island. As I stated, it is practically the same neighbourhood; it lies along the southern shore of Bras d'Or lake, and the two places are a few miles apart, but as I said there is no more business to be done at Irish Cove than at Red Island. One steamer carries all the freight necessary for that community, and there is a wharf at each place to which the steamer comes; but, so far as business is concerned, if there was no business for Mr. Johnston to do, there is no business for Mr. Gillies to do at Irish Cove. But whilst the appointment of Mr. Johnston was made at the minimum of $100, the appointment of Mr. Gillies is made at $250.

Mr. REID: Of course, the hon. gentleman knows the locality much better than I do, and I do not question what he says about it. But I have stated that my officials informed me that where Mr. Johnston was located there was nothing to do; that where Mr. Gillies is located is some distance from the other and that there is something to do at that point. I am only giving the information which was given to me by my officials at the time.

Mr. KYTE: I suppose the minister has some record in his department of this information?

Mr. REID: I discussed it with the Commissioner of Customs, Mr. McDougald, and he told me the position of the officers. There is no record; it was verbal.

Mr. KYTE. Did the commissioner make a report to the minister as to the necessity of appointing a man at Irish Cove?

Mr. REID: Certainly. I discussed it with the commissioner, and he said that that was the place an officer should be, that there was more business to be done at Irish Cove. That is the reason the appointment was made.

Mr. KYTE: If the commissioner made such a recommendation to the Minister of Customs, then I am bound to say he had not informed himself as to the facts. Surely there must be some record in the department on which the minister acted, if not from the commissioner then from some other source which was held to justify the minister in taking this action. I will ask the minister to look up the files, and if there is any information in writing to bring it before the committee.

Mr. REID: I do not think there is, but if there is, I shall be glad to bring it down.

Mr. KYTE: What knowledge has the Commissioner of Customs that the Minister of Customs has not? The commissioner has lived here at Ottawa for many years, and I venture to say that he never visited that locality in his life.

Mr. REID: The hon. member knows that we have inspectors travelling all over the Dominion, and these are in and out of Ottawa all the time. I suppose the commissioner discussed it with them. I do not know where he got the information, but I acted on his advice.

Mr. KYTE: If the Inspector of Customs made a recommendation to the commissioner, that certainly would be in writing.

Mr. REID: Not necessarily.

Mr. KYTE: The Inspector of Customs is Mr. D. C. Macdonald, of Port Hood, who was appointed in May, 1911, and to my knowledge he has never been in Ottawa since. He has never met the Commissioner of Customs, and the commissioner has not been in Cape Breton. I am safe in assuming that any communication between the Inspector of Customs and the commissioner as to the appointment in Irish Cove must have been in writing and the minister can produce it.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I did not refer to the inspector in the locality. We have inspectors travelling through the whole Dominion, officers attached to the main service, but knowing the locality well. It does not necessarily follow that the commissioner would have to get the information from the inspector of that particular district.

Mr. KYTE: I suppose the travelling inspectors make report to the department?

Mr. REID: They discuss these matters verbally with the commissioner.

Mr. KYTE: How could they discuss this matter verbally with the commissioner? The only travelling inspector in the Preventive Service was the late Captain J. W. Gordon, of North Sydney. He occupied the position up to a year ago. Whatever report he made to the commissioner, he made in writing. He would not leave his office in North Sydney to come here and recommend that a preventive officer should be appointed at Irish Cove. So, we get back to where we started: whatever recommendations was made to the minister to appoint a preventive officer at Irish Cove must be in writing; and if there is no recommendation in writing, there is none at all. It comes down, I suppose, to a recommendation from the defeated candidate in the county of Richmond to appoint his brother to that position after he had recommended the dismissal of Martin Johnston. Does the minister think he has made out a case for the appointment of Mr. M. E. Gillies to the office I refer to at a salary of $250 in view of his statement that Martin Johnston was dismissed because there was nothing to do?

Mr. REID: I certainly think we were justified in appointing a man at Irish Cove at a salary of $250.

Mr. KYTE: Why does the minister think he was justified in doing it? Has he any report recommending it to be done?

Mr. REID: I stated to the hon. gentleman that the only information I have is from the Commissioner of Customs, who said I was justified in appointing a man at Irish Cove at a salary of $250, that there was more business doing there, and little if any doing where Mr. Johnston was located.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: And so the minister thinks he was justified in dismissing the other man?

Mr. REID: We did not dismiss him, but let him go because there was nothing for him to do.

Mr. MACLEAN: But this man lives in the same place.

Mr. REID: They are several miles apart.

Mr. MACLEAN: How many?

Mr. REID: I understand four or five miles.

Mr. MACLEAN: If it were twenty-five or thirty miles it would matter little in the work of a preventive officer, because it quite infrequently happens that there is no work for a preventive officer in his own locality. In the Maritime provinces his territory usually extends over a certain portion of the coast line. If it be correct that the dismissed preventive officer resided at a distance of five miles from the residence of the newly appointed preventive officer, it appears to me that the explanation of the minister is hardly satisfactory; I think the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) is entitled to a better answer than he has received. The minister is in honour bound to restore the dismissed preventive officer to office and remove the

last one appointed. Surely it is evident that the reasons given are not sufficient for the dismissal of Mr. Johnston and the appointment of Mr. Gillies. I think the Minister of Customs might as well admit that frankly here and promise to restore the old preventive officer to his place. Cannot we get that promise?

Mr. REID: I have explained to the hon. gentleman that we let Mr. Johnston go because there was nothing for him to do where he was stationed.

Mr. MACLEAN: His successor is in the same place.

Mr. REID: It is several miles distant.

Mr. MACLEAN: A few miles makes no difference.

Mr. REID: It makes a great deal of difference where a man is located. The services of Mr. Gillies are more required where he is now than Mr. Johnston's were; there are more people living there, and there is greater possibility of smuggling taking place.

Mr. MACLEAN: What work would there be for a preventive officer there?

Mr. REID: The work of a preventive officer is to prevent smuggling along the coast.

Mr. MACLEAN: Who would attempt to smuggle there?

Mr. REID: I cannot answer that very well.

Mr. KYTE: When I brought the matter to the attention of the minister last year, he said Mr. Johnston had been dismissed because his services were not necessary, and because he lived on the island and Mr. Gillies lived on the mainland. The place called Red Islands consists of two small plots of land half a mile from the shore, upon which no one lives. Here is the letter I produced last year, containing the recommendation for the dismissal of Mr. Johnston:

Sydney, C.B., February 12, 1912.

Hon. J. D. Reid,
Minister of Customs,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir,—I respectfully ask for the dismissal of Martin Johnston as acting preventive officer at Red Islands. Mr. Johnston has been acting the offensive political partisan during the past several elections.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd) J. A. Gillies.

Here is another from the same person:

Dr. J. D. Reid,
Minister of Customs,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Reid,—Martin Johnston, Red Islands, was a violent political partisan at the last federal election and also at the local election held in June last. This man does not hold office under an Order in Council. I respectfully ask that he be relieved from his position, on the grounds of offensive partisanship, and I hereby recommend Mr. Michael L. McNeil, of Hay Cove, N.B., as his successor.

I will be glad to know that this will be done as soon as possible.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd) J. A. Gillies.

The matter was referred to Mr. Duchemin, the executioner having jurisdiction in that particular part of the province of Nova Scotia, but before the executioner took up the congenial work that had been assigned to him in connection with the beheading of that official, the hon. minister notified him that an investigation was unnecessary, as he had decided to dismiss Mr. Johnston because his services were not required. In answer to my question in regard to the matter, the minister said:

We found that Mr. Johnston's services were not required at this place.

In reply to my further inquiry as to why the minister appointed Mr. Gillies, he said:

He is at another place. Irish Cove is on the mainland.

This goes to show how sorely the hon. minister is in need of information. The Commissioner of Customs also is sorely in need of a little additional information and a little more light on this question as to why Johnston was dismissed and Gillies appointed in his place. If the Commissioner of Customs recommended the appointment of this man Gillies, in the face of the fact that he resided in practically the same district as that in which Johnston lived, and that there was nothing for either of them to do, then I say the Commissioner of Customs did not discharge his duty in this instance as he should discharge it, considering the responsibility that attaches to his office. I would ask the hon. minister to interview his commissioner before he takes up his Estimates again, and ascertain upon what authority or information he recommended that Gillies be appointed preventive officer at that place.

Mr. LAW: How does the minister intend to distribute this increase of $300,000? Does he intend to increase the salaries of collectors of customs or preventive officers,

and does it apply to the inside or the outside service?

Mr. REID: This vote is for the outside service; the law provides that officials in the inside service shall receive a certain annual increase. The practice during the last two years—and, in fact, the practice of my predecessors—has been that the officials of the department, the commissioner and the proper officers, submit a list of the officers from one end of the Dominion to the other to whom they think increases ought to be given, and as a rule their recommendations are adopted. These men know the officers and the conditions under which they work, and they are the ones who are the better able to recommend who should receive increases.

Mr. LAW: Has the minister the list of increases for this year, to which he has referred?

Mr. REID: No. After the Estimates are voted, the Commissioner of Customs and his officials make up a statement showing the increases they recommend for the ensuing fiscal year.

Mr. SINCLAIR: On what principle do they make these recommendations?

Mr. REID: They simply add to the salary of each official the increase to which they think he is entitled for the ensuing year. Of course, they are sometimes unable to give them as much as they would like to, for the reason that vote is small; it is a small amount when you divide it up among so many officials.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is there no principle at all upon which such a list is made up?

Mr. REID: Not such as there is in the inside service, where the law provides for an annual increase of $50 or $100.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. minister has appointed a great number of new men to the customs service during the last eighteen months.

Mr. REID: We had to appoint a good many on account of the extra work.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am told that a great many of them have nothing to do.

Mr. REID: I do not agree with the hon. member there.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How many has the hon. minister appointed?

Mr. REID: I think the total number of new men is 768. Of course there are a great many deaths, resignations and other changes which necessitate the appointment of new men. The opening up of new offices and the covering of new territory requires additional officers. Each year the work of the Customs Department is increasing. I was told by the commissioner the other day that between, I think, North Portal and Coutts, Alberta, there are 400 miles of territory in which we have no officer at all, and that an officer should be stationed every 25 miles for the convenience of incoming settlers and for the protection of the revenue. The same conditions exist, I think, in respect of the district territory between Emerson and North Portal. The commissioner and the inspectors have been urging that we should put a patrol from Emerson right through to British Columbia. Settlers crossing the boundary in these districts sometimes have to drive 50 miles to a customs office and then back again, which is a great hardship. In addition to that, there is a great pressure on the department for the opening of new offices all throughout the interior portions of the West, and it is difficult to give them the number they ask for. We are opening a new office in a place called Wainwright; between Saskatoon and Edmonton, a distance of 400 or 500 miles, we did not have an office at all. Even then the places are fifty miles apart. I think the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) asked last year about a place called Edson. It is my intention to open an office in that locality.

Mr. OLIVER: Is not that office opened yet ?

Mr. REID: It is intended to open one in that locality, and I think Edson is the only suitable place. The one at Athabaska Landing was opened nearly a year ago.

Mr. OLIVER: Edson is certainly the only place; it would be a crime to put it anywhere else.

Mr. KYTE: What is the meaning of the clause at the end of the item, 'notwithstanding any thing in the Civil Service Act.'

Mr. REID: That is to permit of the payment of overtime to landing waiters. As a rule, they receive $850 a year. Their office hours are from eight in the morning until six at night, but of course they very often have to work until eleven or twelve o'clock, and they receive 30 cents an hour for this overtime. If we had not the

clause in, it would be impossible to pay them for overtime.

Mr. LAW: I called the attention of the minister to his appointment of two officials in Yarmouth at salaries of $1,000 a year, while we have three first-class officials, preventive officers Churchill, Potvin and Kirk, who receive only $850, besides their overtime. I trust the minister is considering their case, and will be prepared to give them an increase so as to put them on an equal footing with the two newly appointed men.

Mr. REID: Churchill received $850 and $150 overtime; Potvin received $850 salary and about $100 overtime, and Kirk received $800 and $100 overtime.

Mr. LAW: But the other officials who are appointed at $1,000 get overtime as well. That is, Rogers and Boyd.

Mr. REID: Rogers is not shown as receiving any overtime. Boyd had $23.40 overtime.

Mr. LAW: The three old officials are first-class officials, and it seems to me it was unfair for new men to come in and get more than they did after they had done their duty to the satisfaction of the public and of the department for years. I have nothing to say against the new appointees, and $1,000 is little enough.

Mr. REID: I agree that the salaries of these preventive officers are very small. The usual salary in Ontario and the lower provinces is $850 a year, and then they have the overtime. The men who are appointed to work in the long room or to do clerical work, are appointed at a little higher salary, about $1,000, because they do not get overtime. I would be surprised if these men are doing the same work as the landing waiters and receiving practically the same overtime.

Mr. LAW: Boyd waits for the steamers the same as the others, and
11 p.m. earns a certain amount of overtime. When the daily boats arrive from Boston at six o'clock, they may have 600 passengers, and all the customs officials, except perhaps the collector, go down to the wharf to help pass the passengers. They earn their money.

Mr. REID: Boyd received $23.40 for overtime. The overtime is divided among the landing waiters, unless for some reason one of the landing waiters cannot be present or an extra man is required.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. LAW: Boyd attended the boats the same as the other three tide waiters. In fact, the clerk in the office and the three men cannot handle five hundred persons in the morning and get them off in an hour or an hour and a half, so that they can get the nine o'clock train from Yarmouth.

Mr. REID: The yearly report made out by Smith Harding, the collector, shows Mr. Boyd to be employed in the long room. If they required an extra man he would be taken from the long room. If the hon. member will look over the list for the province, he will see that the salary of a landing waiter is about $850 or $900. I think myself they should get more, but if we increase their salaries by only $100 that would mean an increase altogether of $400,000.

Mr. MACLEAN: How much has this item increased since the minister came into office?

Mr. REID: The estimate that I first put through—it was prepared by my predecessor—was for $200,000 and $100,000 in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. MACLEAN: How much was last year greater than the preceding year?

Mr. REID: $400,000.

Mr. MACLEAN: So that the increase in this item since the hon. gentleman came into office is nearly $1,000,000.

Mr. REID: That is not a fair way of putting it. You cannot say that it is an increase. The salaries increase each year and they will continue to do so as long as imports increase, which makes more work.

Mr. MACLEAN: I suppose some customs officials have died, and that others have been appointed at a less salary than was received by the deceased official? The only observation I have to make regarding this is that I think the cost of administering the Customs Department, particularly the outside service, is growing very rapidly. In the province of Nova Scotia alone—I have not the information before me but I know it is available—there have been unnecessary appointments to the customs service, and the payment of salaries to these unnecessary officials would probably aggregate $25,000 or $30,000. In a great many of the smaller ports of the province, appointments have been made which, I think, are purely political. I know of one person being appointed to the customs service in the county of Lunenburg at a salary

of $1,000 or $1,200 a year, and that official has nothing to do and will not have for a great number of years.

Mr. REID: What is his name?

Mr. MACLEAN: His name is Mr. Mack. I think the appointment is purely political. The appointment of Mr. Henley in the Preventive Service in the county of Halifax, was not, I think, a necessary appointment, and I have no doubt in many other places there have been appointments which were not absolutely necessary. I think the member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) will sustain me in that.

Mr. RHODES: I cannot allow the remarks of the hon. gentleman to go unchallenged. I may say that the only customs official who perhaps was not giving value for the salary he received, happened to be one of the fathers, I might say, of Liberalism in Cumberland county, and was appointed by the late Administration. At that time I think he was 65 years of age. He became incapacitated about a year ago, and was practically confined to his house, but rather than there should be any difficulty over the question he drew his salary until the day of his death a few weeks ago. That is the only case of money being expended where it was not properly earned, and surely hon. gentlemen opposite can find no fault in that case. There have been two appointments to the customs service last year in the town of Amherst, and I know as a matter of fact that they were necessitated in consequence of a report of an inspector of the Customs Department and not through any energy on my part. I had the privilege of recommending two men who were to occupy these positions, but the vacancies arose simply through the increase of business at that port. I do not know that the hon. junior member for Halifax can point his finger at any case and say that a certain appointment was a political appointment, or an unnecessary one. I have in mind the appointment made of a preventive officer at Spencer's Island in my county, and I venture to say that officer will collect little or no revenue, but on the other hand his being appointed at that place will be the means of preventing a considerable amount of smuggling which has been going on there in years gone by, at least so rumour says. His appointment was due to the recommendation of Inspector Boak, who going down the shore saw that was a strategical point where smuggling might take place. I have no doubt the same condition applies to other places in the province of Nova Scotia. Let me say to my hon. friend that if he wants to point to Cumberland as an example of unnecessary appointments to the customs service, he is taking a very unfortunate case from his own viewpoint at all events.

Mr. BOULAY: (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken the question at issue between the hon. member for Richmond and the hon. Minister ber for Richmond and the hon. Minister of Customs deals with the dismissal friends, who has, purely and simply, been replaced by one of our party. Hon gentlemen opposite have no reason to be shocked by what happens to-day, it being one of these trifling occurrences of every day political life. Let them go as far back as 1896, and they will find that greater grievances have already been suffered in this connection. To make the case clear let me recall that Mr. T. B. Cook was pensioned at the age of 46 and replaced by one Mr. Palmer, who was then 61. When the Opposition of the time asked for explanations from the Government, and wanted to know why Mr. Cook had been dismissed, they were told that he was too old; and he had, nevertheless, been replaced by a man who was his elder by fifteen years.

It seems to me that the case mentioned by the hon. member for Richmond is not as momentous as this one, and that he might have dispensed with reminding it.

Mr. KYTE: I would like the minister to tell me, the next time we go into Supply, who has been appointed preventive officer at Arichat in the place of Lawrence Girrior, deceased?

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Friday, February 20, 1914.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Bill No. 78, respecting the patent of Auto Wheels, Limited.—Mr. Fisher.

Bill No. 79, to incorporate The Bruce Peninsula Railway Company.—Mr. Middlebro.

Bill No. 80, respecting The Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

Bill No. 81, to incorporate The Canadian Press Association.—Mr. H. Clark.

Bill No. 82, respecting The Kettle Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

REPORT.

Criminal Statistics for the year ended September 30, 1912. (Appendix to Report of Minister of Trade and Commerce for the year 1912.)—Mr. Foster.

LOAN COMPANIES.

Hon. G. H. PERLEY (for the Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 83, respecting Loan Companies.

He said: This Bill is on the lines of the Trust Companies' Bill already introduced. The object is to secure uniformity in the charters of these companies. There is a provision for compulsory audit and for returns being forwarded to the Minister of Finance. It is intended that this Bill should go to the Banking and Commerce Committee, along with the Trust Companies' Bill, so that both may be considered there.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN PEACE CENTENARY ASSOCIATION.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. W. G. WEICHEL (North Waterloo): I would ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to grant assistance to the Canadian Peace Centenary Association. This association is creating unbounded enthusiasm throughout Canada, and its laudable work in the interests of international peace should, in my estimation, receive encouragement.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister): On June 5, 1913, a somewhat similar question to that now asked by my hon. friend (Mr. Weichel) was asked by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), who has taken a worthy interest in this important subject. The Canadian Peace Centenary Association had then been in existence for upwards of a year, under the presidency of Sir Edmund Walker, of Toronto, and had done valuable work of a preparatory nature. I find on that date I said in part:

> While the Canadian Peace Centenary Association is an unofficial body, the Government strongly sympathizes with and approves of its object and purpose of promoting good will and peace between the nations of the world. The Government is disposed to give favourable consideration to a grant such as that mentioned in the question in case similar action should be taken in other countries.

That statement still holds good so far as this Government is concerned. Indeed, this Government is disposed to go a step further. The cause which the Canadian Peace Centenary Association and the corresponding bodies in the United Kingdom and the United States have set before them is one with which we are warmly sympathetic. It is a triumph of humanity that during a century of rapid development, despite the existence of serious international differences and problems, the British Empire and the United States have found wiser and more humane methods of adjusting differences than the arbitrament of war. We welcome the achievement of a century of peace, and hope that it will prove to be but the first century of peace, the forerunner of a long series stretching into the future as far as human anticipation can trust itself.

The Government is informed that during the eight or nine months which have elapsed since I made my statement last year active organizing work has been carried on by the Canadian Peace Centenary Association. An organizing secretary has been appointed, offices have been opened, visits have been made to important centres in every province of the Dominion, and every necessary preparation for the holding of an adequate celebration a year hence has been made. It is gratifying to note that the organizing secretary, Mr. E. H. Scammell, reports that the response to the efforts of the association has been exceedingly cordial in the numerous centres visited. Strong local committees have been formed, valuable assistance has been rendered by the press, and in general public opinion has manifested an encouraging interest and friendliness. I understand that similar work also has been done in the United Kingdom and in the United States in particular. I am informed that a Bill appropriating a sum of money for the purposes of the celebration is now pending in the United States Congress.

In answer to my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Weichel), I beg to say that, subject to the approval of His Royal Highness the Governor General, it is the purpose of the Government to insert in the Supplementary Estimates to be introduced

this session the sum of $25,000 for the purpose of defraying the preliminary expenditures incurred in the work of organization.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Anything which tends towards the maintenance of peace between Canada and the United States should undoubtedly receive the commendation of the Canadian Government and the Canadian Parliament. Perhaps my right hon. friend would consider that the improvement of our trade relations with the United States would also be conducive to peace.

Mr. FOSTER: We are doing that every day.

Mr. BORDEN: I am sure that from the standpoint of the United States trade relations are really very excellent, because our importations from the United States have been increasing year by year.

THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. LEMIEUX: Some years ago the members of the Press Gallery approached me, as the then head of the Post Office Department, to obtain the right of franking their letters and newspapers during the session and of receiving their letters in the same way. I do not know the extent of the change that has been made, but I am informed that some members of the Press Gallery have been refused the privilege of receiving their letters franked during the session. I would like to know if a change has been made by the post office authorities, and, if so, to what extent.

Mr. PELLETIER: The matter is absolutely new to me. I am sure that the members of the Press Gallery always have a hearty welcome when they come to see me. I will make inquiries; their complaints will be heard and their grievances attended to.

OCEAN RATES COMMISSION.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce whether the report of Mr. Drayton on the joint commission on ocean rates has been laid on the table.

Mr. FOSTER: The report was made by Mr. Drayton and I had a number of copies struck off for the purpose of distribution in the House. I thought that they had been laid on the table, but I will make inquiries at once, and, if it has not been done, it will be done at the next sitting.

EXPORT OF PETROLEUM.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Customs), the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Export Act, chapter 50, of the Revised Statutes, 1906, to give the Governor in Council power to prohibit the exportation of crude or partly manufactured petroleum obtained or won on any land belonging to His Majesty, in the right of Canada, situate in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia or in the Northwest territories or in the Yukon territory.

Mr. REID: There are regulations passed by the Governor in Council with reference to the disposal of petroleum and natural gas rights.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Passed when?

Mr. REID: They were passed by Order in Council, first on March 11, 1910, amended and re-established on March 10, 1911, on August 12, 1911, and on October 16, 1913. It was found that there could not be included in these regulations the right to prohibit the exportation of petroleum, and it was necessary to have a separate Act. Therefore, we are simply taking that power by adding another clause to the present Export Act that was included in the Revised Statutes of 1906.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will my hon. friend explain the tenor of the resolution of 1906?

Mr. BORDEN: I have some recollection of this matter. Regulations have been established for a number of years with regard to the leasing of lands in the West for the purpose of oil production. The matter dates as far back as 1910, and perhaps farther. The subject has been under consideration during the past year. Many representations from different quarters were made to us that certain amendments were required, inasmuch as the regulations when first established were largely in connection with coal and other minerals, the conditions with regard to the production of which are different from those in force in most countries in regard to the production of petroleum. The subject was carefully considered by the expert officer of the Department of the Interior who is charged with this particular duty. He sought information as to the regulations which have been

established in other parts of the world—in some portions of the West Indies, in Mexico, in Egypt, in India and elsewhere. After a careful consideration of those regulations we arrived at the conclusion that certain changes should be made in our regulations. Those changes have been made. In connection with them the subject was under discussion of providing by regulation that, under certain conditions which might seem to justify such action, the export of petroleum might be prohibited by the Minister of the Interior. It was found that the powers vested in the minister under the Acts relating to the Department of the Interior did not permit that to be done; and if at any time it should become desirable in the public interest to prohibit the exportation of petroleum either in whole or in part, that would have to be done by means of authority conferred by this Parliament, in addition to the authority which already exists.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The object of the Bill will be simply to make it absolutely sure that the Minister of the Interior has the right to prohibit the exportation of petroleum?

Mr. BORDEN: That is all.

Mr. OLIVER: Under what circumstances is it proposed to exercise this right, that is to say, what is to be the policy of the Government in practice under this amendment?

Mr. BORDEN: My hon. friend has asked me a question as to which I cannot give a very definite answer at the moment beyond this, that it will only be exercised in very important and extreme cases and in cases in which it might seem expedient, in the interest not only of this country but of His Majesty's dominions as a whole, that the right should be exercised. It is not expected or intended that it shall be a right to be exercised in the immediate future. The object of the regulations, so far as they have been changed, is to make the development of oil production in the West more effective, and to make sure that it will be conducted upon more efficient lines than has been possible in the past. The object of this empowering provision looks to the larger future. My hon. friend will understand that there might be conditions under which its exercise would be desirable.

Mr. OLIVER: We are considering now, not the regulations regarding the development of petroleum, but the proposed amendment to the Act, which is to empower the Government to prohibit export. Inasmuch as this is an extraordinary power, and as at the moment the development of the petroleum industry is only at its beginning, it seems to me very desirable that, at the time when such extraordinary power is proposed to be vested in the Government by Parliament, the Government should state specifically its purpose in asking for this power and should give Parliament to understand the limitations within which they propose to exercise it. I would not ask that such limitations be laid down in the Act, but I think that it would be fair to the House and to the country that there should be a specific understanding on the subject.

Mr. BORDEN: It is not in the mind of the Government that this power should be exercised from any commercial or productive standpoint. The idea in mind is that it might be desirable some time in the future—not only desirable but important—that in connection with matters which may affect the defence of the empire as a whole, as power such as this should be vested in the Government of Canada.

Mr. OLIVER: I hope I shall be pardoned for being somewhat pressing on this point as this is a matter that intimately concerns the constituency I represent as well as other portions of Alberta—in fact, for the moment, it applies only to Alberta. I am quite willing to accept the principle that there are or may be considerations of national or world-wide significance that would warrant the Government in exercising the authority with which it is proposed to invest it. But I am not the man who is putting money into the somewhat risky business of petroleum development at this time. Efforts are being made to secure capital for this enterprise which, as I say, up to the present time carries a very large element of risk, and naturally there is difficulty in securing that capital. I am under the impression that, with a provision such as is proposed upon the statute-book, the result may be that capital will be in a measure deterred from entering upon that field. It is for that reason that I think the Government would be well-advised to be somewhat more specific than my right hon. friend has yet been. I do not wish him to understand that I am at all questioning the good faith of the Government or its purposes; all I say is —and I am urging this point very strongly and for material reasons—that it would be desirable that the Government should be measurably specific in stating the purposes for which, and the restrictions within

which, they propose to exercise this authority when vested in them.

Mr. BORDEN: The hon. gentleman will understand that if an extraordinary power such as this were exercised it would be only for the gravest cause and only for the cause that the particular commodity under consideration is required for such a purpose as that to which I alluded a moment ago. It will be abundantly apparent to him, I think, and to every hon. member, that if steps of that kind were taken and an interruption of business brought about, that is, if under the terms of this statute private interests were injuriously affected, those private interests would have to be taken into consideration and due compensation made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The reason given by the right hon. Prime Minister, I submit to him, is hardly satisfactory. The Government asks power to do by Order in Council what should be done only by Act of Parliament. When we are asked to give such power it is only fair that we should know the reasons which induce the Government to ask for it. I do not understand from the explanation given by my right hon. friend what connection there may be between this and chapter 50 of the Revised Statutes. That statute gives power, not to prohibit the exportation of any commodity, but simply to place export duties on certain commodities, and it is confined practically to timber and products of timber, and ores. The reason for this statute is apparent on its face. It was to enable us to protect ourselves against possible action threatened by the United States. At one time it was supposed that, as a matter of protection, we should have to put an export duty upon our lumber and raw material for lumber going to the other country; and the same with nickel. But now my right hon. friend is asking, not to impose an export duty, but absolutely to prohibit, under certain circumstances which he has very definitely indicated, the export of petroleum. He has suggested a reason, which, I think, I understand, and which I do not desire to discuss at length at this time—that in the development especially of naval defence, petroleum may become an article of war, and for that reason it might be advisable for the Government to prohibit its export. If that be the reason, that is another point of view, but unless I am mistaken, the Government already have power to prevent the export in time of war of all materials that might go to the advantage of the enemy. I have not refreshened my memory recently as to that point, but I think I am right. If that be the object, or whatever be the object, I think the House is entitled to know why such legislation as this—which is absolutely foreign to our ideas of parliamentary government—is sought. The right hon. gentleman simply asks that the Government should be vested with power which ought to be vested in Parliament and Parliament alone, and his explanations seem to me to be absolutely unsatisfactory.

Mr. BORDEN: I do not at all concur in the view which my right hon. friend has put forward, because the power vested in the Government many years ago by chapter 50 is one entirely analogous to this. Further than that, chapter 50 does give power to absolutely prohibit the export of certain articles. It is perfectly apparent that certain conditions might arise when it would be exceedingly important not only to exercise this power along the lines the hon. gentleman has mentioned, but to prevent oil of certain quality and suited for certain purposes from being exported to any country, even though that country might not be engaged in hostilities with the empire of which we form a part. The object in such cases would be to conserve the supply of this particular article in the British Empire for purposes of defence. For that reason, and because of the representations made to us as to the importance of this matter, we are asking Parliament to confer this power upon the Governor General in Council, not for the purpose of interfering in any way with commercial operations, but only for the purpose of being in a position to take action when, under very serious conditions, the prohibition of the export of this article might be a matter of grave importance to the empire.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The only commodity the export of which is prohibited by the Act is game; the other two commodities mentioned are simply lumber and ores. The object of the legislation is apparent on the face of the Act, section 2 of which reads, in part, as follows:

> The Governor in Council may, if any country now or hereafter imposes a duty upon the articles enumerated in schedule A to this Act, or any of them, when imported into such country from Canada, by proclamation published in the Canada Gazette, declare an export duty chargeable upon logs and pulpwood.

My right hon. friend, without giving any good reason to Parliament, and upon conditions of which hon. gentlemen opposite

shall be the sole judges, asks that the Government be authorized to prohibit the exportation of petroleum. When such vague powers are conferred upon the Government, naturally the Government can shield itself behind very good intentions, or behind the certainty that these powers will not be abused, but if there is to be any such exception to the law of the land, we are justified in asking for good reasons why such a power should be exercised.

Mr. BORDEN: What I have said to my right hon. friend with regard to the proposed exercise of power absolutely represents the intention of the Government. I appreciate what he has said as to the wide extent of that power. It is wide, because we thought it necessary to have the power expressed in comprehensive terms. I would suggest that the resolution pass as it is, and I will ask my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, and the Minister of the Interior as well, to go over the material in their possession upon which this proposed legislation is based—and strong representations have been made in regard to it—to ascertain whether or not some qualification which would bring the power into narrower limits might properly be made to meet the views my right hon. friend has expressed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Under such conditions there is no objection to the passing of the resolution, and we can resume the discussion on the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I should be interested to know why this prohibition is confined to petroleum obtained on lands belonging to His Majesty the King. It it be necessary to put this regulation in force for the purpose of maintaining the defence of the country, should we not have the power to prohibit the export of petroleum from any lands in Canada upon which there are petroleum wells? I understand that the great petroleum-producing province of Canada is Ontario.

Mr. BORDEN: I have not observed closely the terms of the resolution, but, having regard to the purposes which I have placed before the committee, I think some importance is to be attached to the suggestion of my hon. friend. I would be content either to let the resolution stand as it is, or to strike out all the words after the word 'petroleum' and let it pass in that form, in which case it would have the wider operation which the hon. member for Guysborough very pertinently and properly suggests.

Mr. KNOWLES: The city from which I come has recently been fortunate enough to strike oil, and this has directed my attention to the regulations. I would like to direct the attention of the Minister of the Interior to one unfortunate feature in connection with the existing regulations. By the payment of a nominal sum, $5, any person, no matter how remotely he is connected with any idea of actually operating a well, is able to walk into the Dominion Land office and tie up three sections of land. Now that the matter has come up in a practical way, I think the Government should take into consideration the advisability of putting into force more practical regulations for administering this branch of the Department of the Interior. I think it is highly improper that any person, rich or poor, can, by paying $5 and making an application covering three sections of land, hold up for speculative purposes any bona fide operator who may seriously contemplate going into the business. My own impression—although I have given imperfect study to the matter—is that the administration of gas and oil rights, especially the latter, should be of such a nature that applications should be entertained only when the department has substantial evidence of the bona fides of the applicant. The application should not be considered until the applicant, by the deposit of a large sum of money, if necessary—because a small sum would be only playing with the matter—shows that he means business, thus excluding to a very considerable extent the operations of those who try to plaster applications on three sections of land, almost 2,000 acres. I think the minister could work out some plan by which the operations of these people would be done away with, and under which, at the same time, the bona fides of the proposed operators would be established. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) made an unfortunate mistake when he said that his district was practically the only one interested in this matter. In Moosejaw we have spent $35,000 in digging a well, and in looking for gas we found oil. The oil has not come out in very large quantities, but there is not the slightest doubt that there is a great deal of oil in that vicinity. But after spending over $35,000 in going down 3,010 feet, we found that the very section upon which we had been working, was plastered by the application of a certain lady whose husband, a very

honourable gentlemen, no doubt, had arranged that entry should be made under the regulations. This gentleman happens to be a friend and a client of mine, but I am against any legislation which permits anything of that nature. The city of Moosejaw had to send its city solicitor and other influential men here in the interests of the city to endeavour to have it arranged that the $35,000 would be duly protected if the oil were found. As soon as oil was mentioned in Moosejaw, dozens of people, boys and girls included, spent $5 to plaster over three sections of land. I do not blame them at all, the regulations were there giving them permission, but I think the regulations should be amended.

Mr. ROCHE: The condition of affairs has been just as the hon. member has stated. The old regulations provided that a person could make an entry for three sections of land by paying his $5 entry fee. He would then have thirty days in which to tender his first year's rental. The hon. gentleman is not aware of the fact that that has been changed?

Mr. KNOWLES: I did not know that.

Mr. ROCHE: The regulations have been recently changed. There was considerable agitation, especially in the district of Calgary, by reason of the fact that we suspended the regulation for a time so that speculators could not go in, pay their $5, secure their entry and have thirty days in which to pay the first year's rental. The concession was cancelled automatically if that rental was not paid. Then these men waited on the steps of the land office to get re-entry, they paid another $5 and had another thirty days. Therefore I suspended the regulations last December, and some of those who were injured, in a speculative sense, rushed into print to show how badly they had been dealt with. These regulations have been changed so as to do away, to as large an extent as possible, with the speculative features; and now, in addition to the $5 entry fee, the applicant must deposit at the same time his first year's rental. This will nip off a great many of these speculative applications. The particular well to which the hon. gentleman has referred in connection with Moosejaw, if my memory serves me correctly, was not plastered, as he said, by applications by any particular party under the old regulations. My idea is that those were some lots that had been sold many years ago to the Canadian Pacific railway, and, as he is aware, the Canadian Pacific railway purchases in those days carried with them the mineral rights. But when the Canadian Pacific railway re-sold those lots they did not dispose of the mineral rights. The city of Moosejaw purchased from a third party, thinking that they were getting the mineral rights. They struck oil and then found that their title did not convey to them the mineral rights, because these were vested in the Canadian Pacific railway. The feature referred to by the hon. member has been remedied to a certain extent by the imposition of the clause which provides for the tendering of the rental for the first year when the application is made.

Mr. KNOWLES: When were the regulations changed?

Mr. ROCHE: About a month ago.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am surprised to learn that; I waited on different officials since coming to Ottawa, that is, within three weeks.

Mr. ROCHE: I will put the regulations on the table to-morrow.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister is not quite right in his information about this Moosejaw case, as is naturally to be expected, as he has a very large department. The Canadian Pacific railway lands in question which the city of Moosejaw owned were originally given to the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Pacific railway did not elect to retain them and they reverted to the Crown and were afterwards given to the city without mineral rights. The question of the townsite lots in all cities was handled in that way by the former Government and in that way the property that went to the city of Moosejaw went through without its oil right. The oil rights were in the Crown, not in the Canadian Pacific railway. My hon. friend and myself seem to be of one mind in the matter.

Motion as amended agreed to, reported, read the first and the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. REID thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 84, to amend the Export Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would the Minister of Marine and Fisheries state if any Order in Council has been passed in connection with the Naval Service Act since he assumed control of his department, and, if so, would he bring copies down some day soon?

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I think that every Order in Council that has been passed in regard to the Naval Service Act since I became minister of that department has been laid on the table of the House. The Act requires that these regulations passed in Council shall be laid on the table of the House, and we have conformed to that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does the minister recollect if any were passed, and, if so, upon what subject?

Mr. HAZEN: I know that a number have been passed; one had regard to injuries sustained by those in the service. I shall get a memorandum of them all for my hon. friend.

Public Works, chargeable to capital—Ship channel, river St. Lawrence, $1,019,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Last year my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries read to the House an Order in Council which had been recently passed appointing a commission to examine and report on the question of the levels of the waters in the river St. Lawrence above Montreal and between Montreal and Quebec. The appointment was a very creditable one, the commission consisting of Professor Haskell, one of the professors of Cornell University, and two well-known Canadians whose ability has never been questioned, Messrs. Stewart and Forneret. For several years, and notably during the last two or three years, there has been some nervousness amongst the shipping interests and people generally as to the lowering of the water of the harbour of Montreal and of the channel between Montreal and Quebec. The lowering of the water level has been assigned to the dredging operations which have taken place for the last fifty years between Montreal and Quebec. The channel, which originally was only eleven feet, increased in depth as the years rolled by, and to-day the policy of the department, if I mistake not, is to deepen the channel still more to a depth of from thirty to thirty-five feet so as to afford ocean navigation as far as Montreal inland. Would my hon. friend state to the committee, first, the nature of the dredging operations during the last fiscal year, second, the cost involved in such operations and, third, if any report has been made by that very important commission as to the level of the water being affected by the dredging operations?

The harbour of Montreal, I need not say, is of vital interest to the country. It is no more a local port; it has become the national port of Canada. Looking at the tables contained in the report of the Board of Trade of Montreal I find the following interesting figures:

	1882.	1912.
Vessels arrived..	614	736
Tonnage..	554,692	2,403,924
Value of merchandise exported	$26,503,001	$87,679,442
Value of merchandise imported..	50,527,497	148,977,605
Customs duties collected	8,395,652	24,555,598

4 p.m. The best year apparently for export was 1906 when the value of merchandise exported from Montreal reached a total of $89,616,459. I have only quoted the figures to show the importance of the port of Montreal in our commercial life as a nation and the importance of maintaining as deep a channel as possible between Montreal and the ocean, without, of course, affecting materially the water level in the upper portion of the St. Lawrence. Indeed, this question is of the utmost importance and affects the whole transportation problem in Canada.

A question that is also connected with this one is that of insurance rates. I remember that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) last year made a statement—I forget whether he made it in the House or in answer to a deputation composed of shipping interests—that the Government were studying the question of providing, if possible, cheaper insurance rates for shipping. Yesterday the question was brought up from a different aspect; the question of ocean freight rates was discussed in the House. I refer now especially to the other phase of the question—that of insurance rates. We all know that our shipping interests are deeply affected by the very high insurance rates prevailing against our shippers from the St. Lawrence river. My hon. friend will correct me if I do not state exactly the views which he expressed at that time to the deputation, or it may have been to the House, but if I

mistake not he stated that the intention of the Government was to come to an understanding with our shippers in Canada and to subsidize a Canadian Lloyds. I would like to know from my hon. friend if anything has been done in this connection, or if any decision has been arrived at by the powers that be.

Mr. FOSTER: My recollection is much the same as the recollection of my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) in reference to the matter. In short, the matter stands in about this way: I stated that the Government was sympathetic with the attempt to lower insurance rates on the St. Lawrence and that negotiations had long been going on with Lloyds with a view to that, but that these were not resulting in any appreciable reduction at that time. Some reductions have been made since that time, I believe, but what I did say at the end was: that it was up to the shipping interests of the St. Lawrence river to show their appreciation of the necessities of the case by forming some association, and undertaking to do their part towards bringing about the necessary relief, in which case, I said, the Government would be disposed, and very sympathetically disposed, to lend an assisting hand. From that time to this I have not received, nor do I think the Government has received, any practical offer in that direction. No practical step has been taken to form a basis for the consideration of the Government, in the way of sympathetic aid.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My recollection of the incident is the same as that of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I am sure the hon. gentleman would help the shipping community, if, when sitting with the Imperial Commission in England, he should make representations to Lloyds. I wish to express my regret that so many accidents happened on the St. Lawrence river last year. There is no doubt that those accidents, which are not attributable to the route itself, are debited to the route by Lloyds.

Mr. FOSTER: They happened upon the route.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is no question but that the ship channel, splendidly maintained as it is, is not responsible for the accidents. Indeed, there is a belief that the libel upon the St. Lawrence route is only one of the pretexts on the part of Lloyds to mulct the Canadian shippers. I trust the Minister of Marine will give me information on these several points: Is the Government to continue its policy of deepening the ship channel to 35 feet, and what compensation works are contemplated in order to maintain an even and equal flow of the water in the channel? What portions of the channel have been widened and what curves have been straightened in the past year? For some years, work of great advantage to the shipping interests was done on the St. Lawrence route, commencing under the late Mr. Tarte and continuing under the late Mr. Prefontaine, and the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, my immediate predecessor in the department. Last year, when a commission of experts was appointed, my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) made some apt remarks on the subject of the conservation of water powers on the St. Lawrence. He said, that the examination of the Upper St. Lawrence by this commission of experts would probably induce the Government to erect compensation works between the Great Lakes and that part of the river above Montreal. The result of that would be, in the first place, to ensure a proper water level, and in the second place, the possible appointment of a commission with the view of developing hydro-electric energy. I am opposed to the proposed development of hydro-electric energy on the St. Lawrence by the Americans. We all know that an unsuccessful attempt was made some years ago to secure at the Long Sault authority from the Canadian Government to develop energy. But, if such works were constructed after having been declared necessary by this commission, the Dominion Government could very well consider the advisability of exploiting the water powers on this great river for the benefit of the Canadian people. I trust that the minister will give some explanation on these matters.

Mr. HAZEN: I agree with all my hon. friend has said with respect to the importance of the great national port of Montreal. My own desire personally, and as minister, and the desire of my department, is to do everything possible to improve the shipping facilities in the port of Montreal and to improve the waterway on which the ocean steamers pass up the river to that city.

There is no doubt that, as the business of this country increases, as it is doing by leaps and bounds, the business of the city of Montreal as the great port of Canada in the summer months must increase. There-

fore I think the efforts of those who are interested in that port will be taxed to the utmost to provide adequate facilities for the handling of the freight that is bound to come in increasing measure every year to that great national port, which is destined for all time to come to remain the greatest of Canadian ports in the summer season.

My hon. friend has referred to the fact that at the last session of Parliament I announced that a commission had been appointed, consisting of Mr. E. E. Haskell, of the School of Engineering of Cornell University, a gentleman who had probably more experience than any other man on this continent in connection with river levels, having had extensive experience with the Missouri, the Mississippi and other rivers, and of two officials of the department, Mr. V. W. Forneret, superintending engineer of the Ship Channel, and Mr. W. J. Stewart, of the Hydrographic Survey, for the purpose of considering the question of the river levels of the St. Lawrence below Montreal, this work being limited to that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There was another commission appointed.

Mr. HAZEN: That was by the Public Works Department. The jurisdiction of the Department of Marine and Fisheries over the St. Lawrence river extends only from the city of Montreal down to the sea. The reaches of the river above Montreal are under the control of the Public Works Department.

We had deepened the St. Lawrence channel from fourteen feet to thirty feet, and we had planned to deepen it to thirty-five feet. The reason for the appointment of that commission was the idea that we could not go on deepening the channel of the St. Lawrence indefinitely without affecting the level of the water in the harbour of Montreal. It was most desirable to have accurate scientific observations taken for the purpose of determining whether there was danger of that, and, if so, to find out what steps should be taken by way of compensating works for the purpose of preventing that lowering from taking place; because it would be a disastrous matter if the result of deepening the channel of the St. Lawrence and allowing larger ships to come to Montreal should be a reduction of the volume of water in that harbour, thus lowering its level, so that in that harbour there would not be the same opportunity for ships of deep draught that there is at the present time. That commission was appointed and it entered upon its work at the end of last session. When I announced the appointment of that commission last year to the House, I was in hopes of being able to lay its report on the table at this session. Although the commissioners have attended to the work as faithfully as possible, I find that, with the data that was on hand and the observations that they were able to make last year, they cannot make a report that would be satisfactory to them without taking further observations during the coming season of open navigation. Therefore I regret that it will be impossible for me to lay their report upon the table of the House before another session. From the information I have received from Mr. Stewart and Mr. Forneret, I have no doubt whatever that probably at the opening of the next session the report will be tabled and the result of the observations of these gentlemen will be made public.

The work of deepening the channel that goes on from time to time is not being proceeded with in any haphazard manner. It has been in charge of gentlemen of high scientific knowledge and experience in work of that character, and the material they have been removing from the channel in different places, they have been placing in such a way that it serves as a compensating work, backing up the water and preventing it from running out too rapidly. For some years that has been in the minds of the gentlemen who are charged with the responsible duty of deepening and widening and straightening that channel. From the information I have received, I think I am justified in saying that nothing so far has been discovered by that commission that would lead the department to abandon for this season the work upon which it has been engaged in deepening that channel to thirty-five feet. It is our intention during the coming season to continue that work.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Has there been any especial change of late years in the depth of water at Montreal on account of the dredging that has been done in the lower St. Lawrence?

Mr. HAZEN: No. The question of the levels of the waters on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence is a very curious one. From observation it has been found that for a period of six or seven years from year to year the water will gradually get lower and lower in the different harbours on the Great

Lakes, and along the St. Lawrence. There appears to be no reason for this. It does not depend upon the rainfall. Then will come a period of the same number of years when the water will gradually rise until after a lapse of about seven years from the time the water was at its lowest it will be as high as it was before. It is a natural phenomenon which men do not at present understand.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is the water rising or falling now?

Mr. HAZEN: It is rising. There has been no appreciable reduction in the level of the water in the harbour of Montreal. There is such a volume of water pouring down past the city on the Montreal side that the harbour commissioners have taken means to divert a portion of that water to the south side, so as to reduce the current on the Montreal side, which interferes with the handling of ships.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And at the same time this gives more water on the south side of the harbour.

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, it serves a double purpose. My hon. friend asks me if I will give him information regarding the work that has been done on the ship channel during the last year. That is given in detail at page 104 of the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. My hon. friend asked me what amount had been spent on the St. Lawrence channel up to the present time. The report states that the total cost of the dredging and plant up to March 31, 1913, is $15,617,893.11, of which $9,610,259.57 is the cost of dredging, and $6,007,633.54 the expenditure for plant, shops, surveys and work of that description.

The quantity of material removed during that time was 85,160,875 cubic yards. In 1911-12 the expenditure was $588,000. The cost of dredging in 1912-13 was $663,229.74. Then, in the report, commencing at page 104, are given details of the operations of the different dredges employed on the St. Lawrence channel. I do not suppose my hon. friend desires that I should read these details. As to the record of work of last season, I find from a statement I have here that the total quantity of dredged material was 6,929,344 cubic yards. The hon. gentleman also asked me to tell him where the dredging operations were carried on. No doubt he will be interested to know also the depth of dredging at low water. The places, with the respective depths are: Montreal harbour, 30 feet; Varennes curve, 35 feet; Cap Charles channel, 30 feet; Grondines, 30 feet; St. Anne traverse, 35 feet; Cap a la Roche curve, 30 feet; Point aux Trembles channel, 35 feet; Repentigny channel, 15 feet; Champlain channel, 30 feet; lake St. Peter (No. 3 curve to W. B. curve), 35 feet; North channel, west sands, 35 feet; St. Thomas channel, 30 feet; floating dock approach, 30 feet; floating dock basin, 50 feet. The statement given in the report shows also the number of days each dredge worked during the year, the nominal working days per year, the hours of actual dredging, and the number of cubic yards of material dredged, and the character of material. As I have said, it is not all easy dredging; there is some shale rock and some rock for which a crusher has to be used. Of course, some of it is easy work. One dredge, the J. Israel Tarte, is a suction dredge which throws the spoil through a pipe several thousand feet from the dredge.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is the cost per cubic yard?

Mr. HAZEN: At page 11 of the Marine Report, my hon. friend will see that the total number of cubic yards dredged was 6,929,344 at a total cost of $66,229.74, or at the rate of 9·57 cents per cubic yard. This covers merely operating expenses and repairs, but not depreciation or interest. According to the information I have received, and according to my own observation, the dredges are kept in first-class repair.

Mr. SINCLAIR: When the Government is able to dredge at such a low rate as 9·57 cents a yard, how comes it that the Minister of Public Works pays from 20 cents to 50 cents a yard for similar work?

Mr. HAZEN: I am here only to tell how we are running our own department. But it must be borne in mind that the Government does not need to make a profit, and we do not allow for interest or depreciation, —and I understand that the depreciation on a machine of this character is a very substantial amount every year. These are items that private contractors have to take into consideration.

Mr. GERMAN: Does the hon. minister really think that even with the J. Israel Tarte he is doing work at the price suggested by these figures? Why should not he take into consideration the matters that have to be considered by contractors and base his price on that?

Mr. HAZEN: It is hard to calculate that. The Government is not seeking a profit, and all we are trying to do is to keep track

of the cost of our operations. The J. Israel Tarte is a suction dredge and cannot be used everywhere. It has a long pipe running from it, and if that were in rough water it would be broken up. But for this dredge the cost is a good deal less than I have given—something like 4 cents a cubic yard.

Mr. GERMAN: That is only the cost of men, fuel and oil?

Mr. HAZEN: It includes wages, fuel, oil, the cost of feeding the men on board, and repairs.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do you feed the men too?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, we make a contract with a steward who feeds the men on board the dredge. I understand they are given excellent food,—certainly there are no complaints—and it costs us, as I recollect, about 14 cents a meal.

Mr. GERMAN: But that does not include the cost of the upkeep of the dredge.

Mr. HAZEN: It includes repairs.

Mr. GERMAN: Minor repairs.

Mr. HAZEN: No, more than that. Of course, we do all our own repair work at our shops at Sorel. Not only that, but we are actually building tug-boats, hopper barges and other craft. I understand the shipyard is doing good work now. The men are practically all working on piece work, instead at so much a day, and the results are better for us and the men get more money.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is there any allowance for interest on construction?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it the intention of the Government to build a marine railway at Sorel?

Mr. HAZEN: There has been some talk about it, but I am inclined to doubt the necessity of a marine railway there. I think the shipyard at Sorel is getting on very well; the men are well employed and the work well directed. I think there are over 1,000 hands employed at Sorel at the present time. Of course there is more work at this time of the year, when the dredges are being repaired, but a large number of men are employed right through the whole season. My hon. friend asked me a question with regard to marine insurance rates. Whilst this is a matter coming more especially within the jurisdiction of the Department of Trade and Commerce, still it is one to which my department feels that it ought to give attention. The department has from time to time made representations to the underwriters and to those who are interested in insurance, pointing out that in recent years very great sums of money have been spent in improving the waterways of the river St. Lawrence and in establishing modern aids to navigation, and urging that these things should be taken into consideration in fixing the rates. The rates are not now nearly as high as they were some years ago, but in the estimation of the ship-owners of this country they are entirely too high. My department has also urged from time to time upon the underwriters—and this was brought very strongly to the attention of Lord Strathcona one or two years ago—the desirability of giving better rates to the vessels which come to the ports of the lower provinces in the winter season. There was a clause in these marine policies known as the British North American clause, under which, at a certain date—I think October 1—the rates on vessels coming to any port in British North America went up, and the ports in question were paying higher rates than were being paid in Portland, Boston, and other Atlantic seaports in the United States. We urged this matter as strongly as possible upon the attention of the underwriters, with the result that they changed that clause so far as the port of Halifax was concerned, and Halifax is now getting lower insurance rates. We have been pressing on the underwriters the necessity of making the same provision with regard to St. John. When my deputy minister was in London this year, attending the conference with regard to the safety of life at sea, he took the matter up again, with the result that the underwriters have asked us for certain information which we are having collated in the department. We hope that when this information is submitted to the underwriters, they will see the justice of making the same concessions so far as the rates at St. John and other ports in the Maritime provinces during the winter season are concerned.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend knows that there has been a strong movement in recent years on the part of navigators and shipping interests generally to have a new channel on the north side of the St. Lawrence below Quebec.

Mr. HAZEN: That is being attended to.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like to know what operations have taken place there this summer. Does the hon. minister con-

template adding to his flotilla of dredges on the river St. Lawrence? The other day my hon. friend announced that he would do his best to have the Government steamers built in Canada; what does he propose to do about the new dredges that are to be made a part of the flotilla of dredges on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. HAZEN: A certain amount of new construction is provided for in these Estimates. The construction of a new self-propelling hopper barge, capacity 650 cubic yards, of which the estimated cost is $125,000, is provided for. We hope to have that barge constructed at Sorel. Provision is also made for a self-propelling elevator dredge for work below Quebec in the north channel. With the dredges we have at present it would take us five, six or seven years to get that north channel dredged out and ready for use. When that north channel is dredged out, my opinion is that the last impediment to safe navigation up the St. Lawrence to the city of Quebec will be removed. We thought that work should be hastened, so we are asking an appropriation for a new dredge. While my policy and the policy of the department is to have as much work done in Canada as possible, it is the opinion of Mr. Forneret and of the other officials that a dredge of the character required for that work cannot be built in Canada. In the first place, it would have to be constructed, I understand, below Montreal, as a dredge of the size required could not pass through the canals. I understand that no firm below Montreal will undertake the construction of such a dredge, and it may be that we will be forced to have it constructed outside of Canada. The department considered the advisability of having it built at Sorel, but, as the dredge will be of a complicated character, we came to the conclusion that it would not be wise to undertake it at Sorel. This, therefore, may be one of the exceptions that will prove the rule with regard to the policy I have laid down.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would my hon. friend explain why a vessel, connected with the Canadian Pacific railway, I think, which met with an accident in the St. Lawrence river last summer or last fall, was sent to New York for repairs, instead of being repaired at Montreal. It was established beyond doubt that the repairs could have been made in the floating dock at Montreal, but for some reason, after temporary repairs were made, the vessel was sent to New York. It is a great pity that after such an efficient dock has been established at Montreal, our steamship companies do not take advantage of it. Would my hon. friend also give us an explanation for the rather long chapter of accidents which took place last season in the river St. Lawrence? I was struck with the list of accidents this year and, in order to restore the reputation of the river St. Lawrence, perhaps it would be quite in order for my hon. friend to tell the House that most of the accidents are due not to the river, not to the channel, but to the errors and mistakes of some of the pilots and sailing masters. I think it is only fair that the minister should give that explanation to the committee.

Mr. HAZEN: Answering my hon. friend's first question as to why the Canadian Pacific Railway steamer Lake Manitoba, which got in difficulties in the St. Lawrence, was not repaired at the Vickers drydock but was sent to New York, I think the reason was that at the time of the accident the Vickers had not their organization fully completed and did not have the equipment and facilities for making the repairs required. I do not know what other reason there could be, for I would think the Canadian Pacific railway would naturally prefer to have their vessels repaired at Montreal rather than at New York. With regard to the accidents that occurred on the St. Lawrence last year, that is a question that should be answered with some degree of care and, at a later period in my Estimates I shall make a statement. In every case there has been an investigation by the Wreck Commissioner, and I shall bring down the reports.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Reverting to the first stage of the discussion this afternoon, perhaps it would not be amiss for the minister to give an authoritative statement with regard to the last phase of the Chicago drainage canal project as affecting the river St. Lawrence. I understand that action has been taken by the United States authorities?

Mr. HAZEN: That is a matter that does not come under my department. At the time the application was made by the Chicago Sanitary Commission for permission to divert 10,000,000 cubic yards a second from Lake Michigan, I took charge of the organization of the opposition to it and, with the assistance of representatives of the Shipping Federation, and of the

Dominion Marine Insurance Company, and engineers of the Public Works Department, prepared the case to be submitted. That was a couple of years ago. The matter was argued before the Secretary of State for War and he refused the permission applied for by the Chicago Sanitary Commission. Since then I have had nothing to do, officially, with the matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has it been referred to the International Joint Commission?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, it is being considered now by the Waterways Commission, and I think Mr. Stewart, chief of the Hydrographic Survey, was detached from the Hydrographic Survey for a time, being a man of great experience, and placed at the disposal of the Prime Minister in regard to the preparation of matters of this sort. It has been engaging his attention. The matter has not come before me officially since then. If the hon. gentleman wants the information I can get it from some other department, or perhaps he can get it when other estimates are taken up.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In making purchases for the department in connection with repairs and work done on the dredging plant, at the shipyards at Sorel and on the channel generally, are tenders called for?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, of course the hon. gentleman understands that repairs made at the shipyards are done by our own employees, but tenders are asked for the material. It is all done, as is any other purchasing of the department, through the purchasing agent's branch. If material is wanted at the shipyard at Sorel the superintendent of the shipyard puts in a requisition to Mr. Doutre, the purchasing agent, and Mr. Doutre thereupon calls for tenders for the work, tenders are received and the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer. The same thing occurs with regard to lumber required for use there. All sorts of materials when bought in large amounts are purchased by tender.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I see a very large amount has been paid to the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company at Quebec.

Mr. HAZEN: That is for coal and is done by tender.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not question the small amounts, but I suppose my hon. friend is right in saying that for all material purchased in large quantities tenders are asked under the supervision of Mr. Doutre?

[Mr. Hazen.]

Mr. HAZEN: That is absolutely correct and in fact I think everything bought there is bought with the approval of the purchasing department.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The most important question to my mind that has been discussed by the hon. member for Rouville and the minister is that of insurance of the St. Lawrence. I did not catch just what the minister proposes for the future. The Minister of Trade and Commerce last year rather gave some hope to the shipping people that something definite would be done in regard to that matter during the year. I understand that nothing has been done to relieve the great expense that the shipping people are put to with regard to the insurance of their ships. Has the matter been dropped, or is the Government still endeavouring to better things, and what is their policy for the future?

Mr. HAZEN: The attitude that we have taken has been practically that taken by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I have discussed these questions with a great many gentlemen interested in shipping, and while the matter, as I said, comes under the Department of Trade and Commerce, still our department, being charged with the administration of the Canada Shipping Act, cannot help having a very deep interest in the subject. I feel it would be my duty and that of my department to make every effort to assist the Trade and Commerce Department in bringing about lower insurance rates. We have done all we can do by making representations to the underwriters, pointing out what Canada has done to improve conditions on our waters. In talking to those gentlemen, when the question of establishing a Canadian Lloyds has come up, I have invariably said that I thought a proposition ought to emanate from the shipping people; that if they would make a proposal I was sure that the matter would receive most careful consideration at the hands of the Government, and that the Government would be willing, as far as they could, to co-operate with them in trying to bring about some arrangement of that sort by which the insurance rates should be reduced. None of the shipping associations or federations have made any such proposal to the Government. They are more familiar with the state of affairs than any official of the department can be, and I think the position we take is the right one, that any proposition ought to come from those who are directly interested in it, as the ship-

ping people are. I said that we would give them every encouragement and every consideration. I suggested that at different times to individual members and those who occupy official positions in the shipping federation, but there has never been any result.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I understand that the minister says that he had a conference with Lloyds in connection with this matter?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN: In these representations, was Halifax differentiated from the St. Lawrence route ?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think that my hon. friend was in the House when I referred to it. For over two years we had been urging from our department, through Lord Strathcona, upon Lloyds, that the British North America clause in its policies of marine insurance ought to be eliminated in so far as the ports of Halifax and St. John and those of the lower provinces generally were concerned. My hon. friend, of course, knows what I refer to when I speak of the British North America clause?

5 p.m. Mr. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. HAZEN: We pointed out as strongly as we were able to do—and in this we had the strong support of Lord Strathcona and of the Canadian Government office—that with the modern aids to navigation which had been established, that clause was not justifiable, if, it ever had been justifiable. We further pointed out that these ports in the lower provinces were quite as safe as Portland or Boston, and yet at a certain time in the year, after the first of October, under the British North America clause, the insurance rates went up automatically as regards ports in the British American possessions and did not go up as regards these American ports.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is the rate for Boston much lower than that for the Maritime provinces ?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think it is now. As a result of those representations they excepted Halifax from the operations of the British North America clause, but they have not up to the present time excepted St. John.

Mr. MACLEAN: When does that take place ?

Mr. HAZEN: I think that it has been operative this winter. We have been urging upon them that they should also deal in the same way with the port of St. John. When my deputy minister was over in London at the Convention for the Safety of Ships, he interviewed the underwriters on this subject, discussed the matter fully, and pointed out to them the admirable manner in which the bay of Fundy is lighted and protected by fog alarms, lights, and submarine bells, with the result that they have asked to be furnished with additional particulars so that the matter may receive further consideration at their hands.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would the minister tell me at what time he was advised officially by Lloyds that Halifax was to be excepted from the British North America Act clause? When did that actually come into operation?

Mr. HAZEN: It may have been the preceding year but I had the idea that it was in operation this year.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am not sure that it is not.

Mr. HAZEN: My deputy minister will obtain this information in the department.

Mr. SINCLAIR: But the minister says that the same rule applies to Halifax as that which applies to the gulf of St. Lawrence.

Mr. HAZEN: What we were told would be done was that the port of Halifax would be exempted from the operation of the British North America Act clause.

Mr. SINCLAIR: So that you do not have to pay the advanced rate of insurance on a ship that is bound from the port of Halifax?

Mr. HAZEN: That is as I understand it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is the way I understand it, but I understood the minister to state that he was trying to get a remedy as far as Halifax and St. John were concerned.

Mr. HAZEN: So we were, and we succeeded in getting the clause removed in so far as Halifax is concerned.

Mr. SINCLAIR: When?

Mr. HAZEN: Last year; but it has not been removed as far as St. John is concerned.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It was not enforced by certain insurance companies last fall in so far as Halifax was concerned. I am

quite well aware that ships have come to Halifax without that additional rate being charged for several years past under the policy of certain insurance companies. I do not know whether all the insurance companies act in the same way.

Mr. LAW: Does the minister refer to the English Lloyds altogether?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. LAW: I know that some of our vessels insure with one of the largest companies in America and that this company makes no such distinction in regard to rates as that.

Mr. HAZEN: No, I was referring to what is well known as the British North America Act clause in the policies that are issued by the Lloyds in London. Most of the transatlantic steamers are insured by the British Lloyds.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I understand the minister to say that last fall the British Lloyds excepted Halifax from the operation of the British North America clause?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Just one word more in connection with the betterment of navigation in the river St. Lawrence. Many things contribute to the reputation, good, bad, or indifferent, of a route of that nature. I remember that my hon. friend appointed a commission a year or two ago to investigate the whole pilotage question. The sittings of the commission were many and the wranglings were also many. But a report was made and my hon. friend, as the head of the department and as the official head of the pilots, had to take some action. I do not know what action he took exactly except that I believe that, generally speaking, he accepted the recommendations made by the commission. But evidently he has not acted upon all the conclusions arrived at by the commissioners because I find that the Board of Trade of Montreal is at the present time making a very strong appeal to the Government, indeed to the Parliament of Canada, in connection with this pilotage question. The board of trade is acting in conjunction with the British Marine Underwriting interests. With the permission of the committee I will read to it the following article which I found in last night's Herald:

[Mr. Sinclair.]

Strong Appeal for Betterment of Pilotage Here—Petition Sent by Council of Board of Trade to Ottawa—Urges Reforms in the Present System—Improvement in Service at Quebec and Montreal is Urged.

A strong appeal has been made to the Government by the Council of the Board of Trade, in the form of a petition which has been sent to the Duke of Connaught, the Senate and the House of Commons regarding the pilotage systems of Quebec and Montreal. It was indicated in this petition that an imperative need of reform existed in this particular department of the marine conduct of the Dominion owing to the numerous accidents which had occurred on the St. Lawrence route, due to the present unsatisfactory condition of the pilotage system.

The petition also made plain its disappointment that the Government had failed to act upon the recommendations which had been made to it previously regarding this matter, which recommendations had been based on the findings of the Royal Commission appointed to investigate the matter.

The petition concludes thus:

That it is urgent that the improvement of the pilotage service below Quebec be effected before the opening of navigation this year so that the British Marine Underwriting interests may be assured that the Dominion Government is doing its part towards securing a reduction in the marine insurance rates on the St. Lawrence route.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray for Your Royal Highness in Council to promote legislation embodying the recommendations of the said Royal Commission on Pilotage in the pilotage districts of Montreal and Quebec.

Signed on behalf of the Council of the Montreal Board of Trade, R. J. Dale, president; Geo. Hadrill, secretary.

Montreal, February 14, 1914.

I wish to know what suggestions of the Pilotage Commission have not been accepted by the department; whether the minister has received this memorandum from the Montreal Board of Trade, and, whether he intends to act upon it. It is not surprising that the insurance rates on the St. Lawrence route should be so high, if, in view of the accidents that have taken place, the department does not follow the recommendations made by its own commission. There may be reason, of course, for not accepting all the recommendations, and I trust the minister will let us know what they are. The pilotage system, the dredging, the maintenance of the water levels, the works generally on the river St. Lawrence, combine to make the reputation of that route, and if there be laches anywhere, the insurance companies and underwriters would be perhaps justified in their judgment as to maintaining the high insurance rates.

Mr. HAZEN: The communication referred to by my hon. friend has been received by the department and a reply is

now being prepared. I think the Montreal Board of Trade must be under a misapprehension as to what has taken place.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understood the minister to state last year, that he intended to adopt the recommendations in the report of the Pilotage Commission.

Mr. HAZEN: I will explain to my hon. friend what has been done. A commission, consisting of three gentlemen representing the ship-owners, and Mr. Lachance, representing the pilots, was appointed. The report was not unanimous on all points. A minority report on some points was submitted by Mr. Lachance, who was at that time president of the Pilots Corporation. There are two pilot organizations on the St. Lawrence: the Montreal pilots, between Montreal and Quebec, and the Quebec pilots, from Quebec down, and they are entirely different bodies. I think I am correct in saying that every recommendation made with respect to the Montreal pilotage district has already been carried out. The commission found things in a pretty satisfactory state in the Montreal district; the recommendations were not of very great importance, and we were able to carry them out by regulations, without the necessity of obtaining further legislation. I am equally correct in saying, I think, that practically every important recommendation that was made by the commission with regard to the Quebec pilotage district, has also been carried into effect, so far as we were able to do so by regulations, before the session of Parliament. I repeat, without any reservation, that I think the essential recommendations made by the Pilotage Commission, with regard to the Quebec district, are in effect at present. There is, however, one recommendation made by the commission which is worthy of careful consideration, viz., the abolition of the pilots' corporation. There is a tradition connected with the corporation which seems to be very much prized by the pilots, and they say: we are willing to surrender into the hands of the Minister of Marine, as the chief pilotage authority, practically all the powers we possess at present, with regard to apprentices, the admission of pilots and so on, but we would like to have the privilege of retaining the corporation. Connected with that is the recommendation of the Pilotage Commission that the system of paying pilots should be changed. At present, in Quebec, the money earned by the pilots is pooled, and divided equally among those who are on the roll, each pilot receiving an equal amount during the year. The commission recommended that should be dispensed with, and that the pilots should not be allowed to pool their earnings, but that each should be paid the amount he actually earns himself. The very best of the pilots, the men who earn the most money, are themselves opposed to this, and they point out that under some of the different systems which prevail in the ports of the world, the pilots' earnings are pooled as in Quebec. The pilots seem to feel very strongly on the subject, and I think the matter is worthy of consideration. I am trying to give it the best consideration I can. The argument of the shipping interests, who are opposed to the present system, is, that it gives no opportunity for individual ambition, and that under it the poor pilot earns just as much as the good pilot. On the other hand, the pilots say: those of us who earn the most money are quite willing to divide it with the others; we all do our best, and even if the Government should say that the system of pooling the earnings of the pilots will not be recognized, we still can continue to pool our earnings and to divide them up amongst ourselves if we so wish. The matter will receive careful consideration.

That was the principal recommendation of the private commission which has been acted upon so far. There were two more. One was in regard to the situation of the office in the city of Quebec, which is a minor matter. It was thought that the office ought to be moved to some other part of the city, as where the office is at present there were temptations in the way of pilots. There was another recommendation about purchasing a new boat for the pilots to live on at Father Point. This is a very minor matter, but in the near future we may ask Parliament for an appropriation to buy that boat. Every recommendation has been carried out in good faith by my department up to the present time. Whether we shall abolish the corporation absolutely, or whether we shall let it continue in name out of respect to the feelings of the pilots, is a matter that we are now considering. It is a matter that will have to be dealt with by legislation.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Do we not pension the pilots?

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. gentleman will perhaps remember that a good many years ago it was felt that there were far too many pilots, and an agreement was come to with

the Government of that day under which the pilots were to be pensioned off until the number was brought down to seventy-five, at which figure it stands at present. The pilots are contending that the Order in Council does not limit the number of pensions and that they are all entitled to the same extra pension. While there may be some ambiguity in the language of the Order in Council, I think a perusal of all the papers and files would show that the manifest intention of the Government was to limit the number of extra pensions and only continue them until the number of pilots was reduced to seventy-five. In addition to the extra pension there are pensions paid out of the fund which the pilots themselves have.

My hon. friend from Rouville asked me for a statement regarding the disasters on the St. Lawrence river last year. I am now able to give him that statement. The disasters last year were not excessive at all; the losses were not many. On May 30, the Canada of Trieste, 8,816 tons, grounded above St. Augustin. The amount of the damage was not stated.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that one of the river boats?

Mr. HAZEN: A transatlantic boat. On May 27 the Megantic touched lightly at Point Marie. There was no damage done. On June 20 the Pisa, of Germany, collided with the dock wall at Quebec and was slightly damaged. The damage did not exceed $300. On June 29 the Lake Manitoba, of Liverpool, stranded at the Isle of Orleans. The amount of damage is not stated, but it is considerable. On August 24 the Barcelona, of Germany, stranded below Longue Pointe, but was not damaged. On September 1 the Montreal, of Montreal, collided with the Querida between Beaconcourt and Champlain, damage not over $150. On October 17 the Tyr, of Norway, grounded at St. Barnaby's island. There was no apparent damage. On August 14 the Hesperian, of Glasgow, stranded at Varennes and Cap St. Michel and was slightly damaged. On July 28 the Crown of Cordova, of Glasgow, collided with the Lady of Gaspé at Cap de la Madeleine. Considerable damage was done to the Lady of Gaspé. On September 13 the Whackatane, of Plymouth, collided with the wharf at Indian Cove and was slightly damaged. On September 24 the Mount Temple, of Liverpool, stranded in Montreal harbour, and was slightly damaged. On September 25 the steamer Germany grounded at Batiscan, no damage done. The hon. gentleman will see that last year the losses amounted to very little indeed.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How many of these accidents were due to defective piloting?

Mr. HAZEN: I cannot tell from the statement I have, but the hon. gentleman will see that several were collisions, where probably two or more vessels were more or less to blame. Most of them were of such a trifling character that I fancy no investigation was held by the wreck commissioner.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In reference to the pensions to pilots, the corporation received last year $124,080, which gave to each of the 75 pilots $1,680. Although perhaps this item does not call for these remarks, I wish to call the attention of my hon. friend to the importance of keeping watch over the expenditure around the harbour of Quebec.

Mr. HAZEN: If my hon. friend refers to the Harbour Commissioners, I shall have to bring down a Bill a little later on in regard to them, and I will then give ample opportunity for discussion.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will wait until my hon. friend brings in that Bill.

Public Works, chargeable to capital—To provide for construction and completion of dredging plant, etc., $666,500.

Mr. HAZEN: We have really been discussing this item with the other one. Is any further explanation required?

Mr. MARCIL: I read some months ago of changes which have been made at the Sorel shipyard. In the report of Mr. Jackson, the superintendent of Sorel shipyards, at page 139 of the report of the department for 1913, he says:

During the fiscal year 1912-13, many improvements have been effected towards placing the Sorel shipyard on a good, sound, commercial basis, and the general condition of things changed and improved all round.

Superfluous men have all been suspended, and the number now working are allocated and arranged in such a way that all are fully employed.

How many men are employed in Sorel at present as compared with say two years ago?

Mr. HAZEN: Practically the whole system has undergone a change. Scarcely a man is working for us now except on piece work. Many years ago a large number of men were getting very low pay, $1.15 and $1.25 a day. The change has resulted in

the men getting better wages and giving better results. At the present time about 1,100 men are employed. Of course this is the busiest season of the year.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that a substantial increase over two years ago?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not know. We are doing more work there of actual construction in addition to the repairing that was being done two years ago. It is a great disadvantage to have men working for six months and then idle for the other six months of the year. Besides the repair work, we are enedavouring to keep steady work there on scows and barges and things of that sort that are required in Canada.

Mr. MARCIL: Complaints were made that several hundred appointees of the old Government were dismissed on the new Administration coming into office. Is that a fact?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think so.

Mr. MARCIL: Charges are made that there were wholesale dismissals. Are the appointments made, as formerly was charged, on the recommendation of members?

Mr. HAZEN: Appointments are made by the superintendent of the shipyard, Mr. Jackson, and he has positive instructions not to take any man who is not competent to perform the work for which he is employed.

Mr. MARCIL: I wanted to know if the shipyard is run on business lines or on political lines—whether appointments are made as in other workshops or on recommendation of members of Parliament?

Mr. HAZEN: It is run on business principles, so far as it is possible to run any branch of Government on business principles. Hon. gentlemen opposite know—for they have been in Governments or supported Governments—that it is impossible to keep these services wholly clear of political influences; there is no use in shutting our eyes to that fact. But I think that we are running it on sound lines and are getting good results.

Mr. MARCIL: Then it is true that appointments are made on the recommendation of members of Parliament.

Mr. HAZEN: Certainly, I do not make any appointments myself.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In view of the reference to 'superfluous men,' it would be interesting to know how many men have been employed in 1911, 1912 and 1913.

Mr. HAZEN: I think the same number as now. I have not the figures at hand, but I can get them should hon. gentlemen desire it.

Public Works, chargeable to capital—New ice-breaker for river St. Lawrence, $500,000.

Mr. HAZEN: We had some discussion of this subject the other night. The purpose of this vote is to get a thoroughly up-to-date ice-breaker for work on the St. Lawrence, with the view to preventing floods and to give an earlier season of navigation up to the city of Montreal. There are now two ice-breakers, the Montcalm and the Lady Grey. They are not as powerful or as modern as we desire. They were built to serve the dual purpose of ice-breakers in the winter and ship channel work in the summer. But the result has not been satisfactory. They are most expensive boats to use in the summer, on account of their tremendous consumption of coal, and yet as ice-breakers they are not powerful enough to cope with the conditions. We asked for tenders for the proposed new ice-breaker, making it a condition that it must be built in Canada. Tenders were received from a number of firms in the old country, but they did not comply with the conditions. Two firms in Canada tendered—one the Canadian Vickers, and the other George P. Davey, of Quebec. The amounts they named were very much higher than the department had expected they would be. The tenders have been referred to the technical officers of the department to see if some change cannot be made that will reduce the expense without interfering with the efficiency of the vessel.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the hon. minister aware of a memorial sent by the Quebec Harbour Commissioners about winter navigation below Quebec, as the result of a most interesting lecture by Professor Barnes, and a recommendation that an ice-breaker like the Ermack might be secured by the Canadian Government in order to facilitate winter navigation below Quebec? And if so, has the minister taken any action in the matter?

Mr. HAZEN: We received the memorial, but have not taken action up to the present time. We have demonstrated the possibili-

ties, I think, by sending the Montcalm to Seven islands, and other points, but we have up to the present taken no action to get a steamer for the service.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I may inform my hon. friend that no later than last month, an ocean vessel left St. Catherines bay, at the mouth of the Saguenay, with full cargo, for Europe-England, I think. The vessel belongs to the Chicoutimi Pulp Company, and carried full cargo of pulp. I met the manager, in Montreal about three weeks ago, and he said: You might inform your colleagues of the House that yesterday we cleared a vessel with full cargo of pulp. It is well known amongst navigators around Quebec that St. Catherines bay is practically free from ice the whole winter, and it is said that navigation could be made possible should any transatlantic line make its terminus there. It would be worth while to study this question. As to the ice-breakers, am I to understand that at present they are at work at Cap Rouge or above Cap Rouge?

Mr. HAZEN: One is at Cap Rouge and the other at Portneuf above Cap Rouge.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. gentleman will remember that last year we had something to say about Sydney. Is any provision being made for ice-breaking in that port?

Mr. HAZEN: I have always remembered the very strong presentation of the case of Sydney made by my hon. friend. We are doing the best we can with the machinery at our command. The Stanley has been at Sydney this year, in fact I think we had word that she was just coming back. Demands have been made for ice-breaking in different places all of which have merit but all of which cannot be dealt with with our present equipment. I think I told my hon. friend from Cape Breton that we hoped soon to have more machinery for this work. When the ferry is put on between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, it will not be necessary, I presume, to keep the ice-breakers in the channel there, and so these vessels will be left free for other work. I hope we shall then have a boat which will give its entire time to that work. We have had to use the Stanley for different purposes; we send her on a trip to the Magdalen Islands now and then, and under these conditions it is impossible for us to do as much ice-breaking as we would like to do.

Mr. LAW: With reference to my taking up with the minister the matter of Yarmouth harbour being frozen up and occasioning a delay in the Boston boats, I was informed by the department that they had asked for a report from the harbour master at Yarmouth. Has the minister heard anything with reference to the matter?

Mr. HAZEN: The deputy minister wired the harbour master at Yarmouth asking for a report, but up to the present time no report has been received, or, if it has come to the department, it has not been brought to my attention or to the attention of the deputy minister.

Mr. LEMIEUX: With reference to the difficulties encountered because of ice conditions, I should like to be allowed to read a short summary of a very interesting lecture delivered last year by Professor Barnes, in the city of Quebec. It is in French, but I will attempt to translate it:

If Canada had been isolated; if she had not had an easy route southward; if she had not had access to the Atlantic ports of the neighbouring republic, the problem of winter navigation would have been solved long ago. The lecturer strongly insisted upon the national importance of solving this problem of winter navigation, and referred to its solution as being one of the surest means of preventing the diversion of a large quantity of Canadian trade towards United States ports. He strongly insisted on the importance of ensuring to Canadian ports all the traffic possible, the great portion of which is actually diverted towards American ports. To ameliorate conditions of navigation on the St. Lawrence, it is necessary to study the movement of the ice and be in a position to detect the presence of ice in foggy weather. For many years Professor Barnes has taken a deep interest in the problem of the formation of ice. The Dominion Government, profoundly interested in the results of his experiments, has at last granted him the favour of completing them on one of the ice-breakers. During his experiments Professor Barnes has been made aware of the extraordinary physical phenomenon that an iceberg, dissolving itself in salt water, creates by that fusion a current or tide of such a nature that the cold water surrounding it disappears from the surface and a warmer current is thereby created. The result is that water is much warmer in the neighbourhood of an iceberg than it is some miles distant from it. Professor Barnes has also ascertained, by means of his micro-thermometer, that the temperature of the air is lowered in the neighbourhood of the shore. He is assured that he is now in possession of a means of ascertaining the presence of ice in foggy weather or when nearing the shore. This is one of the many things which will help to obtain for the river St. Lawrence an ultimate reduction of insurance rates. The lecturer has compared the conditions of navigation on the St. Lawrence with those on many of the larger rivers of the world. Winter navigation has made immense strides all over the world. Russia, Norway, Holland have had to face problems of very great difficulty, but, realizing the

importance of maintaining their trade at all seasons of the year, those nations have not hesitated to impose upon themselves great sacrifices. Canada has not made great advances in this regard. We have been foolish enough to let our trade flow southward instead of studying the winter navigation problem. Professor Barnes recommends the construction of an ice-breaker such as the Ermack, a boat which Russia has used with much success in the harbours of the Baltic sea. Sometimes the Ermack cuts more than one foot of solid ice at a speed of nine knots, towing eight vessels at the same time. The Ermack is 335 feet long, 71 feet wide, has a tonnage of 8,000, a draught of 22 feet, and horse-power of 10,000. It is said that the Ermack can break ice which has a thickness of 35 feet. This is the kind of an ice-breaker we should have in operation, particularly in the Cabot strait. The lecturer, however, admitted that the Lady Grey and the Montcalm have accomplished great work so far. Professor Barnes declared that very little expenditure would be required to facilitate winter navigation on the St. Lawrence as far as Quebec, with the use of an ice-breaker of the same tonnage and of the same frame and build as the Ermack.

I have read this little summary of Mr. Barnes' report in order to impress on my hon. friend the necessity of continuing the investigation of this question of the possibility of winter navigation. If we want to build up this country and to be independent of the American ports we must try to solve the problem of winter navigation, and the best way to solve it is to experiment, as Professor Barnes has done, until you find a solution.

Mr. HAZEN: The question of winter navigation is, I think, beyond the experimental stage. There is no question about the feasibility with vessels especially built for the service. The only question is whether it will pay commercially to construct vessels that can successfully navigate through the ice in the winter. The ice-breaker we have designed, for which tenders have been received and are being considered, is superior to the Ermack and to the latest boat launched for the Russian Government a few months ago, because the naval architect of the department, Mr. Duguid, has consulted with the naval architect of the Russian Government and they agree that the Canadian boat will be really a superior boat. Its dimensions are much the same as those of the Ermack, length 275 feet; breadth, moulded, 55 feet to depth 60 feet; depth, not less than 27 feet, and indicated horse-power eight to ten thousand. My hon. friend quoted the horse-power of the Ermack as ten thousand. The officials say it is not ten thousand and that this will be a more powerful boat than the Ermack when completed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When will she be completed?

Mr. HAZEN: The tenders received seemed to be very high, and we are trying to make some reduction in the price without impairing the efficiency of the boat.

Mr. MARCIL: I have sent in for the report of a select committee of thirty years ago on the question of winter navigation on the St. Lawrence. That committee heard evidence from a large number of experienced men showing that even at that time winter navigation was recognized as quite feasible. So this is nothing new, the only question is whether it would pay to invest in the vessels required for such a service. As Prof. Barnes has very well said, Canada has lost a great deal of its trade in the winter by the fact that the moment navigation closes down in Montreal and Quebec, business goes south. Of course, previous to Confederation we had not even St. John and Halifax and the whole business of Montreal and the western country went down to Portland, Boston and other American ports. If we had had winter navigation from Quebec, 75 per cent of that trade could have been kept in Canadian channels.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the statement made by the minister of the work done by the Convention held in London regarding the saving of human life at sea. In glancing through the report of the department I find that in the life-saving service of Canada there are forty life-saving stations, four in New Brunswick, sixteen in Nova Scotia, five in Prince Edward Island, four in British Columbia, and eleven in Otario. The gulf of St. Lawrence and the province of Quebec are left without a single life-saving station. The large passenger steamers pass up and down that river and gulf, and surely there should be one or more life-saving stations on the Gaspé coast or somewhere on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. HAZEN: It is most extraordinary that there is not a life-saving station on the gulf or the river St. Lawrence. I shall certainly have the matter carefully looked into and perhaps bring the matter up again in the House.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Has the minister in his possession any documentary matter relating to the discontinuance of the British North America clause in the Lloyds insurance policy? If so, I should be glad to see them.

Mr. HAZEN: I shall be very glad to show them to my hon. friend.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We will have occasion to discuss the harbour of Montreal and the harbour of Quebec?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, there will be Bills referring to them both during the session.

Public Works, chargeable to capital—To provide for the construction of a specially designed steamer to be used exclusively for testing or sweeping the river St. Lawrence ship channel, $100,000.

Mr. HAZEN: I have here the report of Mr. Forneret, superintending engineer of the St. Lawrence ship channel, who reports that the problem of properly sweeping the St. Lawrence river is a difficult one, and that owing to the increasing area to be covered by the sweeping scows it is impossible, with the present equipment, to examine the channel properly in the season of navigation. This boat is to be built at Sorel. The dimensions are 130 feet long by 30 by 15 feet draught.

The other evening there was some criticism on the item for unforeseen expenditures, in relation to Mr. Duchemin, who was employed in the province of Nova Scotia to investigate certain charges of political partisanship. The hon. gentleman from Pictou made reference to Mr. Duchemin in connection with a case in which a man named Currie was arrested and found guilty of perjury. The impression left on my mind from what the hon. gentleman from Pictou said was that, in the course of holding an investigation, an official had been found guilty on the evidence of a man named Currie who was afterwards found guilty of perjury, and that Mr. Duchemin had appeared as a witness for the defence and had tried to get Currie clear on the ground that the oath had not been administered to him in a legal manner. I showed the letter which I am about to read to the hon. member for Pictou before the House met to-day. Mr. Duchemin has written a letter to the Sydney Record, and in fairness to him and in view of the serious charge laid against him, I think it only fair that I should read that letter to the House. If the committee will wait for one moment I will read the letter, which appears in the Sydney Record of February 16. It is as follows:

To the Editor of the Record.

Sir,—I wish to refer to a grossly defamatory article purporting to be a despatch from Ottawa which was conspicuously featured on the first page of your issue on Saturday last. It deals with the case of Mr. John J. McDonald, preventive officer of customs at North Sydney, who was accused of partisanship and subjected to an investigation before me, as commissioner of inquiry, at North Sydney in the autumn of 1912.

Your article also refers to the evidence given at this inquiry by one Ronald Currie, who was afterwards prosecuted for perjury, convicted and sentenced to a term of imprisonment.

You say: 'The evidence against the accused was given by a man named Currie. The evidence was represented as sworn to and the office holder dismissed. An action for perjury was started against Currie, who pleaded innocence and set up as a defence the fact that he had not actually been sworn by Duchemin, because the regular form of administering oaths had not been followed. The chief witness on his behalf was Duchemin. Duchemin gave evidence that the oath had not been properly administered by him at all the investigations.'

Every essential statement in the foregoing extract is untrue. The evidence against the office holder in question was given, not only by Currie, but by five or six other witnesses. Currie's evidence was not believed by me, and I did not regard the statements of the other witnesses as sufficiently serious to warrant Mr. McDonald's dismissal. This office holder was therefore not dismissed, as stated by you, but was exonerated on the report which I submitted to the Government, and holds his position up to the present time.

To satisfy you on these points, I give extracts from my report submitted to the Government under date October 15, 1912:

'The evidenec of Ronald Currie was disproved by that of Joseph McPherson and the accused, John J. McDonald, both of whom swore positively that the story told by Currie was absolutely untrue in every particular. I am satisfied that these two men were stating the facts, and I therefore declined to accept the testimony of Mr. Currie.'

I also give you the concluding paragraph of my report, which exonerated Mr. McDonald. notwithstanding the depositions that were submitted to me against him:

'The only occasion on which it was alleged by any witness that he took a direct part in politics was in the matter of canvassing a voter, Joseph Naves, and the testimony in this regard is so conflicting and unsatisfactory that I do not feel like basing an adverse finding on this evidence, and must find that the charge of partisanship against this official has not been established.'

Your assertion that the chief witness on Mr. Currie's behalf, in the subsequent indictment of this witness for perjury, was myself, is as recklessly false as every other material statement in your article. I was subpœnaed, not by the accused, or on his behalf, but by the Crown, to produce the record showing the false statement that Mr. Currie had made before me as a commissioner.

Your further statement that I gave evidence that the oath had not been properly administered by me at all the investigations is equally false. My evidence in this connection, given before Judge Finlayson, was as follows: 'In this case, as in a few other cases where a copy of the Bible was not readily available, I caused the witness to hold up his hand and put the usual formula to him.'

This form of administering an oath has been followed by members of the Bar of Nova Scotia for a quarter of a century in swearing affidavits for use in the Supreme Court and the registry of deeds. Mr. D. D. McKenzie, who was present at the investigation as counsel for Mr. McDonald, raised no objection with regard to it. Judge Finlayson, before whom Currie's trial for perjury took place, regarded the oath as binding on the witness. Judge Finlayson's view was upheld by a majority of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, and was finally confirmed by the unanimous judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada.

In such a state of facts, you will, I am sure, appreciate the absurdity of your position when you question the binding character of the oath that was put to Mr. Currie in this case.

The concluding part of your article is as grossly and recklessly untrue as the portions of it I have already dealt with. You say: 'When a Conservative worker faced a charge of perjury Duchemin appeared in court to swear that the testimony before him leading to a charge against the accused had not been regularly sworn at all.'

I have never yet appeared in court as a witness for any individual who was accused of perjury. I gave evidence at two trials—in both cases as a Crown witness against the accused persons.

If your statement in this connection, like the other allegations contained in your articles, is not clearly libellous, I do not understand the meaning of the term.

Elsewhere in the article you say that I denied accused office holders the right of counsel. My answer to this is that the investigations held by myself and by my fellow commissioner, Mr. Lane, were the only ones in the history of partisanship inquiries in this province where counsel was admitted to defend accused persons. Counsel was admitted at my investigations in Glace Bay, Sydney, North Sydney and Sydney Mines on different occasions. Mr. F. B. A. Chipman, now law partner of Mr. E. M. Macdonald, of Pictou, defended an office holder in one case in Glace Bay; Mr. W. F. Carroll appeared on behalf of another; Mr. Ronald McVicar, barrister of this city, attended an accused office holder at an investigation taken by me in Sydney. In the McDonald case, above referred to, Mr. D. D. McKenzie appeared as counsel on behalf of Mr. McDonald, as he did also in the case of Dr. Horace Rindress, members of the Board of Harbour Commissioners at North Sydney, and in other cases at Sydney Mines, and he was never on any occasion denied the right to appear on behalf of accused persons, cross-examine witnesses and call witnesses on behalf of the accused and present arguments to the court in their favour.

As I have said, the Commissioners of Inquiry appointed by the Borden Government were the first officials of the kind in this province to admit counsel to defend accused office holders. This right was denied Conservative office holders by the commissioners appointed by the Laurier Administration after the change of Government in 1896. I do not base this statement on hearsay. My authority is Mr. J. T. Ross, barrister, of Halifax, who was the chief commissioner doing similar work for the Laurier Administration after the change of Government in 1896, who personally informed me that he had never allowed counsel to appear at any of his investigations.

This, however, is merely by the way. My main object in furnishing you with this statement of facts is to correct the mass of defamatory misstatements contained in your article of Saturday with reference to the J. J. McDonald and Currie cases.

I would ask you to give this letter a position in your paper as prominent as that occupied by the article whose misstatements it is designed to correct.

H. P. Duchemin.

In view of the very serious character of the charges against Mr. Duchemin made by the hon. member for Pictou, and by other hon. members of the House, I thought it was only fair and right that, side by side with these charges, there should be placed on the pages of 'Hansard' the statement which Mr. Duchemin has made over his own signature giving his version as to what actually did occur.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I suppose that my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) will be afforded an opportunity to reply?

Mr. HAZEN: Most certainly; it makes no difference what item it is. I thought it only fair and right, that, as Mr. Duchemin is not a member of this House, this statement in regard to the matter should go upon the pages of 'Hansard.'

Mr. LEMIEUX: What Estimates will be taken up this evening?

Mr. ROGERS: With the consent of the House we will take up agriculture.

Mr. OLIVER: Agriculture has not been taken up in the House.

Mr. ROGERS: I quite appreciate that but I was suggesting that with the consent of the House we might allow the Minister of Agriculture to go on with his Estimates. If there is any objection we will go on with the Estimates of the Department of Customs.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Could Railways go on?

Mr. HAZEN: That is in the same position as Agriculture.

Mr. OLIVER: As I understand it, the feeling on this side of the House is that the Estimates of the Department of Customs should go on. They have already been taken up and there would be no question as to the effect upon the rights of hon. members on this side of the House at a later date.

At six o'clock the House resumed, and then took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

Further consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bill number 12, respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company —Mr. Douglas. Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

On section 3—securities:

Mr. LANCASTER: They had a limitation of $20,000 per mile of securities to be issued by the Railway Company, and they convinced the Railway Committee that they could not do with less than $35,000. The section is amended to that end.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the limitation of time?

Mr. LANCASTER: They have to commence in one year and finish in three years.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

PACIFIC, PEACE RVER AND ATHABASKA RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House in Committee on Bill No. 26 to incorporate the Pacific, Peace River and Athabaska Railway Company—Mr. R. B. Bennett. Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

On section 1—incorporation:

Mr. OLIVER: What is the location of this railway?

Mr. LANCASTER: The location is set out in section 8 of the Bill. By some freak or mistake they did not insert the gauge in the Bill, and as we have not yet a standard gauge under the Railway Act, we inserted it here.

Mr. OLIVER: Is this company allowed two years to commence?

Mr. LANCASTER: This being a new charter the provisions of the Railway Act apply to it in that respect, and there being no special provision in the Bill to the contrary, they will have two years to commence and five years to complete

Mr. OLIVER: Where is the head office of the company?

Mr. LANCASTER: In Vancouver.

Mr. OLIVER: As to telephone and telegraph lines, is this company given any extra powers?

[Mr. Oliver.]

Mr. LANCASTER: No; the Bill contains the municipal standard clauses with regard to the location of poles, and so on, in a municipality, and the rates charged will be under the control of the Railway Commission.

Mr. OLIVER: Has the company authority to develop water powers?

Mr. LANCASTER: Under the standard clause, they can acquire water powers, but not by expropriation, and the rates charged for supplying power must be approved by the Railway Commission.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

OTTAWA AND UNGAVA RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House in committee on Bill No. 37, respecting the Ottawa and Ungava Railway Company.—Mr. Chabot. Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

Mr. OLIVER: Is this a new proposition?

Mr. LANCASTER: No, this is an authority to the Ottawa and Ungava Railway Company to construct, maintain and operate the following additional branch lines:

Eastward, from a point on the main line north of the 49th circle of latitude by the most feasible route and crossing the Ashwapmuchuan, Mistassini, Peribonka, Bersimis, Outarde, Manicuagan, Pentecote, Ste. Marguerite, Moisie, Romaine and Natashwan rivers, to lake Melville or to a point on the boundary between the province of Quebec and Labrador in the vicinity of St. Lewis Inlet or of St. Charles river.

We struck out all the words in section one after what I have just read, because it clashed with the provisions of the Railway Act and was not considered good legislation. It was substituting other language for their rights in regard to the branch lines. Every company can build six miles of branch lines without any authority; but if they build more, they must ask Parliament for authority, and then we make them state their termini.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who are the incorporators?

Mr. LANCASTER: I cannot say unless I look at the original Act. This is an additional power for the company.

Mr. LEMIEUX: At what point does the line start?

Mr. LANCASTER: It begins at a point on the main line north of the 49th parallel,

running eastward by the most feasible route, and crossing those rivers to the lake or other place that I have mentioned.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not wish to delay the passing of this Bill, but I would like to hear the sponsor give an explanation of it. It seems to be quite a large contract. If there is no objection we might perhaps consider the Bill later on.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is it a renewal?

Mr. LANCASTER: The incorporation began in 1910; it was renewed in 1912. This is an additional line which the company is asking permission to build. Section 2 renews the old line. What I have read is the new right asked for.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not object to the Bill at all; I am sure that it is a very excellent one, but I saw in the papers not very long ago a statement that some gentlemen from London, England, were interested in a similar venture. We must be very careful how such charters are granted and what hopes they may raise in the minds of the public abroad. I would be pleased if the sponsor was here to explain the nature of the Bill, the capital involved, the total length of the line, etc.

Mr. LANCASTER: I can tell my hon. friend exactly where the original road runs. What I have read refers to the new line for which they are asking. The original road is from a point on the National Transcontinental railway at the head of the Gatineau river, thence to Leaf lake on Ungava bay, about nine hundred miles in length, also a branch from lake Minto to Payne lake, an addition of two hundred miles. That is what by section 2 they are asking us to extend the time for.

Mr. LEMIEUX: With the permission of the committee I would ask that the third reading of this Bill be postponed, because I would like to hear the sponsor in regard to it. I am not opposed to it at all; I would probably support it, but it is such a large contract that we are entitled to some further explanation.

Progress reported.

THESSALON AND NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House in Committee on Bill No. 39, respecting the Thessalon and Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Smith. Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

Mr. OLIVER: It might be well to have a statement in regard to this Bill also.

Mr. LANCASTER: This is a railway that is partly constructed, and therefore the company does not need to ask for time for commencement, but they ask for time for completion. This line runs from a point on the Algoma branch of the Canadian Pacific railway about two miles northeast of the town of Thessalon, thence southwesterly to a point in or near the town of Thessalon, in the district of Algoma, thence northwesterly to a point at or near Thessalon station on the Algoma branch of the Canadian Pacific railway, and from either of the said points on the said Algoma branch, northerly to a point on the Mississauga river in or near the township of Gould. That is the original charter; that is not our language this year. That is what they are asking us to give them more time to complete.

Mr. MACDONALD: While I am sure that everyone in the committee admires the attention and care of the hon. gentleman who is chairman of the Railway Committee in regard to these railway Bills, I think that hon. gentlemen who are sponsors of Bills, who are desirous of seeing them passed and who take any interest whatever in them, should be present to give some information other than the technical information which the chairman is able to give. I think that the Minister of Railways also should be present. In previous parliaments no railway legislation passed through committee without the Minister of Railways of the day being present in order that questions of policy which might arise in connection with the matter could be dealt with by him. We are open to the charge of allowing legislation to go through in a careless manner, when hon. gentlemen simply introduce these Bills and then do not appear to see them pass, and when the Minister of Railways also is not present.

Mr. ROGERS: While I agree with my hon. friend from Pictou that the sponsor of the Bill ought to be in his seat if he is anxious to pass the legislation for which he assumes responsibility when he places his name upon the Bill, under present circumstances I cannot agree with him in his remarks respecting the Minister of Railways.

Mr. MACDONALD: If the minister is unwell, I withdraw my remarks in regard to him.

Progress reported.

JOLIETTE AND LAKE MANUAN COLONIZATION RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House in Committee on Bill No. 36, respecting the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—Mr. Guilbault. Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

Mr. OLIVER: If the hon. minister who is leading the House would establish a rule or would put the question forward so that the House would agree and understand that, unless the sponsor of a Bill were present, the Bill would stand, I think it would be agreeable to the whole House, and would be a very proper rule. I do not like to insist upon holding up a Bill, but I quite agree with everything that my hon. friend from Pictou has said and that the hon. minister has said. We are unduly careless in the passing of legislation affecting in an intimate degree the interest of the public. Although this is called private legislation, it really affects the interest of the public, and for this class of legislation the public are entitled to more consideration at our hands than we have given in the past. If the Government will take some measure of responsibility in establishing the rule, we on this side of the House will be very glad to support the Government in making it.

Mr. LANCASTER: I do not object to the Bill being allowed to stand, but I can explain it if the hon. gentleman desires.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to pick on this Bill particularly. I am quite willing to let it go through with an explanation. But I would rather have the rule established and let everybody follow it.

Mr. ROGERS: The hon. gentleman will recollect that last year when Bills of a similar nature were going through we had the same discussion. I took the ground then that the member who is responsible for a Bill should be present and should endeavour to explain it to the satisfaction of the committee before we proceed. I take the same ground now, except that I would add that the sponsor for a Bill, if he prefers, might select a colleague who will act for him and explain the Bill to the satisfaction of the committee, and I should then expect and hope that the business of the committee would go on. Otherwise, if there is the slightest objection from anybody on either side, and if the sponsor of the Bill under consideration is absent and no one is ready to speak on his behalf, then, so far as I am concerned, we are prepared to let the Bill stand over.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) would not raise objection in this case. The Bill is well known and this is the fourth time they have comé for an extension. This railway construction is well known.

Mr. OLIVER: Perhaps the chairman of the Railway Committee (Mr. Lancaster) will give such explanation as he can, and under these circumstances the Bill might go through.

Mr. LANCASTER: This is for a railway from Joliette to Lake Manuan, with an extension from Joliette to Montreal. Section 1 we have not amended—it is merely an extension of time, with two years to begin and five years to complete. Section 2, we have amended. We have repealed this section and another in order to amend their telegraph powers which are not according to our standard. We then enact our standard telegraph clause. We protect municipalities by providing that they shall not build on the highway, and that nothing in the Act shall allow them to erect poles without the municipality's consent. We have made it a model charter.

Mr. OLIVER: Does this Bill ask for telephone powers ?

Mr. LANCASTER: No.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE: Has any work been done under this charter ?

Mr. LANCASTER: We understand so.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: It was explained to the committee that a considerable amount of money has been expended, that they have 69 miles surveyed. This, we were told, is a colonization road in Quebec.

Mr. LANCASTER: They showed pretty good bona fides.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House in Committee on Bill No. 42, respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company—Mr. Shepherd. Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the purpose of this Bill?

Mr. LANCASTER: This Bill is the renewal of an existing charter. It covers the following lines: from Kamloops via Campbellford to Alberni canal; Comox via Cumberland to Alberni canal; from Englishman's river to Alberni canal; from Duncan's to Alberni via Cowichan valley; from Comax to Campbell river; from Esquimalt to Nanaimo; and a branch was granted in 1912 from the north fork of Oyster river to Hardy's bay on the west coast of Vancouver island. They are asking for renewal of these rights and an extension of two years to begin and five years to complete was granted by the committee. The Bill as printed is not changed except that we added a section, the standard clause as to highways.

Mr. OLIVER: That is the only amendment?

Mr. LANCASTER: Yes, they have no water-powers or anything of that kind.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ERIE, LONDON AND TILLSONBURG COMPANY.

The House in Committee on Bill No. 46, respecting the Erie, London and Tillsonburg Railway Company—Mr. Morphy. Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

Mr. LANCASTER: This charter covers a line from Port Burwell to London through Aylmer, and from a point between Port Burwell and Aylmer to Tillsonburg. It has been renewed twice, and this is the third renewal. We did not change section 1 as printed. As to section 2, the old Bill gave water-powers which were wider than those we now allow; so we imposed the condition that if they wished renewal, they must accept the standard clause. We repeal the sections of their charter relating to this as well as that relating to the time limit and enact three standard clauses.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PEACE RIVER TRAMWAY AND NAVIGATION COMPANY.

The House in Committee on Bill No. 48, to incorporate the Peace River Tramway and Navigation Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett. Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

On section 9—railway authorized:

Mr. LANCASTER: This section was amended to provide for the standard gauge. I do not know why, but they asked us to let them have a railway of a gauge of three feet, which we could not allow, because the Railway Commission would not then be able to fully control it. The words 'to be operated by steam, electricity or other power' were struck out because this is covered by the Railway Act. To make the section more definite, we struck out 'or near' in two or three places to avoid any uncertainty about the route. The section now reads, as we amended it:

The company may lay out, construct and operate a railway, of the gauge of four feet eight and one-half inches, commencing at a point at Smith's landing on the Slave river, thence along the westerly side of the Slave river to a point in the Northwest territories at Fort Smith on the Slave river, also commencing at a point south of Vermilion rapids at or near the Peace river, thence in an easterly direction along the northerly bank of the Peace river to a point on the Peace river north of Vermilion falls, in the province of Alberta.

The general scope of the charter is not changed, but the language of the Bill is made more direct and certain, and changed so as to facilitate location by route maps, etc.

On section 12—securities:

Mr. LANCASTER: In the original Bill the securities issued by the company were not to exceed $50,000 a mile; we thought that too high, and accordingly we limit them to $30,000 a mile.

On section 17—agreements with other companies.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the length of the line at Vermilion rapids?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The length of the line is said to be only a few miles. The navigation part of the enterprise was the part most strongly urged by the gentlemen who had charge of the Bill before the committee, Mr. Thompson and Mr. Law; the idea of the railway was to provide facilities to get around the rapids with electric power.

Mr. OLIVER. What is the length of the proposed line passing Vermilion rapids on Peace river?

Mr. BENNETT: I think the distance mentioned was sixteen miles; whether that is correct or not I cannot say.

Mr. OLIVER: I think the mileage should be stated. The sections of railway proposed are to overcome the breaks in navigation that exist on the Slave river and on the Peace river. I happen to have a personal knowledge of the length of line required

on the Slave river running from Smith's landing to Fort Smith. We are giving the company authority to build only for a distance of sixteen miles. In the case of the piece of line intended to be used to pass the Vermilion Falls on Peace river, I do not gather from the reading of the Bill that there are two fixed points, nor is there any specific mileage given.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I should like to point out that when the matter was before the committee, the capital was fixed at $1,000,000 and the bonding power, at my instance, reduced from $50,000 to $30,000 a mile. The capitalization included not only the tramway part of the system, but also the navigation part. My understanding was that the distance was not very great, but I am free to say that the hon. member for Edmonton has a much wider knowledge of the matter than I have. The gentlemen before the committee, to whom I have referred, explained that the distance covered in connecting these two points would be the only distance required.

Mr. OLIVER: This piece of track proposed to be laid around Vermilion Falls is in the constituency which I represent. I have no objection to the company's being authorized to build, but when we are giving them specific authorization for a specific purpose, as the representative of that district I ask this committee to put specific limitations upon the authority given the company.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: As I have said, I have no personal knowledge of the matter; my name is attached to the Bill merely for the purpose of introducing it and giving such information as may be required. I would suggest that the matter stand until the information asked for by the hon. gentleman can be obtained from those promoting the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER: I would ask that that be done, because I do not think we should give the company such indefinite powers as are conveyed by the terms of this Bill. I think they should say specifically how many miles of railroad they are going to build, and from what point to what point the track is to be laid.

Progress reported.

CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY OF CANADA.

The House in Committee on Bill No. 52, respecting the Central Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. W. H. Bennett. Mr. Blondin in the Chair.

[Mr. Oliver.]

Mr. LANCASTER: This is an old friend which we have put into such shape that no mischief can be done. This Bill was brought in last year. They wanted to extend a lot of charters which would give them a right to litigate in regard to land grants, under old provincial statutes. This was opposed by the Governments of Ontario and Quebec and by members of the Dominion Parliament. The House was almost unanimous that the Bill should not pass unless the promoters agreed to abandon all such claims as a condition of receiving a renewal. The Carillon and Grenville railway is about the only part of any of these lines that has ever been built. At the instance of the Railway Committee and of the House I went to Toronto and discussed with the Provincial authorities and their counsel and also with the gentlemen from the province of Quebec, the whole situation and we drafted a clause that satisfied them that it would prevent all such claims being raised and that was satisfactory to me and to the House and the committee. This clause was agreed on last year and a new Bill was introduced in the Senate with that clause in it, so that we could pass it when it came to this House. The Senate threw out that clause and we rejected the Bill in this House without even sending it to the Railway Committee as it was not thought desirable to pass the Bill without that clause. We insert at the beginning of section 1, 'subject to the provisions of section 3 of this Act,' which is as follows:

1. It is hereby expressly declared and enacted that the Central Railway Company of Canada shall not, nor shall the Ottawa River Railway Company, the Central Counties Railway Company, the Ottawa Valley Railway Company, the Carillon and Grenville Railway Company or the Ottawa River Navigation Company, nor the assigns of any of the said companies, nor shall any other company or person whatsoever, be entitled to receive any land grant or grants under the provisions of the statutes of the late province of Canada, 19 and 20 Victoria, chapter 112, and 24 Victoria, chapters 80 and 87, or any of them, or any amending or substituted Acts, or any other statutes or Acts of Canada or any of the provinces of Canada.

Then we have added three standard sections to water-powers and municipal control of highways.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 34, respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Jameson.

Bill No. 44, respecting the Vancouver Life Insurance Company, of Vancouver, B.C., and to change its name to The Vancouver Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 14, respecting the Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company, Limited, and to change its name to The Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

Bill No. 24, respecting the Canadian Railway Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to The Globe Indemnity Company of Canada.—Mr. Baker.

Bill No. 49, respecting the Saskatchewan Central Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 72, respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 73, respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 74, respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—Mr. G. V. White.

Bill No. 75, respecting the Continental Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

Bill No. 76, to incorporate Les Soeurs le la Charité de L'Hopital Saint Antoine de Le Pas.—Mr. Lavallée.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply. Mr. Blondin in the chair.

Customs—Salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports and of other officers on inspection and preventive service, including salaries and expenses in conection with the Board of Customs, $335,000.

Mr. McCRANEY: I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) to some facts connected with the dismissal of the late sub-collector at Rosthern, Saskatchewan, and to inquire of him if I can obtain information as to the circumstances under which officials of the Government are dismissed, and what is the practice in that respect. Some time early in 1911 it was decided by the predecessor of the present minister to establish a sub-collectorship at Rosthern. The office would have been opened quite early in that year but for one fact. There was already a sub-land agency in Rosthern and Mr. Paterson, the then Minister of Customs, thought it better to appoint the sub-land agent as sub-collector of customs, and as the sub-land agent was at that time receiving a salary of $600 a year, it was proposed to appoint him also as sub-collector of customs at a salary of $300. The sub-land agent was ill, he was unable to open the customs office at Rosthern; this illness continued until midsummer, and eventually Mr. McGregor, who was the sub-land agent, died. In the month of August a new sub-land agent was appointed in the person of Mr. Tobias Unruh, and about the 14th August Mr. Unruh was instructed to open the customs office in Rosthern. I see by the Auditor General's Report that his salary commenced from the 1st September, 1911, and continued at the rate of $300 per year until his dismissal on October 14, 1912. I am informed that after the Dominion elections of 1911, when it was

9 p.m.

known that there was to be a change of Government, Mr. Unruh went to the president of the Conservative Association at Rosthern and inquired of him whether he was to be dismissed, and Mr. Unruh was assured that he would not. He gave as a reason for wanting the information that he intended to obtain a building as an office for the sub-land agency, and the sub-collectorship of customs, and being told that he would not be dismissed he moved into the new office. I questioned the minister as to the matter on the 9th of February, and my question and the answer appear in 'Hansard.'

Mr. McCraney:

1. On what grounds was Tobias Unruh dismissed from the position of sub-land agent and collector of customs at Rosthern, Saskatchewan?

Mr. J. D. Reid:

1. Tobias Unruh was dismissed from the position of sub-collector of customs at Rosthern, Saskatchewan, because he had never been permanently appointed to the position in which he was temporarily acting from August 4, 1911, and because information was received from Donald Maclean, candidate in the last Dominion election, that he had taken an active part in the last provincial and Dominion elections.

Mr. Unruh was apparently dismissed in October, 1912, and in his place Mr. E. St. George Hodgson was appointed sub-collector. From the Auditor General's Report it would appear that Mr. Hodgson was given a salary at the rate of $300 a year for one month only, and within a month after the dismissal of Mr. Unruh that salary was raised from $300 to $600 a year. The last report of the collector of customs shows the income of the office to be in the neighbourhood of $3,500 per annum. I am informed there was no investigation held into the charges of partisanship which were laid by Mr. Maclean, the defeated Conservative candidate, against Mr. Unruh. I desire to ask the minister, whether when a Conservative member or a defeated Conservative candidate makes an alle-

gation against an official, it is his practice to hold an investigation, and if so, why was not an investigation held in the case of Mr. Unruh. I may be answered that Mr. Unruh was not a permanent appointee to the office, but at the same time Mr. Unruh was a permanent employee of the Interior Department as sub-land agent, and if he were guilty of partisanship in one capacity he would be guilty of partisanship in the other. I submit that whether Mr. Unruh had been a permanent employee of the Customs Department or not, the fact that he was a permanent sub-land agent entitled him to the right to have an investigation. I understand that in some cases where such a charge was made, the officer was asked if he were guilty of active partisanship, and if he admitted it he was admonished not to do it again. I wish the minister to inform the House what the practice is. I am not concerned specially with Mr. Unruh or Mr. Hodgson, but I am concerned to know what office-holders may expect, and whether there is to be a different treatment as between Conservative and Liberal officials who may be guilty of partisanship.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): Mr. Unruh was appointed on the strength of a letter from Hon. Mr. Paterson in the month of August, 1911, or some time after the Government had dissolved.

Mr. McCRANEY: Dissolved the House?

Mr. REID: Yes. If the hon. member had been here in 1896 he would remember that the same question was raised, and that there were quite a number of officials who had been appointed after the Conservative Government had dissolved, and their appointments were not recognized, they being summarily dismissed without any charges having been made against them. Mr. Unruh was appointed on the strength of a letter from Mr. Paterson, and he was appointed temporarily, subject to his being let out at any time the minister wished. In addition to that, charges of political partisanship were made against Mr. Unruh, and the Department of the Interior dismissed him. In dismissing him I felt that he having been appointed after the Government had dissolved, his appointment could not be recognized in the same manner as if he had been appointed previous to the Government having ceased to be in office. The hon. gentleman asked what position I take with reference to dismissals in the department. With three or four exceptions, I have always had the member for the constituency assume the responsibility of the charge that the official took part in an election. The rule agreed to by both sides of the House was that when a member asserted that an official took part in an election, that statement was accepted and the official dismissed. In other cases where charges have been made by others, where the constituency has been represented by an hon. member opposite, we have held an investigation in almost every case. This is one of the exceptions. The official had already been dismissed by the Department of the Interior. From the fact of his having been dismissed as sub-land agent, and charges of political partisanship having been made against him, and the Government having dissolved and gone to the country, I felt justified in making the change that I did in this case.

Mr. McCRANEY: I want to correct my hon. friend, if I may, as to his statement respecting the practice in 1896. I entirely agree with the principle that a Government defeated at the polls has not a right to appoint a lot of its political friends to office. That was the rule in 1896; I do not object to the rule in 1911. In 1896 a number of King's Counsel and other officials who had been appointed were dismissed. Perhaps the same practice did not prevail in 1911, because there was a good precedent against it. My hon. friend the minister has stated that these appointments were made after dissolution. The appointments which were objectionable were made after the defeat of the Government. The fact that they were made after dissolution was not the reason why they were objectionable. The reason was because the Government of the day had suffered defeat at the hands of the electors, having been found wanting in their confidence. I do not object to the principle to which the hon. minister has referred being enforced in respect to appointments made after the Government has been defeated at the polls. My hon. friend the minister gives a reason, which I must accept, that under these peculiar circumstances Mr. Unruh was not a permanent official; that he had already been dismissed as sub-land agent, and that therefore the minister dismissed him. The minister says that he takes the word of the sitting member, who is a Conservative, or the word of the late Conservative candidate, as the case

may be. The member or candidate assumes the responsibility for the correctness of the facts he alleges. If information is received from any other source, if we put a case before the minister, then he holds an investigation. What does he do if on the investigation he finds that there has been a case of political partisanship? Does he dismiss, or does he say: Do not do it again? That is what I want to get at, because I am afraid that the practice of the Government is simply to admonish its own friends and to dismiss its opponents. If we are to have a Civil Service that is to be of any use, there must be equal treatment all around. I would not wish to retain any officer who has been found guilty of political partisanship. I do not know whether Mr. Unruh was guilty of political partisanship in 1911 or not. If he was, he has suffered for it. I notice that Mr. Maclean alleged that he was guilty of political partisanship in the provincial elections of 1912. I do not believe anything of the kind. Mr. Unruh knew at that time at any rate that he was in the employ of the Conservative Government, and I am quite sure that he would not have taken his official life in his hands and done any such thing. He is not well off; he kept store in a small way; he gave up his store in order to take up this position. After this Government came into power, on the assurance of the Conservative Association, he incurred expenditures to fit up an office. He has had to go back to storekeeping and into a different kind of life, as the result of his dismissal. Will the minister tell me what is his practice with regard to Conservative officials who are guilty of political partisanship? Does he admonish them only and leave them in office, or does he dismiss them, as he would dismiss Liberals?

Mr. REID: I have never had a case of that kind before me. I have never had any of the hon. members opposite furnish me with such a case, so it is hard for me to answer the question without having some information as to what the hon. gentleman refers to. I do not think there should be so much complaint as to the dismissals of officials in the West. So far as my memory serves me at the present time, I do not think there have been any dismissals in British Columbia, and in Alberta I think that just one official has been dismissed since we came into power. In Saskatchewan there have been only two: one at Rosthern, and I think one at Humboldt. The man at Humboldt was appointed prior to the dissolution of Parliament; and, if I remember rightly, charges of political partisanship were made against him, and the commissioner who was appointed went to Humboldt and held an investigation, and on his report the man was dismissed. I may be wrong in saying that there have been only these two, but at all events there have not been more than three or four at the most. Therefore, I do not think that the hon. member has much reason to complain in so far as dismissals in his province are concerned. If there are complaints such as are mentioned by the hon. member of any Conservatives having taken part in the elections, if he will make his charges, just as a member on this side would do, we will take action, and then I shall be able to tell just what the result will be on the evidence that is submitted.

Mr. McCRANEY: I shall be surprised if my hon. friend the minister has not given more consideration to this matter than he has enlightened us with to-night. I fear that what he is doing with Liberal appointees is firing them, and what he is doing with Conservative appointees is telling them not to do it again or leaving them alone. I will give my hon. friend a case. The Rosthern Enterprise is edited by Mr. S. T. Willoughby, who is the secretary of the Conservative Association at Rosthern. The minister will find that the present collector of customs at Rosthern took part in a Conservative meeting at Rosthern. I am going to read such portion of the minutes of that meeting as I think it pertinent to this discussion. It is headed, 'Conservatives seek favours at Ottawa,' and reads as follows:

> There was a large attendance at the annual meeting of the Conservative Association of the the town of Rosthern held on Tuesday evening, January 27, in the town hall. After the election of officers Mr. Braden informed the meeting that the association was endeavouring to secure certain things from the Dominion Government. Chief among these was an extension to the experimental farm so that mixed farming and stock raising might be taken up. Mr. Braden was very hopeful from a personal talk with officials that the request would be granted. The association was also working on the proposition to throw open the Duck Lake Indian reserve. But the Indians themselves controlled the situation and Mr. Braden stated the department would not do anything until the consent of the Indians was obtained. There were one or two other very important matters to Rosthern but which it is probably unwise to disclose.

Now, if the minister will follow the report he will see that a speech was made by J. D. Brown in support of Mr. Braden's sugges-

tion, and also by Mr. John Hamm. I will not read these intervening speeches, though they may be very good. Mr. Hodgson, collector of customs, appointed at $600 a year and increased within a month, the sub-land agent, and Major Hodgson, of Rosthern, were all there. They were there in one person, and of him we read:

Mayor Hodgson urged the sending of a strong delegation to Ottawa to press upon the Government the necessity of granting the various matters already mentioned. Mr. Hodgson understood the prospects of success were very favourable, more particularly with two of the requests.

If the minister will glance further down this record he will find the following:

After considerable discussion the following men were chosen as the deputation to Ottawa: President Braden, Vice-President A. P. Siebert, Mayor Hodgson, J. D. Brown and J. A. Sanderson. The deputation includes the mayor of Rosthern, and J. D. Brown, chairman of the Board of Trade. However, it was decided that both of these bodies be requested to ratify the appointments. The deputation is quite a strong one.

Now, I put that report before the minister. The Rosthern Enterprise is a reputable paper. Mr. Willoughby runs it as a non-partisan paper. He is secretary of the Conservative Association, as the minister will see from the list of officers. He was the reporter of this meeting. Now, I put it to the minister, what is he going to do about Mr. Hodgson? I have no doubt that if he were to ask Mr. Hodgson whether he were there or not, Mr. Hodgson would say, yes. It is a matter of public notoriety. Well, is the minister going to say to Mr. Hodgson: 'We have had discussions in regard to this matter in Parliament; you are an intelligent man and ought to have known better, and I am going to dismiss you.' Or is he going to say: 'Don't do it again'?

Mr. REID: This was a business meeting?

Mr. McCRANEY: Of the Conservative Association.

Mr. REID: It was called for the purpose of taking up public matters in connection with Rosthern, and Mr. Hodgson, who is mayor of the town, was called in, no doubt, for the purpose of consulting with them and doing what he could in the interests of the town. Does the hon. gentleman claim that because Mr. Hodgson is mayor of the town he was taking part in politics? Because if that is—

Mr. McCRANEY: My hon. friend knows better than that. I am not saying that a man can not be mayor and be a Conservative. All I say is that he cannot be an office-holder and active member of a political association.

Mr. REID: This does not say that he was an active member of the association. He was mayor of the town and was called in to this meeting. According to the paper it was a meeting of the Conservatives, but he was there as mayor, called in to discuss public questions. I do not take it from that paper that he is a member of the executive of the Conservative party of Rosthern. If so, he must cease to—

Mr. McCRANEY: Of course, that is the minister's answer. He will tell Mr. Hodgson: 'Don't do it again.'

Mr. REID: He is not taking part in politics. There is no election on.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. REID: I do not see that this shows he is taking a part in politics.

Mr. McCRANEY: I am disappointed in the minister, though I must say I am not very much surprised. If he will look over that report again he will see that the main business was the election of officers. He says it was for the discussion of public business; but what political party is there that does not discuss public business at its meetings? I know that is the way with the Liberal associations; we are always working for the public.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McCRANEY: And I am sure the hon. minister will say the same for the Conservative party. Had a Liberal been the mayor of Rosthern, he would not have been called in to the meeting. Mr. Hodgson was an easy comer. He is the man who more than any other is responsible for the dismissal of Mr. Unruh. He is an earnest worker and he has got Mr. Unruh's job. He was at the meeting and is appointed a delegate of the Conservative Association to interview my hon. friend in regard to matters in the Rosthern district. He was at the meeting when he was appointed, and he accepts the appointment. But the very thing happens that I expected would happen, the minister now takes the position that partisanship can only take place during an election, and in order to bring himself within the prohibition an office holder must be fool enough to allow himself to be elected member of an executive. I cannot imagine

that my hon. friend could find a stronger case of an intelligent man being guilty of partisanship than the one I have put before him. I do not ask him to take my word for it, the public record is there; and if he asks Mr. Hodgson he will get a confirmation of it. As I say, my interest is not for Mr. Unruh. If he were to ask me to try and get him back, I would tell him the chances were not good, and I would also say: I would not advise you to go back into that crowd again. It is not Mr. Unruh or Mr. Hodgson that I am making this discussion about, but I want to know what treatment Mr. Unruh is to get and what treament Mr. Hodgson is to get. If there is to be a difference in the treatment of individuals, we want to know it. If we wish to put matters in our Civil Service, both the inside and the outside service, on a better basis, we must have a definite line to work on, and the same treatment accorded to all. My hon. friend oftens tells us that these are matters of reprisals—that the Liberals did the same thing when they came in in 1896, and the Conservatives are doing the same now. He is not helping the situation by that, but only aggravating it; he is creating a precedent which may be quoted against him, which I should be sorry to see. All through this country men are being dismissed from the public service who are reported upon by defeated candidates. I do not object to the method, but I say that this treatment by the minister should be fair all round. I would like the minister to give a better statement than he has given.

Mr. REID: According to this paper, the Enterprise, a meeting of the Conservative Association was held. The report says:

> The following officers were elected: Hon. Pres., Hon. R. L. Borden; Hon. Vice-Pres., Hon. W. D. Willoughby; Pres., Geo. Braden; Vice-Pres., A. P. Siebert; Sec.-Treas., S. T. Willoughby. Executive Committee: J. D. Brown, John Hann, J. E. McKenzie, F. V. Reilly, J. A. Sanderson and D. A. Siebert.

The hon. gentleman must admit at once that Mr. Hodgson was not elected a member of that executive. This paper says that after the officers were elected those present at the meeting desired to take up the matter of having something done by the Government for Rosthern. The first thing they did was to call in Mr. Hodgson, the mayor. Who else should they call in? The mayor of the town was the very first man they should send for to discuss public matters in so far as the municipality of Rosthern was concerned.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are you quite sure they sent for the mayor?

Mr. REID: I am only taking the report of the paper which I have before me. It goes on to say:

> After a considerable discussion, the following men were chosen as a deputation to Ottawa: President Braden, Vice-Pres. A. P. Siebert, Mayor Hodgson, J. D. Brown and J. A. Sanderson.

The meeting confirmed the appointment of these gentlemen. Mr. Hodgson, according to this paper, was appointed at that meeting to come to Ottawa to see what he could do in the interests of the town of Rosthern. The hon. member objects to Mr. Hodgson's coming here for that purpose.

Mr. McCRANEY: No.

Mr. REID: I hope the people of Rosthern will understand my hon. friend's attitude in this matter. The hon. member is complaining about the dismissals in Saskatchewan and Alberta in so far as the Customs Department is concerned. If the other departments have not dismissed any more officials than I have, I do not think the hon. member has any reason to complain. I have had very many complaints from the West to the effect that we have not dismissed nearly as many as should have been dismissed. There are many men in the customs service in those two provinces who, if the members or candidates had acted upon the information then given to them or representations urged upon them, would have been dismissed. When I tell the hon. member that in Alberta one official was dismissed and in Saskatchewan two, so far as the Customs Department is concerned, I think he has very little reason to complain. This report appearing in the Enterprise is all that the hon. gentleman can submit as evidence of Mr. Hodgson's taking part in politics since he was appointed, and I think his case is very weak indeed. Mr. Hodgson was sent for and he went to that meeting not for the purpose of taking part in politics, but, as mayor, simply to do what he could in the interests of the town of Rosthern, and the hon. member is now objecting to Mr. Hodgson's coming to Ottawa in the interests of that town.

Mr. McCRANEY: I thought better of the minister than that. The minister has tried to fix on me two things: one is that I objected to members of the Conservative Association coming to Ottawa to interview the minister.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman objected to the mayor's coming here.

Mr. McCRANEY: Not at all. I have no objection to members of the Conservative Association coming down here; we are always glad to see them. I have no objection to the mayor's coming down here; it was quite a proper thing to do. The minister knows better than to say that I am objecting to Mr. Hodgson's coming here; what I do take objection to is that Mayor Hodgson, as land agent and subcollector of Customs, was at the Conservative meeting and took part. My hon. friend uses his imagination and tells us a story about somebody having sent out for Mayor Hodgson and that Mayor Hodgson, in his innocence, came to the meeting and took part only as mayor. The only people who had a right to appoint Mayor Hodgson to come to Ottawa as mayor was the council. If my hon. friend will look at the report he will see that this Conservative association appoints Hodgson and asks the council to ratify the appointment. I do not object to the council's having ratified the appointment and sending him down, but it shows what the Conservative association is trying to do.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: Did the council ratify the appointment?

Mr. McCRANEY: I do not know whether they did or not; probably he would have come here any way. If the minister desires any more information on the subject, he can get it by communicating with Mr. Hodgson. Mr. Hodgson is a man who will at once tell him what happened; it will not be necessary to ask for a statutory declaration, and the minister may take Mr. Hodgson's word, I am quite sure, as to whether the report is or is not substantially true. Will the minister do that, or does he think it worth while? If he does that, and if he finds that the report is substantially correct, what is he going to do about it? Is he going to say what he did to-night: That it does not matter? Is he going to say to Mr. Hodgson: You have violated the principles of this Government; we are not going to allow officials to take any part in political affairs?

Mr. WILCOX: I would like to cite a parallel case to my hon. friend. The committee will remember that in 1909 I came to Ottawa as member-elect from the north riding of Essex. Shortly afterwards the then Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) visited Windsor. Between the date of the by-election and the general election, ministers were hovering around; there was a great gathering of the clans in Essex, and promises were made to build docks, wharfs and public buildings. The Minister of Public Works visited Windsor, where there were gathered together a large number of prominent men, amongst others the collector of customs, Dr. J. Smith. The committee knows that Windsor is the sixth largest port in the Dominion of Canada; and that in the year 1910 the revenue from that port was $2,400,000. In one year after the general election the revenue increased to $5,000,000. Mr. Smith is still collector of customs. I have made no recommendation to the department for his dismissal, notwithstanding that he has been guilty of the same offence as that to which my hon. friend alluded. This meeting was held on Saturday, August 27, 1910, between the by-election and the general election which was coming on and from which great results were expected by the Liberal party. Of this meeting, the Weekly Record, a loyal supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, said:

> Dr. J. A. Smith, who is one of the most energetic boosters for 'Great Windsor' that this city possesses, made an excellent address, fortified with facts and figures that commended the attention of Dr. Pugsley. The requirements for a new federal building and a public wharf to come under the observation daily, said Dr. Smith, 'For some years I have felt the need of changes in the post office building and I have asked that the building be extended. I am in receipt of complaints every day from the Windsor populace. Goods are arriving here daily with no dock in the city to unload them at. They must be unloaded at Walkerville. Conditions are certainly bad,' he concluded.

The same paper said:

> Dr. J. A. Smith, Windsor's collector of customs, was seen by the Record this morning and was asked concerning the good news from Ottawa. 'Yes, indeed, I am highly elated said the doctor. I have been doing missionary work along this line for the past six years and always felt hopeful we would land the dock. Windsor's great strides commercially demanded recognition.'

I ask my hon. friend if it was any worse for the deputy collector at Rosthern to whom he has alluded, to take the steps he speaks of than for Dr. Smith, collector of the city of Windsor, to address this meeting. I am not saying that either of these gentlemen was guilty of any offence.

Mr. McCRANEY: Is the hon. gentleman reading from the account of the Liberal Association of Windsor or from a newspaper publication.

Mr. WILCOX: I am reading from an account of a meeting at which Dr. Pugsley was called in to bring glad tidings of great joy to the Liberal party up there.

Mr. McCRANEY: I do not think I need discuss my hon. friend's point too seriously, because I do not think he is in a very serious mood himself. The Minister of Public Works of that day was there to meet all the citizens, I have no doubt.

Mr. NEELY: In listening to the report of this political meeting at Rosthern, called for the purpose of the election of officers and transaction of other business, I fail to find any statements that accord with the statement of the minister that Mr. Hodgson was called to that meeting. Did the minister find that in the article, that Mr. Hodgson was called to the meeting?

Mr. REID: Reading the article that is the impression I formed.

Mr. NEELY: When the minister had to add the effort of his own imagination to the plain statement of the article in the newspaper, then it appears to me that the minister is making the best he can of a very bad case. I asked some time ago for a return in connection with the dismissal of the sub-collector of customs at the port of Humboldt. It is not a voluminous return and should have been brought down before this.

Mr. REID: That report was completed to-day and will be ready to hand in to-morrow.

Mr. NEELY: That is delightful, especially when we are considering the Customs Estimates to-night. Perhaps next year I may get an opportunity of again discussing that dismissal. The minister says he has been very kind to Saskatchewan. He certainly has not been very kind to Humboldt because the only collector in that constituency, at the port of Humboldt, Mr. James G. Richardson, was dismissed. The minister says he expects he was dismissed for partisanship. I suppose he really thinks that, but if there was an investigation into the conduct of Mr. Richardson I would like to see the evidence taken during that investigation. So far as the election of 1911 is concerned, I know personally that Mr. Richardson, at the commencement of the campaign, came east to visit friends and only returned about noon on the day of the election. Certainly he did not canvass, and how he voted I do not know. I know he has many relatives and friends in the East whose leanings are Conservative. I am quite certain that he has voted both ways in elections as he is a man of independent mind; and since he became collector of customs, I have never known him to take an active part in the conduct of an election. My hon. friend will have to give us some other instance if he wants to make a comparison with the case that has been referred to by my hon. friend from Saskatoon. The conduct of the Government since it has come into office, as far as the dismissal of Government servants in western Canada is concerned, is an absolute scandal. When I became a member of this House the first thing that came to my notice was the appointment in Humboldt of a man who was always known as a Conservative in his sympathies. I do not suppose that gentleman ever gave a Liberal vote in his life. He was a son of ex-Premier Norquay, and he was appointed by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), as land agent at Humboldt. I am not discussing the Department of the Interior at the present moment, but when the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche) brings his Estimates forward we will discuss those Estimates.

Mr. ROCHE: Was it not a fact that the hon. gentleman referred to by the hon. member for Humboldt was in the service for several years prior to that?

Mr. NEELY: He was in the service; he was not removed from the service at all, and, more than that, he was promoted from a position under the agent and given the appointment of agent at the Humboldt office, a position that he had never occupied under any previous administration. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. Wilcox) tells us that he has not recommended the dismissal of this collector, although this collector, he says, took a prominent part in urging upon the Minister of Public Works of the late Administration that he ought to do certain things for the town of Windsor. I have known of many magnanimous things being done by Conservative members. I could tell the House of a very magnanimous thing that the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) did once upon a time. It was generally recognized before the last election that the hon. member for Selkirk was going to have a very hard time in his constituency. He did not have a very large majority and he just managed to get elected. A few months after the election he was good enough, kind enough, magnanimous enough to recommend the returning officer at his election, appointed by the late Liberal Administration, as Indian agent in his constituency.

An hon. MEMBER: Had he made his return at that time?

Mr. NEELY: The return had been made at that time.

Mr. BRADBURY: Does the hon. gentleman mean to insinuate that the returning officer did anything that was wrong?

Mr. NEELY: No, but I did not want the hon. member for Essex to have all the glory on the other side of the House. The hon. member for Essex made quite a hero of himself by his statement that he had not recommended the decapitation of Dr. Smith. I am telling the hon. member for Essex of a case where a member on his side of the House went him one better, took the returning officer appointed by us and gave him an appointment a few months after the election, and the election was quite close. The hon. member for Essex must not take quite so much credit to himself. In regard to this case of Humboldt, I think the minister ought to have some definite information as to why Mr. Richardson was dismissed. I think it is only fair that the minister should give us the information because to-morrow will be too late. If the minister cannot give us that information I suppose that possibly we will have an opportunity later on if his Estimates are not concluded.

Mr. REID: I have sent for the return and it may be here in a few minutes. If there is any possibility of getting it for the hon. gentleman this evening I will get it. At all events there will be ample opportunity to discuss the case before my Estimates are passed because I will not ask the committee to pass all the Estimates. We will leave an item so that we can discuss anything in connection with customs on the item that is left.

Mr. McKAY: In justice to Mr. Hodgson, I do not think the meeting referred to, in so far as he took part in it, was of a political nature because he took part in it in connection with a matter that was then under discussion as mayor of the town. I have been informed that there were other well-known Liberals in Rosthern who attended that meeting. The hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) knows some of these well-known Liberals. I understand that Mr. J. D. Brown was at that meeting, and that as a result joint resolutions were passed as coming from the Town Council, the Conservative Association and the Board of Trade. Further than that I have no personal knowledge. In connection with that deputation that came down to see me, Mr. Hodgson represented the town, and there were some well-known Liberals, such as Mr. Bashford and Mr. J. D. Brown.

Mr. McCRANEY: My hon. friend does not say for a moment that J. D. Brown is a Liberal. He is a member of the Conservative executive.

Mr. McKAY: I understand that although he attended this meeting he was always a Liberal. This is the first intimation I have had that he was a Conservative. Up to this date I understand that Mr. Brown was a Liberal.

Mr. McCRANEY: Mr. Bashford was not at that meeting though.

Mr. McKAY: I do not say that he was, but I say that they met in connection with questions of interest to the town of Rosthern, and that the deputation with Liberals, such as Mr. Bashford, who had not allied themselves with the Conservative party, came and waited upon me in connection with those matters, thereby showing that the matters that were discussed were not regarded as of a partisan character, but were purely questions concerning the town, in regard to which the Conservative Association, the Town Council, the Board of Trade and Liberals at large joined together.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: To assist the corporation.

Mr. McKAY: Exactly, and Mr. Hodgson was there looking after the interests of the town.

Mr. McCRANEY: I have a very high regard for the opinion of my hon. friend, but when he gets into fiction, uses his imagination and conjures up something to show that Mr. Hodgson was only there for the purpose of expressing himself as mayor, I do not follow him. I venture to say that Mr. Hodgson was one of the first to arrive at the meeting; that is the kind of a man he is, and that is the kind of a Conservative he is. The hon. gentleman puts it up to me that Mr. J. D. Brown was there. Mr. J. D. Brown opposed me in 1911 for all he was worth. In that election I had a majority of 45 in Rosthern. Mr. Brown supported the present Liberal local member for Rosthern, and he had a majority of 30 against him with Mr. Brown's support. Mr. Brown has become a member of the Conservative Association,

and that is the very best thing for the Liberal party that could have happened.

Mr. McKAY: When Mr. Brown opposed the hon. member for Saskatoon, was he not supporting an independent Liberal?

Mr. McCRANEY: No, not a Liberal at all, but a man who was working hand in hand with the Conservatives.

Mr. McKAY: I do not say that Mr. Brown was at the meeting, but I say that he waited upon me in company with other Liberals.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Minister of Customs seems to have had some kind of wireless information from the Northwest, which suggested to him that once the Conservative Association met, they decided that Mr. Hodgson, who seems to be the poohbah of the Conservatives up there, and ready to fill every available office lying loose, should be sent for. That deduction of the minister is a violent one and has no justification. I think any one who has heard the discussion, and the newspaper clipping read, will feel satisfied that Mr. Hodgson was there from the very start. The minister seems to be developing a fertility of imagination which is startling, and he will have to restrain himself, if he continues looking around in this way for some expedient to answer why he does not dismiss Conservative officials when they engage in politics. But, I specially want to call his attention to a case in which one of these great investigators of his did not dismiss a man. This afternoon, just before six o'clock, when most members had left the House, the Minister of Marine read a long statement from Mr. Duchemin in reply to a certain telegraph despatch that appeared in the Sydney Record, in relation to a debate which took place here last Friday night, in regard to an investigation held into the conduct of a namesake of mine, Mr. Macdonald, of North Sydney. In the course of this investigation a witness named Curry gave evidence for which he was prosecuted for perjury and incarcerated in the penitentiary. I made a statement which appeared in 'Hansard' in regard to that, and an inaccurate summary of this statement having been telegraphed to the Sydney papers, Mr. Duchemin rushes into print. He tells us in the statement read by the minister this afternoon, that Mr. Macdonald was not dismissed, and as no person here had ever pretended he was dismissed, that statement is of no consequence. Then he asserts that he did not recommend the dismissal of Macdonald. There is very good reason why he did not recommend the dismissal of Macdonald, and it is, that the very next day after this witness, Curry, had given his testimony, he was arrested for perjury and was committed for trial, and the whole basis of the prosecution fell to pieces, and Mr. Duchemin, who claims such great credit for not having recommended the dismissal, after he had seen the spectacle of this star witness on the road to the penitentiary, made up his mind that he had better not report that this official should be dismissed. Then Mr. Duchemin denies, as was stated here, that he was a witness for the defence, but the truth is that if he was not formally called for the defence he was their chief witness because it was on his testimony that the judge granted a reserved case. The truth is that it was on the testimony of Mr. Duchemin that the defendant was able to take his case to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, and afterwards to the Supreme Court of Canada, and it was on his testimony that all the argument took place. He really was a witness for the defence, although he happened to be called for the Crown. In this letter which the Minister of Marine read with such gusto this afternoon, when there was nobody present to deal with it, Mr. Duchemin tells us that the form of oath administered by him was the form administered for twenty-five years by every commissioner of the Supreme Court in Nova Scatia. As this gentleman has only been in Nova Scotia some twelve or thirteen years, he does not know anything about what happened twenty-five years ago, and if he, as a judge of a court, acting under a solemn Order in Council, appointed by virtue of the provisions of a statute of the Parliament of Canada, is holding a court, is he doing what a commissioner would be doing who is simply taking an affidavit? He was not taking affidavits; he was holding a court, and I want to say that there never has been a court in the province of Nova Scotia, from the most inferior court held by a justice of the peace up to the Supreme Court of Judicature in that province, in which an oath has been administered for the last twenty-five years or fifty years for that matter, except by the witness kissing the Bible. Let us see the way this man did his business. I have here the Eastern Law Reporter, and as an answer to the Minister of Marine I shall read what Mr. Justice Graham tells us in regard to the way Mr. Duchemin did business. Mr. Justice Graham, in a long and able judgment,

10 p.m.

holds that Mr. Duchemin did not administer the oath properly, and, so far as he was concerned (and Chief Justice Townshend agreed with him) he held that Curry did not commit perjury, because of the method in which Mr. Duchemin administered the oath:

> The case states: The defendant was sworn by holding up his right hand without being asked whether he had any objection to be sworn in the regular way. This is the evidence given about it by the commissioner himself on the perjury trial, or rather the portion of it in the case:

This great judicial official when he was asked as to whether the evidence was given under oath, starts out giving evidence for the Crown forsooth, by providing a case for the defence, as he really was, answered as follows:

> Q. Was the evidence given under oath? A. I think under oath, although some little question with regard to that has been raised. There was no copy of the Bible used. In a few cases where copy of the Scriptures was not readily available, I called the witness to hold up his right hand and went through the formula with the man. It was done in this case.

This investigator would like the court to know, according to this description, that he usually administered the oath by giving a copy of the Scriptures to the witness, although it is quite clear from his statement he did not carry any copy of the testament around with him, and as a great many of these investigations were held in Conservative committee rooms and such like places where a copy of the Scriptures is not usually found, he did not have the Bible always at hand. In his letter he wants to say that for twenty-five years people have been going around in Nova Scotia administering oaths without having a testament, but he would like the court to believe that he always wished to have a copy of the Scriptures, and where there was not one available he asked the witness to hold up his right hand. I quote from the evidence:

> Q. Tell what was done? A. I called the witness to raise his right hand and I put this formula to him: 'The evidence you will give in this inquiry will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God.'
>
> Q. And he did he raise his hand? A. He raised his right hand.
>
> By the Court:
>
> Q. I suppose, Mr. Duchemin, you determined yourself the manner in which you would swear him? A. Yes, I did not ask any questions.
>
> Q. You determined yourself the manner in which he would be sworn? A. Yes, as a matter of fact at that time.

Mr. Duchemin was cross-examined by Mr. Maddin and Mr. Maddin was laying the ground for his reserved case because he knew that his client had been proven to have committed perjury in order to drive from office, if he could, a gentleman who occupied a position in the Customs Department. Therefore Mr. Maddin said:

> You did not ask him whether he would prefer to be sworn on the Bible; whether it was a matter of conscience?

Mr. Duchemin replied:

> No, I put no question to him. No option given to him. No choice. No questions put to him.

That is the story of Mr. Duchemin and that is the evidence upon which the counsel for Curry, after his conviction, after his sentence to the penitentiary, asks the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia to hold that that conviction should be quashed. He succeeded in getting two judges in that court to hold with him. The majority of the court, however, held that as the oath had been administered pro forma, it was an oath upon which perjury would arise, if perjury had been committed. This gentleman in his letter tried to urge certain cases in which he permitted counsel. He says he permitted my hon. friend from North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) to appear before him in this and other cases. In my county, when he came to investigate, he frightened the life out of half a dozen poor railway section men who wanted to know whether they could get a lawyer or not. He told them: No, they are not allowed to appear at this investigation. What does he himself say in a letter to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries? In question No. 1 on the Order Paper, in which my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) wants information in regard to a letter from Mr. H. P. Duchemin, the following statement appears:

> With regard to the excluding of counsel, I may say that I followed this course in accordance with instructions given me by other departments of the Government.

While the gentleman down in Sydney is trying to argue that he was very fair in permitting counsel to appear, he writes to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who renews this subject as he did this afternoon, that he excluded counsel because he had been instructed to do so by several departments, in defiance of the law, in defiance of the statute under which he was appointed, which provides that any person charged with such

an offence has the right to have counsel act for him. Then he said that commissioners were appointed fifteen years ago and that counsel did not appear before them. The answer to that is that the statute at that time did not provide for this being done. The provisions of the statute under which Mr. Duchemin conducted his investigations were absolutely and entirely ignored by him. The only cases where he permitted counsel to be present were the few cases which he mentioned in his letter. In 75 per cent of the cases he deliberately excluded counsel. What is the secret of the whole thing? I do not believe that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knew this afternoon that Mr. Curry, who had been adjudged by the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia as having committed perjury in this charge against McDonald, the customs official, after the conviction was confirmed by the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia; after it was confirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada, was allowed out by the hon. Minister of Justice on ticket of leave on suspended sentence. I do not know whether the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who took advantage this afternoon of the absence of some of us who were interested in the matter to read the document by Mr. Duchemin, knew that this man Curry, who had been adjudged to be a perjurer, had been let out three weeks ago on suspended sentence by the Minister of Justice, after every legal procedure that a Conservative organization in the province of Nova Scotia could resort to had been resorted to. So far as the Curry case is concerned, I leave that as an answer to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the letter which he read this afternoon.

Mr. RHODES: This has been universally recognized as a very dull session, and hon. gentlemen opposite, in their fighting attitude, have changed considerably from last session. They appear to have become quite conscious of the fact themselves, and for that reason on Friday night they indulge in fireworks in remembrance of their fighting attitude of last year, and as a political force they are much the same as Falstaff's army. I do not propose to argue the McDonald case at any great length. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) took some ten or fifteen minutes to make it appear that Mr. Duchemin, who was making an investigation in Nova Scotia, could not properly administer an oath, and he cited the judgment of Mr. Justice Graham to the effect that Mr. Duchemin did not properly administer an oath.

Mr. MACDONALD: That was not it at all.

Mr. RHODES: The oath must have been properly administered or else there could not have been a charge of perjury.

Mr. MACDONALD: You cannot quibble that way.

Mr. RHODES: The hon. gentleman from Pictou is a master in quibbling, and he of all others should know a quibble when he sees one. At all events, I cannot see the virtue in his argument, because, if it meant anything at all, it meant that Mr. Duchemin had not properly administered oaths, whereas the whole effect of the case was that perjury had been committed, which meant that the oath had been properly administered. The hon. member for Pictou has referred to the investigation in the McDonald case. The hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) was present, so I am advised, as counsel for Mr. McDonald.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was not present at all. I came into the investigation after this man was examined.

Mr. RHODES: I accept the word of the hon. gentleman at once. My information was to the contrary. Coming down to rock bottom, we in this House know perfectly well that hon. gentlemen opposite are playing politics when they discuss the manner in which dismissals have taken place. But the mass of the people in this country may possibly believe that there is something in all this discussion which takes place on Friday evenings in this House, instigated by hon. gentlemen opposite.

There is some credit at all events to be taken by this Administration. They have instituted investigations in the province of Nova Scotia. In a few instances they have been conducted in my county, and I can say that, unless the evidence was clear and sound, no dismissal took place. I have in my possession very bitter letters from supporters or friends claiming that Mr. Duchemin had not made dismissals upon evidence which had been placed before him, but which he had not deemed sufficient. What happened when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power in 1896?

Were there any investigations in the province of Nova Scotia?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. RHODES: I hear 'Oh, oh' on the other side of the House, and objection oft-repeated to the tu quoque argument. I do not wish for a moment to justify actions of this Administration with what has been done by the previous Administration, but I want to refer to what they did as an evidence of the insincerity of the objections to-night. Taking one department alone in the county of Cumberland, some eight customs officials were dismissed, some of whom had been in the service for many years, and in no instance was there an investigation or a shadow of an investigation. I have moved for a return in respect to the dismissals in Cumberland, and let me refer to it merely so far as it relates to dismissals in the Department of Customs.

The first dismissal was Alexander Wilson, sub-collector of customs at Pugwash. He entered the customs service on the 16th of January, 1892. Roughly speaking, he was in the service for a period of four years. Under date of June 18, 1897, he was dismissed for active political partisanship. There were no expenses, as no investigation was held. There is nothing in the official record to show by whom the charges were made. I remember in the House last night or the night before that very serious objection was taken because the minister could not disclose upon whose recommendation an appointment had been made; but there is absolutely nothing on the record to show why certain dismissals took place, as the one to which I have just referred. The second was that of Chas. E. Kerr, sub-collector of customs at Wallace, N.S. He entered the customs service December 2, 1884. Under date October 26, 1897, he was dismissed for active political partisanship on charges made by Mr. J. H. Logan, M.P. There were no expenses as no investigation was held. The third case was that of Robert B. Murray, sub-collector of customs, Springhill, N.S. He entered the customs service on July 1, 1893, which means that he was in the service for about four years. Under date September 24, 1897, he was dismissed for political partisanship. There were no expenses as there was no investigation held; and there is nothing on the official file to show by whom the charges were preferred. The fourth was T. R. Lowe, sub-collector of customs, Tignish, N.S., who entered the customs service on January 14, 1888. Under date September 13, 1897, he was dismissed for active political partisanship. There were no expenses as no investigation was held, and there is nothing on the official file to show by whom the charges were preferred. The fifth was, I. T. Forrest, preventive officer of customs, Amherst Point, N.S. He entered the customs service on October 23, 1886. I do not know what caused our hon. friends opposite to show some delicacy in this dismissal. They did not merely swing the axe and behead this officer, but declared there was no necessity for an officer at this point and so his services were dispensed with on January 7, 1898. The sixth case was John Moffat, sub-collector of customs, Joggins, N.S.; entered the customs service on May 11, 1864. This mean that he had been thirty-three years in the public service, and I can say truthfully, from knowledge of the family of the man, and from having made inquiries in the district, that no finer type of public servant could be found in the Dominion; a man of an exceedingly high character, a man who bore a splendid reputation in the district in which he lived, revered and honoured by all who knew him. He was dismissed, after thirty-three years' service, by Order in Council, for active political partisanship. There were no expenses as no investigation was held, and there is nothing on the official files to show by whom the charges were preferred. The seventh case was James Kerr, sub-collector of customs, Port Greville, Nova Scotia, who entered the customs service on 1st September, 1886, which means that he had served for about eleven years. Under date September 10, 1897, he was dismissed for active political partisanship on charges preferred by Mr. H. J. Logan, M. P. There were no expenses as no investigation was held. The eighth case was Mark Phinney, preventive officer of customs, West Bay, Nova Scotia; They took a long time to dismiss him, because they found great difficulty in discovering any ground whatever on which to dismiss him, but finally they took his head off. So they dismissed in Cumberland alone, after the elections of 1896, eight sub-collectors of customs—cleaned out the whole box-and-dice of them except a few left for strategic political purposes. There was no investigation and no redress. The correspondence is pitiable in some cases—letters from some of these men who had been in the public service for many years and who were suddenly cut off from what they had properly regarded as a life stipend, and without any redress whatever. There is nothing on the record to show that the

Liberal-Conservatives, in spite of this treatment, tried, night after night, to prevent the passage of the Estimates in this House. I say in all sincerity, and I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite who have been supporters of an Administration will agree with me, that it is hard for a public man to make dismissals. Any dismissals for which I have been responsible, I have made with great regret and only under extreme pressure; and I do not know but that I have incurred more the displeasure of my friends for dismissals I have refused to make than I have incurred the displeasure of my opponents for those that I have made. Dismissals have taken place under this Administration, as they have taken place before and will continue to take place so long as men are human and officials take part in politics. Why do not hon. gentlemen opposite take their medicine? They were defeated on September 21, 1911. Partisanship undoubtedly marked the conduct of a good many of these officials, and they were dismissed. Hon. gentlemen opposite have made their protest, and what more can be said? In view of the record of the Liberal party in Nova Scotia in the dismissal of officials, I confess, I am surprised at the—shall I say—audacity of hon. gentlemen opposite in coming back night after night to this question of dismissals under this Administration. I have read here the particulars of eight dismissals in the Customs service alone. I think I could give the names of a hundred in the various departments of the Government in my own constituency. They were dismissed by the dozens, and not a shadow of investigation in any department of the Government from one end of that constituency to the other. Let me give particularly the case of Alexander Fowley, who was car inspector at Springhill junction. He was a Scotchman, a man of infinite experience, an intelligent man who had the knowledge necessary to make him a proper and efficient car inspector. Upon his experience, skill and care depended the lives of thousands of passengers who passed through that place, and thousands and thousands of dollars' worth of property. He was dismissed without investigation, though he was not a partisan, with the result that he found his grave in nine months through worry and practical starvation—and the correspondence will show that in a large degree. And who was appointed to take the place of this efficient officer? Why, a shoemaker, a man who knows no more about cars or car appliances than I know about astronomy—and that is not much. Hon. gentlemen opposite may take a certain pleasure in charging department after department under this Government with ruthless dismissals in Nova Scotia, but if they want to pursue that subject, we shall only have to meet them in kind, and the evidence we can bring forward will not be very pleasant for them. I do not say this in any partisan sense, I do not say it in any bitter sense, though I have been speaking earnestly. There will be dismissals made without proper investigation, improperly made—let us admit that for the sake of the argument, and it is to be expected where so many take place. But let hon. gentlemen opposite remember what took place when they came into power in 1896. Let them play the game fairly, realizing that we are now in much the same position that they were in then. But we are proceeding along nicer lines. Men are getting an opportunity to be heard, and that never took place in 1896. I do not propose to discuss this subject further, except to say that, if hon. gentlemen opposite wish to assume the same attitude with respect to other departments of the Government, as they have assumed with respect to this, I shall deem it necessary to read their record in those other departments as I have done in the case of the Department of Customs.

Mr. KYTE: The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) prefaced his remarks by intimating that this had been a rather dull session. I think we all observed that the hon. gentleman was somewhat dull himself. I do not know whether that is attributed to the appointment of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) as Solicitor General, but if so, I sympathize with him and hope he will recover his former spirit and enjoy the contribution he makes from time to time to the debates of this House. I wish to tell him that we are not objecting to the fact that the present Government have instituted investigations into complaints against public officials; what we are objecting is the farcical character of those investigations. It has been shown time and again that, though these investigations were held, officials were dismissed without the slightest foundation of evidence. It would have been a good deal better if this Government had adopted the practice which the hon. gentleman says was adopted by the late Government and dismissed these men upon charges made

on the responsibility of members of this House. The hon. member refers to the dismissals in Cumberland and cited one case of a man dismissed because there was nothing for him to do. In that case the late Government did not appoint a successor, but how far were they behind the enterprise of the present Government? Last night I called the attention of the House to the case of a man who was dismissed from office in my county because there was nothing for him to do. And what does the present Minister of Customs do? He appoints another man, at more than twice the salary paid to the former official —because there was nothing to do. I admit that the late Government has not been as considerate in respect of its obligations to its supporters as the present Government is, because they, the members of this Government, are bound to make dismissals and bound to make new appointments. If no charge of partisanship can be brought against the official, they dismiss him because there is nothing for him to do, and immediately appoint another man to the same position at more than twice the salary paid to the man dismissed. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) has made a record in the matter of dismissals. Take, for instance, the case of the poor unfortunate cripple in the town of Oxford, county of Cumberland, an officer of the Department of Customs, who was dismissed on the recommendation of the hon. member for Cumberland. No investigation was held; the minister simply took the word of the hon. member for Cumberland.

Mr. RHODES: I offered the collector of customs referred to, an investigation, and gave him five weeks' notice before he was dismissed. The offer is still open.

Mr. KYTE: There was a dismissal made in my county without investigation; a subsequent opportunity was given to the poor man to have an investigation, which was ultimately held. Witnesses were examined, and no evidence to prove the charge against him was offered. Was the man reinstated? No. Notwithstanding the fact that at the second investigation the commissioner failed to find evidence against him, the dismissal was confirmed. I have no doubt that the poor cripple, Bent, knew very well from what quarter the wind was blowing when the hon. member for Cumberland magnanimously offered him an investigation, which he knew would avail him nothing.

[Mr. Kyte.]

Mr. RHODES: I will go a little further and make the assertion, upon my responsibility as a member of this House, that if Mr. Bent wishes an investigation he shall have an impartial one, and if it be found that he was not a partisan, he shall be restored to office.

Mr. KYTE: I have no doubt that the hon. member for Cumberland means what he says, but in the face of the record of the present Government in the matter of dismissals, I think Mr. Bent, crippled through he may be, would prefer to sacrifice the emoluments of his office rather than be subjected to a farcical investigation by the Minister of Customs or his officials. The hon. member for Cumberland got away from the point we were discussing to-night. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) was not finding fault with the Government in respect of dismissals, but he was finding fault with Mr. Duchemin in respect of an inquiry which he conducted at North Sydney, and, furthermore, he was finding fault with the Minister of Justice in discharging from the penitentiary a man who had sworn away the official life of a gentleman in the town of North Sydney. That is where the shoe pinches. Although the hon. member for Cumberland has no authority to speak for the legal department of the Government on the present occasion, I am sure he would be willing to make a defence if any could be made under the circumstances. We had a case in my county two years ago where a man was convicted of forgery and sentenced to twelve months in jail, and before one month of the sentence had expired he was released upon the order of the Minister of Justice in order that he might enjoy the emoluments of a public office under the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I say this is the thing that public opinion will cry out against, and this is the thing that we on this side of the House must protest against. If the whole machinery of the law is to be so exercised that, because they happen to be Conservatives, the doors of the penitentiary are opened to persons who have been proved guilty of serious crimes, I say that a serious condition of affairs is arising in the history of this country. The Minister of Justice made no defence for the improper discharge of Landry from jail two years ago, neither is there any defence forthcoming from the discharge of Curry from the penitentiary a few weeks ago. The charge was established, and, as the hon. member for Pictou says, the case was taken

to the higher court at the expense of the Conservative Association of the province of Nova Scotia. Then, every defence and every subterfuge failing, after the highest court in the Dominion of Canada had affirmed Currie's conviction, because the gentlemen interested had the ear of the Minister of Justice, the doors of the penitentiary were opened and Currie was discharged. Of what use is it for the hon. member for Cumberland to talk about fair play for this poor cripple, Bent? The principles adopted by this Government would justify Mr. Bent or any other official in refusing a farcical investigation and avoiding the treatment which would necessarily follow. Has the hon. minister brought down the information I asked for with respect to the appointment of Michael McNeil as preventive officer at Red Islands?

Mr. REID: I have not that information yet, but we can let this item stand, if the hon. gentleman has no objection.

Mr. OLIVER: I would suggest that the item we are now discussing be allowed to stand. The next item contains reference to a great many matters which might be open to discussion. I think there would be no objection to the passing of the item with reference to the purchasing of a new revenue cruiser.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

INDEX

THIRD SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT, 1914.

Abbreviations:—1r., 2r., 3r.=first, second, or third reading. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Con.=Consideration. Div.=Division. M.=Motion. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Acme-Carbon mails, 2687.

Address to H.R.H. the Governor General, on departure from Canada, 5275.

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 4, 49, 94, 127, 167, 202, 259, 285.
Amendments proposed: Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 22; Mr. Neely, 267.

Adulteration Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1433. 2r., 2388. Com., 3362. 3r., 3362.

Advertising, fraudulent. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bill.

Aerial navigation, 2972.

Agricultural implements
Duties on: m., Mr. Knowles, 1548; div., 1602.
Extent of industry, 572.
Rebate on raw material, 1360.
Tariff on, 3140.
Valuation for duty, 2958.

Agriculture
Department
Employees, 341, 363.
Entomology, division of, 1130.
Estimates, 341, 1098-1111, 1130-1163, 1670-1688, 2370, 3487-3504.
Encouragement of, 6, 8, 76, 81, 84, 109, 171, 179, 225, 292, 301, 303, 358, 809, 1143-1162, 2956.
Experimental farms, 1098, 1135, 1154, 2370, 3487.
Gazette, 1098, 1161, 1670.
Insect pests, 1130, 1155.
Kentville, tuberculous cattle at, 4559.
Quebec, in, 1143, 1148-1152, 1156-1160, 1162, 1676.

Aikins, Mr. James A. M. (Brandon)
Budget, 2645.
Transportation, 2646.
Wheat markets, 2648.
Agricultural implements, 2651.
National Policy, 2652.
Railway subsidies, 2654.
Trade of the West, 2656.
Dominion lands, 201, 3321.
Hudson Bay terminals, 683.
Senate representation, 1496.

Alaska-Yukon railway, 1433.

Alberta
Internal elevators, 473, 572.
Irrigation, 1605.
Natural gas, 357.
Rural mail, 817.

Alcohol, tariff on, 3106.

Aldershot camp, 1435.

Alert, steamer, 308, 325, 423-429, 474, 669.

Alexander post office, 2960.

Alguire, Mr. D. O. (Stormont)
Old age pensions, 1352.

Alpine club of Canada, 4155.

Aluminum leaf, tariff on, 3132.

Ames, Mr. Herbert B. (Montreal, St. Antoine)
Budget, 2501.
Trade outlook, 2501.
Revenue and expenditures, 2503.
Debt of Canada, 2504.
Temporary loans, 2507.
Tariff revision, 2508.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3725.

Amherst armoury, 3714, 4293.

Animals, health of, 3173.

Annapolis county mails, 345.

Antigonish
Customs collector, 3860, 3893.
Food inspector, 666.
Immigration agents, 573, 5210
Mail service, 572
Public works, 5227.

Arcadia rural mails, 701.

Archives, 720, 740, 1769. *See also* Records.

Armouries, 666, 702, 1890, 1902, 4204, 4576, *See also* Militia Estimates.

Armstrong, Mr. J. A. Macdonald (North York)
Budget, 2592.
Agricultural implements, 2595.
Senate reform, 2595.
Free wheat, 2596.
Privilege, 3114.

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (East Lambton)
Canadian Northern Railway, 3904.
Militia, 4586.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2132.
Prudential Life of Canada, 2902.
Public buildings, 1900.

Armstrong. J. H., dismissal of, 2179.

Arthabaska public works, 1114. *See also* Drummond.

Art. *See* National Gallery.

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Explosives, regulation of, 3869.
Georgian Bay Canal, 2969.
Indian reserves, 3546.
Iron and steel industry, 1519, 3213.
Timber licenses, 5025.

Asiatic trade, 887, 5035.

L'Assurance de Rimouski, 3894.

Astronomical surveys, 4155.

Athabaska Landing-Fort McMurray telegraph, 354.

Atlantic fishing disaster, 5194.

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway, 892.

Auditor General, office of, 723.

Aurora Menace, 2310, 3056, 3236.

Automobile lamp lenses, tariff on, 3133.

Avignon post office, 818.

Bad Throat river water powers, 1913.

Bagot county rural mails, 1694.

Baie des Chaleurs Railway, 358.

Baie St. Paul mails, 1819, 1914, 3058, 4368.

Ball, Mr. R. J. (S. Grey)
Brodeur, Hon. L. P., trips of, 1112.

Bank failures, 3199, 3208, 3860, 3894. *See also* Farmers Bank.

Bank rates of interest, 5199.

Banks and Banking. *See* Loan Companies *and* Trust Companies.

Banque Internationale, 4712, 4753.

Barnard, Mr. Geo. H. (Victoria, B.C.)
Asiatic immigration, 1250.
Divorce reform, 837.

Barrette, Mr. J. A. (Berthier)
Banks and banking, 3894.

Barriefield camp, 3714.

Basic slag, duty on, 444, 511, 630.
Amendment proposed: Mr. Emmerson, 638.

Bassano post office, 472.

Bathurst
Harbour, 348, 4212, 4295.
Public works, 348.

Battlefields, historic, 4183. *See also* Quebec.

Bear River wharf, 2013.

Beattie, Mr. Thomas (London)
London and Port Stanley Railway Company, 1416.

Beaubien homestead, 1842, 3331-3346.

Beauce rural mails, 1690.

Bedford public building, 2945.

Beland, Hon. H. S. (Beauce)
Agricultural implement duties, 1586.
Agriculture estimates, 1148.
Beauce rural mails, 1690.
Coal resources, 1806.
Franking privilege, 3224.
House of Commons representation, 5316.
Immigration, 1617, 1624.
Inland Revenue estimates, 1377.
Rimouski Insurance Company, 4713, 4807.

Bennett, Mr. R. B. (Calgary)
Advertising, fraudulent, 3469.
Boy scouts, 4132.
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, 796.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3734.
Naturalization, 4133.

Bennett, Mr. Wm. H. (East Simcoe)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Pig-iron industry, 230.
Transportation, 233.
Bounties on steel, 1516.
House of Commons accomodation, 4199.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2321.
Post office employees, 2379.
Transportation, 951, 2978.

Bergeron, J. C., payments to, 368.

Best, Mr. John A. (Dufferin)
Lemieux, Hon. R., trips of, 698.
Privilege, 3114.
Tariff, 3062.

Bickerdike, Mr. Robert (Montreal, St. Lawrence)
Death penalty, 4, 483, 4516.
Immigration, 1638.
Judges' salaries, 3611.
Pilotage, 3624, 5069.
Prison reform, 4514.

Biggar, Col. J. L., trip to Europe of, 1217.

Binder twine. *See* **Inspection and Sale Act.**

Biological Board, 2434.

Bishop, A., employment of, 3208.

Bisley and Canadian team, 512, 1215.

Black Cape post office, 703, 2178.

Blain, Mr. Richard (Peel)
Dismissals, 1201.
Farmers Bank, 4895.
Public tenders, 1205.

Blood Reserve grazing lease, 357.

Blue-books, translation of, 2436.

Boar's Head fog alarm. 2787.

Boivin, Mr. Geo. H. (Shefford)
Agriculture department employees, 363
Budget, 2891
Agricultural implements, 2894.
Free food, 2895.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3717, 4054
Dismissals, 1405.
Eastern Townships diseased cattle, 263.
Fenian raid veterans, 349, 440.
Granby post office, 363, 697.
Inland Revenue estimates, 1371, 1405.
Judges' salaries, 3605.
Newport Customs employees, 890, 1021, 1332.
Post offices in Eastern Townships, 3647.
Riendeau, S., employment of, 1114.
Shefford county rural mail, 363.
Tariff, 3152, 3157.

Bonaventure
Experimental farm, 357.
Indian reserves, 2544.
Mails, 1692, 2178.
Public works, 892, 1360.

Borden, Rt. Hon. R. L. (Prime Minister)
Address to H.R.H. the Governor General, 5275.
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Delay in meeting of Parliament, 22.
Solicitor Generalship, 22.
Highways improvement, 23.
Senate, 24.
Naval defence, 25.
Quebec terminals, 29.
Cost of living, 29.
Agricultural implement duties, 1558
Atlantic mail service, 5062.
British Columbia Better Terms Commission, 2372, 4628, 4997.
Brooke, Mrs. M. J., pension of, 4964.
Canadian Northern Railway Aid Bill, 3650, 4009, 4025-4089, 4221-4281, 4300-4334, 4376, 4399, 4452, 4548. *See also* 3252, 3319, 3397, 3453, 3573.
Canadian Pacific Railway and Austrian emigration, 899.
Canadian Peace Centenary Association, 970, 4961.
Charlottetown Confederation Convention, 4960.

Borden, Rt. Hon. R. L.—Con.
Cigarettes, prohibition of, 1478.
Colpitts, Mr., case of, 454.
Confederation, semi-centennial of, 1450.
Conservation Commission, 718.
Divorce
Procedure in parliament, 4882.
Reform, 838.
Dry docks subsidies, 4095.
Electoral corruption, 918.
Empress of Ireland, loss of, 4433, 4552, 4554, 4555. 4628, 4716, 4879, 4894, 4954, 5230.
Explosives, manufacture of, 1810.
Farmers Bank, 4802.
Fenian raid veterans, 4359.
Fishing disaster—appeal for government aid, 5196.
Fuller, Mrs. M. E., pension of, 4998.
Goodwin, Geo., return of deposit to, 2371.
Grand Trunk Pacific bond guarantee, 4831, 4929.
High Commissioner's office, 311.
Hindu immigration, 4295, 4369, 4566.
House of Commons
Business of the House, 1606, 3197.
Debates, French translation of, 5271.
Deputy Speaker, office of, 1365.
Easter adjournment, 2311.
Morning sittings, 2788, 3210, 3310.
Questions and answers, 880.
Representation, *See that title.*
Saturday sittings, 3784.
Wednesday sittings, 1264.
Imperial Press Conference, 4961.
Indian Act Amendment, 3482, 3540, 3550.
Intercolonial Railway
Canadian Pacific Railway traffic agreement, 594.
Management, 3286.
Suburban trains, 1065.
International Waterways Commission, 1163, 1396, 1483, 4962.
Irrigation Act Amendment, 3485.
Labour conditions
Unemployment, 5032.
Vancouver Island, 1325.
Western, 3892.
Labrador coast line, 2954.
Life-saving rewards, 5177.
Militia and religious processions, 5375.
Monk, Hon. F. D., death of, 3785.
Mounted police, 310, 708-718, 4963.
National Council of Women, 2948.
National Transcontinental Railway
Commission, 4838.
Investigation, 2353.
Management, 5099.
Montreal, connection with, 5128.
Naturalization, 4813.
Natural resources, provincial control of, 1069.
Naval service, 5157.
Navigable waters, pollution of, 1742.

Borden, Rt. Hon. R. L.—Con.

Newfoundland shipping disaster, 2517, 2995.
Newspaper reports of caucus, 1871.
Paris government office, 4966.
Parliamentary procedure
Answers of length, 1061.
Commons admendments to Senate amendments, 5034.
Privilege, basing on newspaper statements, 1121.
Returns and private papers, 4958.
Supply, Committee of, without notice, 307.
Thursday sittings and Government precedence, 696, 706, 708, 721.
Petroleum, export of, 971, 1758, 3463.
Pollution of navigable waters, 1742.
Postal rates to Britain, 3235.
Quebec Battlefields Commission, 3891, 4117.
Railway Act Amendment, 2947.
Records Departmental Commission, 4963.
Representation in the House of Commons, 611, 620, 795, 842, 866, 927, 5306, 5324, 5352, 5364.
St. John Valley railway bridges, 3883, 3959, 4024.
San Francisco exposition, 3255.
Senate representation, 1483, 1911, 3513, 5277, 5296.
Strathcona, Lord, death of, 91.
Tariff, 4432.
Tate, W., claim of, 4967.
Transatlantic mail service, 594.
Unemployed in Montreal, 3176.
Vincent, J. U., appointment of, 1410.

Borden, Sir Frederick, trips of, 570.

Boulay, Mr. H. (Rimouski)
Agriculture, encouragement of, 358, 1111, 1149.
Canada and Gulf Railway, 1022.
Clement, Hon. Justice, 2263, 2367.
Dismissals, 969, 1426.
Farmers Bank, 4896.
French guides for museums, 1816.
Immigration, 1620.
Intercolonial Railway
Appointments of chiefs, 471.
Branch lines, 5126.
Employees' wages, 471, 1016.
Management of, 3311, 4947.
Tie contracts, 1331.
Judges' salaries, 1938.
Marine signals, improvement of, 5182.
Militia, 4596.
National Transcontinental Railway stations, 1604.
Naturalization, 4818.
Naval service, 334, 346. b173.
Ottawa as a federal district, 1889.
Pedley, F., resignation of, 817.
Pilotage, 3629.
Railway Commission, 2437.
Rimouski land purchase, 1695.

Boulay, Mr. H.—Con.

Sessional messengers, 704.
Smuggling, alleged, 1782.
Trade commissioners, 888.
Vineberg, Helen, divorce Bill, 4880.

Bounties on steel. *See* Steel.

Bourassa, Mr. J. Boutin (Lévis)
Carrier machine shops, 1819, 2961.
Dismissals, 4369, 5028.
Fenian raid veterans, 1022.
Intercolonial Railway
Double tracking, 4558.
Fire claims, 5029.
'Safety First' engineer, 2262.
Investigations into political partisanship, 2308.
Larose, Wilfrid, 1818.
Lauzon postmaster, 5029.
Lévis
Experimental farm, 369.
Rural mail, 369.
Mail bag locks, 701.
National Transcontinental Railway Quebec terminals, 2177.
Ontario Fire Insurance Co., 4295.
St. Romuald post office, 809, 4021.

Boy Scouts, 4131, 5002.

Boyce, Mr. A. C. (West Algoma)
Electoral corruption, 914.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2180.
Prudential Life of Canada, 2900.
Vineberg, Helen, divorce Bill, 4881.
Wagner, Philip, 1184.

Boyer, Mr. Gustave (Vaudreuil)
Agriculture, aid to, 809.

Boyer, Mr. A. G.—Con.
Bergeron, J. C., payments to, 368.
Butter manufacture, 2385.
Chevrier et Frères, payments to, 368.
Graham wharf, 443.
Intercolonial Railway lumber purchase, 894.
Ottawa river lightkeepers, 574.
Point Fortune wharf, 3398.
Quebec seigniories, 568.
Rigaud
Post office, 442, 3638, 4021.
Wharf, 442.
Wharfs, revenue from, 368.

Boys, Mr. W. A. (South Simcoe)
Barcelona Light and Power Company, 1911, 1981.
W. C. Edwards Company, 3474.

Bradbury, Mr. George H. (Selkirk)
Butter manufacture, 3164.
Central Western Canada Railway Company, 806.
Cold storage, 3568.
Dismissals, 1199.

Bradbury, Mr. Geo. H.—Con.
Fenian raid veterans, 5001.
Indians, 3483, 3545.
Ottawa public buildings, 1878.
Pollution of navigable waters, 1745, 2013.
Tariff, 3124.
Winnipeg-Gimli train service, 4629.

Brantford public building, 817, 871, 5218.

British Columbia-Alaska Railway, proposed, 1870.

Bristol, Mr. Edward (Toronto Centre)
Better Terms Commission, 359, 2372, 4628, 4997.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3787, 4254.

Broder, Mr. Andrew (Dundas)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Naval defence, 177.
Highways improvement, 177.
Cost of living, 178.
Agriculture, aid to, 179.
Cigarettes, prohibition of, 1473.

Brodeur, Hon. L. P., trips of, 1112.

Brome rural mail service, 703.

Brooks, Mrs. M. J., pension of, 4964.

Brouillard, Mr. Ovide (Drummond and Arthabaska)
Arthabaska public works, 1114.
Dismissals, 1023.
Drummond and Arthabaska post offices, 1019.
Le Present printing contracts, 1534.
Newspaper advertising, 1781.
Rimouski government employees, 4021.

Buchanan, Mr. William A. (Medicine Hat)
Acme-Carbon mails, 2687.
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Free wheat, 304.
Transportation, 304.
Agricultural implement duties, 1585.
Alberta
Internal elevators, 473, 572, 1216.
Irrigation, 1605.
Natural gas, 357.
Rural mail, 817.
Bassano post office, 472.
Blood Reserve grazing lease, 357.
Budget, 2660.
Freight rates, 2660.
Tariff, 2661.
Free wheat, 2663.
Agricultural implements, 2665.
Immigration, 2667.
Burns grazing lease, 2591.
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, 766.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3948, 4424.
Canadian Pacific Railway irrigated lands, 2785.
Central Western Canada Railway Company, 804.

Buchanan, Mr. Wm.—Con.
Coal lands, 365.
Coutts customs officer, 436.
Dominion lands, 3320.
Glencurrie post office, 4561.
Grain elevators, 1647.
Homesteaders' pre-emptions. 357.
Irrigation, 574, 3596.
Labour disputes, 545.
Natural resources, provincial control of, 1067.
Newspapers, postal rates on, 3238.
Ottawa building leases, 2544.
Railway Commissioners' superannuation, 574.
Ranching Commission, 574.
Rural post office libraries, 892.

Budget, 2440, 2482, 2520, 2547, 2592, 2639, 2690, 2734, 2789, 2841.
Amendment proposed: Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 2849; div., 2898.

Buffalo herd, 4155.

Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St Maurice)
Cap de la Madeleine wharf, 2959.
Grandmère buildings, 2688.
Ice breaking, 409.
Inland Revenue estimates, 1372.
Judges' salaries, 1932, 3604.
Naval service, 5167.
Penitentiaries estimates, 62368.
Post office estimates, 3647.
St. Maurice boom service, 2688.
St. Maurice Shawinigan public works. 5194.
Three Rivers
Camp, 3509.
Dismissals, 818.
Postal district, 5129.
Post office, 2688.
Preventive officer, 473.
Public buildings, 569.

Burnham, Mr. John H. (Peterborough West)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Naval defence, 46.
Cost of living, 47.
Highways improvement, 48.
Asiatic immigration, 1251.
Battlefields, preservation of, 4118.
Boy scouts, 4132.
Budget, 2629.
Protection and free trade, 2630.
Labour conditions, 2635.
Butter manufacture, 3163.
Canadian Northern Railway, 2262, 2591 3967.
Cigarettes, prohibition of, 1475.
Criminal Code and moral law, 3480.
Divorce reform, 827.
Elections Act Amendment, 478.
Electoral corruption, 907.
Farmers Bank, 3529.
Fisheries of Ontario, 1827, 1916.

Burnham, Mr. John.—Con.

Georgian Bay canal, 2973.
High Commissioner's office, 1768.
Immigration, 1618.
Judges' salaries, 1937.
Naturalization, 4532, 4544.
Ocean transportation, 2932.
Old age pensions, 1340.
Oriental industrial competition, 4558.
Panama canal rates, 3509.
Privilege, 3058.
Tariff, 1358, 3124.
Titles of honour, 479.
Trade, balance of, adjustment, 2016.
Trent canal, 4940, 4994.
W. C. Edwards Company, 3475.

Burrell, Hon. Martin (Minister of Agriculture)

Agriculture, Department of, estimates, 341, 1098-1111, 1130-1163, 1670-1688, 2370, 3173, 3487-3502.
Agricultural Gazette, 1098, 1104, 1161, 1670.
Animals, health of, 3173.
Butter. *See* Dairy Products.
Cold storage, 1680, 1752, 3559, 4172.
Cow testing, 1673.
Dairy products regulation, 1678, 1751, 2384, 2387, 3162.
Exhibitions, 1684.
Experimental farms, 1098, 1109, 1154, 2370, 3493.
Food products, inspection of, 1672, 1679, 2370.
Fruit inspection, 1674.
Horse breeding, 3493, 3501.
Insect pests, 1130-1133, 1155.
Lévis quarantine station, 1108.
Live stock industry, 3493.
Patent Office, 5200.
Patent Record, 1098.
Patents, renewal of, 1668, 1669, 2948, 3205.
Potatoes, tariff on, 3090.
Quebec, agriculture in, 1677.
Tobacco culture, 1147.

Bury drill hall, 2960.

Butter. *See* Dairy Products.

Buttons, ivory, tariff on, 3159.

Cable rates, 5246.

Cameron, A. J., Fenian raid bounty commissioner, 2960.

Campbell, Glen, charges against, 622, 1853.

Camperville and Winnipegosis mails, 2686.

Canada and Gulf Railway, 1022.

Canada Grain Act Amendment Bill. Res., 3161. 1r., 3162. 2r., 3573. Com., 3574. 3r., 3861.

Canada Shipping Act Amendment Bills

Coasting privileges: 1r., 90.
Investigations of casualties: 1r., 4552. 2r. and com., 4554. 3r., 4631.

Canada Shipping Act Amendment Bills—Con.

Pilotage: 1r., 3054. 2r., 3621. Com., 3621. 3r., 3631.
Shipping: Res., 1540. 1r., 1540. 2r., 1607.
See also Merchant Shipping.

Canada, Steamship, 2437, 3715.

Canada Temperance Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 3453. 2r., 3588. Com., 3588. 3r., 3717. *See also* 1760, 2373.

Canadian Northern Railway

Conductors, dismissal of, 2518.
Loan, application for, 1361.
Pacific terminus, 699.
Payments, 345.
Subsidies, 2262, 2591.
Terminals, 2262.

Canadian Northern Railway Aid Bill. Res., 3651, 3717, 3787, 3828, 3896, 3967, 4009, 4025, 4216, 4296, 4323, 4370. 1r., 4426. 2r., 4452. Com., 4525, 4545. Rep., 4551. 3r., 4631, 4675.

Amendments proposed
On res.: Mr. Macdonald, 3833; div., 4008.
In com. on res.: Mr. Carvell, 4014; div., 4019.
On 2r. of res.: Mr. Ross, 4376; div., 4390. Mr. Pugsley, 4391; div., 4413. Mr. Oliver, 4416; div., 4425.
On 3r. of Bill: Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 4634; div., 4663. Mr. Verville, 4664; div., 4674.

Canadian Pacific Railway

Austria, office in, 896.
Irrigated lands, 2785.
Labour award, 2961.
Lachine bridge, 3111.
Toronto-Sudbury line, 1113.
Winnipeg-Gimli train service, 4629.

Canadian Peace Centenary Association, 970, 4961.

Canadians in Mexico, protection of, 2785.

Canals, 365, 1957, 2963, 4162, 5108.

Canning factories, 1605.

Canning public building site, 1899, 4183, 5224.

Canso

Letter boxes, 703.
Reduction works, 1693, 2080.

Cap aux Corbeau wharf, 4293.

Cap de la Madeleine wharf, 2959.

Cape Breton, naturalization in, 1116.

Capital punishment, abolition of, 4, 482, 1731. 4516.

Carbons, tariff on, 3132.

Cardin, Mr. P. J. A. (Richelieu)

St. Joseph de Sorel post office, 572.
Trempe, L. J., employment of, 1434, 1695.

Carleton Centre mails, 1818, 4021.

Carleton Head breakwater, 2178.

Carnations, tariff on, 3043.

Carrick, Mr. J. J. (Thunder Bay and Rainy River)
Canadian Northern Railway, 3811.
Iron and steel industry, 1498.
Rainy River Radial Railway Company, 2950.

Carroll, Mr. W. F. (Cape Breton South)
Alert, steamer, 308, 423.
Biggar, Col. J. L., 1217.
Bridgeport postmaster, dismissal of, 3840.
Budget, 2547
Naval defence, 2548.
Immigration, 2549.
Steel industry, 2551.
Coal industry, 2553.
Cost of living, 2554.
Tariff, 2555.
Labour conditions, 2556.
Canada Temperance Act, 3592.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4027, 4081, 4227, 4667, 4671.
Civil Service, 5373.
Cold storage, 1680, 3565, 4172.
Dismissals, 1171, 3840.
Dry docks, 4092, 4111.
Excise estimates, 1414, 1417.
Explosives, regulation of, 3863.
Fenian raid veterans, 4355, 5000.
Fish and fisheries
Industry, 5275.
Protection, 1794, 1822.
Transportation, 390.
Franklin, B. J., employment of, 5217.
Glace Bay harbour, 4207.
Ice breakers, 402.
Immigration, 1643.
Indians, 3542.
Intercolonial Railway
Appointments, 1113.
Branch lines, 5115.
Management, 3313.
Standard rules, 2957.
Judges' salaries, 1944, 3611.
Labour
Disputes, 532.
Public works, on, 4205, 5202.
Lobster regulations, 5186.
Militia, 4599, 4605.
Mira river steamboat service, 2933, 5038.
Naturalization, 1116, 4139, 4537, 4820.
Naval service, 333.
Old age pensions, 1343.
Ottawa as the Capital, 1884.
Pig iron, drawback on, 3216.
Public buildings in Cape Breton, 1895.
Railway employees—hours of service, 2175.
St. Peter's Indian school, 2479.
Steamboat subsidies, 2933.
Technical education, 5207.

Carroll, Mr. W. F.—Con.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 3476.
Townsend, N. T., resignation of, 2436.
Vancouver Island coal strike, 1276, 4667.
Whitney Pier subcollector of customs, 433.
Winter, Lt.-Col. E. F., employment of, 2840.

Carslake Hotel purchase, 1871, 2436, 4023, 4192.

Carson. *See* Home Rule.

Carvell, Mr. Frank B. (Carleton, N.B.)
Basic slag, 643.
Bounties on iron and steel, 1520.
Butter manufacture, 2384.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3912, 4011, 4235, 4308, 4525.
Capital punishment, 491.
Carson, Sir Edward, presentation to, 1785.
Dismissals, 1196, 1388, 2424.
Divorce reform, 832.
Dorval land purchase, 1218, 2436.
Dredge Fielding, 2261.
Dredging in New Brunswick, 2078.
Dry docks subsidies, 3961.
Empress of Ireland, loss of, 4556.
Experimental farms, N.B., 1135, 1140, 3489, 3492.
Fenian raid veterans, 3367, 4341.
Fisheries, 786, 1799.
Foundation Co., Ltd., 1876.
Fredericton public works, 705.
Fundy, Bay of, navigation, 165.
Government officials in politics, 436, 1195.
Government Railways Claims Act, 2392.
Government telegraph service, 2375.
House of Comomns Debates, distribution of, 1774.
Indian schools, 2395.
Inland Revenue, appointment of Deputy Minister of, 1411.
Intercolonial Railway—Chatham Junction-Brockville Branch, 4477.
International Horse Show, 2439.
Iron and steel, bounties on, 1520.
Judges' salaries, 3608.
Kelly, W. J., case of, 1696, 1722.
Labour conditions on Vancouver Island, 526, 544, 660, 1288, 1305.
Lévis quarantine, 1218.
Light buoys, 1169.
Marion Bridge-Woodbine mails, 1116.
Militia, 2371, 3412-3440, 4527, 4592, 4620-4628.
Montreal harbourmaster, 4022.
Natonal Transcontinental Railway
Deficit, 1780.
Investigation, 2051.
Operation, 4453, 4455.
Naturalization, 4535, 4537, 4539.
Ottawa
Building leases, 2439, 2519.
Custom house, 2079.
Water supply, 1887.

Carvell, Mr. F. B.—Con.

Patents, renewal of, 2919.
Payne, Stephen, employment of, 1605.
Post Office Department automobile, 3113.
Potatoes, tariff on, 3067, 3085, 3103.
Railway mail clerks, 2381.
St. John
Custom house, 1330.
Harbour, 1331.
Marine service, 1913.
St. John and Quebec Railway, 2997, 3881, 3959.
Souris rifle range, 4592.
Southampton Railway Company, 1455, 3009.
Sussex public building, 1694.
Tariff, 3040, 4335, 4430.
Tobique Indian reserve, 816, 1359, 1535, 1915, 2590, 3534.
Transatlantic mail service, 582.
Vincent, J. U.. appointment of, 1411.
Volunteer bounty, 1396.
West Indies, trade with, 2015.
Woodstock public building coal supplies, 569.

Cassana flour, tariff on, 3043.

Caterpillar moths, 1132.

Cattle
Inspection of, 758.
United States embargo, 3065.
See also Live Stock.

Census, 842, 954.

Chabot, Mr. John Leo (Ottawa)
Civil Service, 4446.
House of Commons representation, 5309.

Chain, tariff on, 3138.

Chairman and Acting Chairman, rulings of
Acceptance of member's statement, 2420.
Estimates, though not printed in French, may be considered, 403.

Chambly canal, 2990, 4558.

Charlottetown
Confederation Convention, 4960.
Mails, 2014, 3058.

Charlton, Mr. William A. (Norfolk)
Canadian Northern Railway, 3998.

Chesley post office, 664, 5231.

Chevrier et Frères, payments to, 368.

Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W. (Inverness)
Alexander post office, 2960.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4080, 4219.
Dismissals, 1406, 1418, 1815.
Farmers Bank, 1117, 4798.
Fish transportation, 386, 393.
Fisheries advisory board, 348, 702, 2412.
Government telegraph and telephone system, 4181.
Grigg, trade commissioner, 2435.
Indians, Nova Scotia, 2474-2479.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 1740, 4867.
Coal contracts, 3194.

Chisholm, Mr. A. W.—Con.

Inverness
Fruit inspector, 1672.
Harbour, 1818.
Postal service, 815.
Steam service, 2943, 5040.
Margaree harbour repairs, 4209.
Militia, 4617.
Port Hawkesbury public building, 1895.

Chisholm, Mr. William (Antigonish)
Antigonish
Customs collector, 3860, 3893, 4435.
Food inspector, 666.
Immigration agents, 573, 5210.
Mail service, 572, 5137.
Public buildings, need of, 1896, 5227.
Cattle disease, 3175.
Decoste, Capt. J., dismissal of, 1783.
Dominion Atlantic Railway, 1115.
Duchemin, Mr., expenses of, 5239.
Eastern Extension Railway, 3183.
Fenian raid veterans, 2080, 4999.
Government officials in politics, 2407.
Guysborough mails, 1914.
Heatherton Indian reserve, 573
House of Commons
Representation, 5344.
Returns, alleged incomplete, 2377.
Immigration, 1629.
Intercolonial Railway
Antigonish bridge, 1016.
Dorchester water supply, 1015.
Extensions, 3179, 4938.
Passes, 4877.
Repairs, 5121.
Judges' salaries, 1930.
Liberator publication, 3236.
Mail clerks, 3241.
Militia, 4608, 4615, 5012.
Nova Scotia immigration agents, 1691.
Plainfield post office, 2016.
Privilege, 2085, 5955.
South Lake, protection works, 5233.
Vancouver Orange Lodge, 2591.

Cigarettes, prohibition of, 1473, 1688.

Cimon, E. H., expenses of, 664.

Civil Service
Appointments, 666, 1164.
Commission, 697.
Superannuation, 1691.

Civil Service Act (Post Office) Amendment Bill. Res., 2378. 1r., 2389. 2r., 3173. Com., 3220. 3r., 3220, 3249.

Civil Service Acts Amendment Bill. Res., 4437. 1r., 4452.

Civil Service Insurance Bill. Res., 1751. 1r., 1751. 2r., 1871. Com., 1871. 3r., 1875.

Civil Service Superannuation Bill. Res., 5364. 1r., 5374.

Clark, Mr. Hugh (North Bruce)
Farmers Bank, 3530.
Militia, 5006.

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Delay in meeting of Parliament, 35.
Redistribution of representation, 35.
Highways improvement, 36.
By-elections, 37.
Tariff, 38.
Free wheat, 42.
Agricultural implement duties, 1587.
Asiatic trade, 5036.
British cattle embargo, 759.
Budget, 2862
Trade, 2864.
Borrowings, 2865.
Home market, 2869.
Tariff, 2871.
Free wheat, 2873.
Iron industry, 2875.
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, 802.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4239.
Canadians at Bisley, 518.
Dominion lands, 4890.
Farmers Bank, 4912.
Grain markets, 1658.
House of Commons representation, 869.
Naval service, 330, 5155.
Ottawa municipal government, 1883.
Pig iron, drawback on, 3218.
Steel industry, 1506.

Clarke, Mr. A. H. (South Essex)
Tobacco culture, 1147.

Clarke, Mr. W. A. (North Wellington)
Budget, 2731.

Clement, Mr. Justice, expenses of, 2263, 2367.

Clements, Mr. Herbert S. (Comox-Atlin)
Canadian Northern Railway, 4665, 4672.
Government telegraph lines in British Columbia, 2376.
Militia for Prince Rupert, 4586.
Navigable waters protection, 343.

Coal
Contracts for dredges, 923.
Lands, 365.
Royalties, 1809.

Coasting privileges, 2435, 2915-2925, 5196.

Coasting trade of Canada, 756.

Cobequid, steamer, wreck of, 165, 358, 1166.

Cochrane, Hon. Frank (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, 795.
Central Western Canada Railway Company, 805.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, 201.
Hudson Bay terminals, 678.
Intercolonial Railway train service, 258.
Prince Edward Island Railway, 310.

Cockshutt, Mr. William F. (Brantford)
Agricultural implements, tariff on, 3143.
Brantford public building, 873.
Budget, 2529
Agricultural implements, 2537.
Cost of living, 2536.
Naval defence, 2542.
Protection, 2532.
Transportation, 2541.
Canadians in Mexico, 2785.
Confederation, semi-centennial of, 1452.
Immigration, 1624.
Naturalization, 4531, 4533, 4536.
Stone, tariff on, 873, 3127.
Trade agencies, 321.

Cocoanuts, tariff on, 3106.

Coderre, Hon. Louis (Secretary of State)
Archives Department, 1771.
Canada Temperance Act, 1760 .
Companies Act Amendment, 3397, 3861, 4806.
Explosives, manufacture of, 3587, 3861.
French translation, 5273.
Mines Department estimates, 1801-1815.
Naturalization, 1763.
Ores, treatment of, 1803.
Peat, experiments with, 1804-1810.
Printing and stationery, 724-740, 1774.
Secretary of State Department—salaries, etc., 724.
Tar sand deposits, 1812.
Voters' lists, 1760, 5267.

Coke, tariff on, 3137.

Cold Storage Regulation Bill. Res., 1752. 1r., 1753. 2r., 3559. Com., 3559, 4172. 3r., 4173. *See also* 700, 707, 1680.

Cold Storage in Nova Scotia, 700.

Coldbrook Station postmaster, 1690.

Cole Harbour wharf, 1693.

Colpitts, G. A., case of, 446.

Companies Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 3397. 2r., 3861. Com., 3861. 3r., 3861. Senate amendments, 4806.

Confederation, semi-centennial of, 1444.

Conservation
Commission, 718, 5201.
Natural resources, 3323.

Cookshire public building, 2960.

Co-operative Credit Societies Bill. 1r., 3637.

Cornwall canal, 2990.

Cost of Living, 21, 29, 40, 48, 69, 79, 87, 96, 102, 110, 121, 132, 178, 190, 245, 249, 294, 5376. *See also* Budget.

Cost of Living Commission, 356, 2436.

Cow testing, 1673.

Criminal Code Amendment Bills
Firearms and detectaphones, 1r., 467.
Fraudulent advertising, 1r., 3397. 2r., 3466. Com., 3466, 3480. 3r., 3481. *See also* 4215.

Criminal Code revision, 3058.

Cromwell, Mr. F. R. (Crompton)
St. George's Club, 3427.

Crothers, Hon. Thos. W.(Minister of Labour)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Cost of living, 276.
United Shoe Machinery Co., 277.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4665.
Farmers Bank, 4726, 4923.
Labour
Estimates, 339, 523-566, 656-663, 5202.
Montreal harbour, in, 5203.
Matches, white phosphorus, 1536, 1756.
Natural resources, provincial control of, 1093.
Technical education, 4888, 5206.
Vancouver Island labour troubles, 523-566, 656, 1305.

Cruise, Mr. Robt. (Dauphin)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Free wheat, 295.
Cost of living, 296.
Reciprocity with United States, 297.
Budget, 2824.
Farm implements, 2825.
Free wheat, 2825.
Camperville mails, 2686.
Canadian Northern Railway, 2518.

Currie, Mr. John A. (North Simcoe)
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, 766.
Militia, 3434.
Tariff, 3149.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 3275.

Currie, Ronald, 990, 1005, 1361, 1603.

Customs
Appointments, 473.
Dismissals, 963, 997.
Duties, 5363.
Estimates, 400, 422-439, 963-969, 997-1011, 2363, 2374.
Protection service, 423.
Undervaluation, 3318.

Customs Act (Pig-iron drawback) Amendment Bill. Res., 3210. 1r., 3220. 2r., 3510. Com., 3511. 3r., 3511. *See also* Tariff Bill.

Dairy Products Regulation Bill. Res., 1751. 1r., 1752. 2r., 2384. Com., 3162. 3r., 3173.

Davidson, Mr. Avard L. (Annapolis)
Fenian raid veterans, 3376.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 2418.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2150.

Death Penalty. *See* Capital Punishment.

Debt of Canada, 1116.

Delisle, Mr. Michel (Portneuf)
Montcalm, Steamship, 666.
Morrison, Lt.-Col., expenses of, 1915.
Murray Bay steamer service, 1915.
Pilotage, 666, 1219.
Portneuf lightkeeper, 1219, 3510.
St. Casimir post office, 360, 667.
Sessional indemnity, 817.

Demers, Mr. M. Joseph (St. John and Iberville)
Dismissals, 1376, 2689.
Farmers Bank, 4736.
Hansard, omission in, 4886.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2250.
Paradis, L., appointment of, 2840.
Railway Act Amendment, 610, 793.
Ste. Brigide mails, 893.
St. Johns
Bridge, 2689.
Customs collector, 893.
Inland Revenue, 1021.
Rural mail, 366.
Seed grain, 369.

Denison, J. R., postmaster, 3209, 3640, 5259, 5264.

Dental machines, tariff on, 3144.

Dentistry congress, 2957.

Deputy Speaker, office of, 1362.

Des Prairies river dredging, 1731.

Detectaphone, use of, 468.

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)
Budget, 2621
National policy, 2622.
Surpluses, 2624.
Immigration, 2625.
Tariff, 2626.
Transportation, 2627.
Agriculture, 2628.
Canal traffic, 365.
Explosives, regulation of, 3863.
Farmers Bank, 4722.
Georgian Bay canal, 567, 1047, 2968.
Grain shipments, 472.
House of Commons representation, 5321.
Hull
Customs office, 568.
Inland Revenue receipts, 473.
International Waterways, 164.
Judges' salaries, 1925.
Mineral deposits, 1023.

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B.—Con.
Nova Scotia coal, 365.
Ottawa and Hull Improvement Commission, 697.
Privilege, 1119.
Public buildings, expenditure on, 4190.
Ulster and the Minister of Militia, 1903.
Unemployment, 5031.
W. C. Edwards Company, 3474.
Wright county post offices, 445.

Dismissals, 430, 762, 770, 990, 997, 1170-1188, 1375, 1385-1395, 1401, 1424.
Bigelow, J. E., 1436.
Décoste, J., Capt., 1783.
Drummond and Arthabaska, 1023.
Faucher, E., painter, 1784.
Fish hatchery employees, 370.
Intercolonial Railway employees, 370.
Laing, J. R., postmaster, 370.
Larivière, Mr., land agent, 370.
Leslie, Wm. C., postmaster, 369.
McGillis, J., 1435.
McLeod, M. H., geologist, 1815.
McRae, A., lighthouse-keeper, 1118.
Three Rivers postal officials, 818.

D'Israeli wharf, 1435.

Divorce cases, procedure in, 1118.

Divorce reform, 821.

Doherty, Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)
Advertising, fraudulent, 3397, 3466, 3480.
Asiatic immigration, 1258.
Canada Temperance Act Amendment, 3453, 3588, 3717.
Capital punishment, 741.
Divorce reform, 835.
Dominion Lands Act Amendment, 4367, 4821, 4889.
Dominion police, 2368.
Elections Act Amendment, 478.
Electoral corruption, 908.
Exchequer Court, 2367.
Explosives, regulation of, 3863.
Falardeau case, 459.
Fatsari, G., release of, 405.
Fraudulent advertising, 3397, 3466, 3480.
Haultain, Chief Justice, judgments of, 1265.
Judges, Prince Edward Island, 4887.
Judges' salaries, 1940, 3603, 3886, 3957.
Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, 1955.
Justice Department
Estimates, 342, 2365, 4521.
Salaries, 342.
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amendment, 3251, 3516.
Kelly, Wm. J., case of, 1706.
Labrador coast, jurisdiction on, 2954.
Merchants Accident Guarantee Company, 3512.
Monk, Hon. F. D., death of, 3787.

Doherty, Hon. C. J.—Con.
Naturalization, British nationality, 3249, 4119, 4143, 4173, 4367, 4529-4545, 4808-4821, 4823.
O'Brien, A. H., superannuation of, 1945.
Pembroke Lumber Company, claim of, 5026.
Penitentiaries, 2365, 2368, 4521.
Pension to guard's widow, 3460, 3531.
Prison reform, 4522.
Prisons and Reformatories Act Amendment, 3397, 3466.
Senate representation, 1488.
Supreme Court appeals, 3251, 3462.
White slave traffic, 4523.

Dominion Atlantic Railway, 1115.

Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2261. 2r., 3512. Com., 3512, 3554. 3r., 3558. *See also* 4151.

Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bills
Aikins, Mr. 1r., 201.
Doherty, Mr. 1r., 4367. 2r., 4821. Com., 4821, 4889. 3r., 4891.
Roche, Mr. 1r., 2261. 2r., 3249. Com., 3249, 3320, 3511. 3r., 3512.

Dominion Lands and Parks, 1836, 2372, 4151.
Orders in Council approved, 4713.

Dorchester
Government employees, 3638.
Penitentiary, 440.

Dorion dredging, 443.

Dorval militia land purchase, 1025, 1119, 1218, 2436.

Douglas, Mr. James (Strathcona)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Free wheat, 299.
Aid to agriculture, 301.
Unemployed labour, 301.
Budget, 2835
Freight rates, 2837.
Binder twine, 2838.
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, 765, 804.
Dominion lands, 3349-3361.
Government officials in politics, 1836
Hudson Bay terminals, 568.
Indians, 2478.

Dredges and dredging
Canada, 811, 1218.
Coal supplies, 2078.
East river, 5363.
Fielding, 2261.
George McKenzie, 1780.
New Brunswick, 2078.
Prince Edward Island, 3058.

Drill halls. *See* Armouries.

Drummond and Arthabaska postmasters, 1019.

Dry Docks Subsidies Act Amendment Bill. Res., 3961. 1r., 3965. 2r., 4090. Com., 4090. 3r., 4112. *See also* 5237.

Dubé, P., employment of, 2016.

Duchemin, H. P., payments to, 353, 697, 770, 893, 926, 966, 990, 1111, 1173.

Dunvegan telegraph, 816.

Duthie Point lighthouse, 703.

Eastern Extension Railway, 3183.

Eastern Townships
Diseased cattle, 363.
Experimental farm, 1694.
Post offices, dismissals in, 3640, 5261.

East Jeddore dredging, 925.

East river improvements, 811.

Edmonton and Ft. George mail service, 891.

Edmonton drill hall, 354.

Edmundston immigration office, 704, 1619.

Edson-Grand Prairie mail service, 369.

Edwards, Mr. John W. (Frontenac)
Agricultural Gazette, 1104.
Barriefield camp, 3714.
Budget, 2603
Farm products, 2604.
Free wheat, 2610.
Transportation, 2614.
Agricultural implements, 2615.
Cost of living, 2619.
Steel industry, 2619.
Reciprocity with the United States, 2620.
Capital punishment, 501.
Civil Service, 4449, 4450.
Cold storage, 1681.
Fenian raid veterans, 3509.
Fisher, Hon. S., on Canadian farming, 1110.
Fisheries, 1825.
Franking privilege, 3225.
Frontenac rural mail, 813.
Government officials in politics, 433, 1840.
Kingston causeway, 3509.
Kingston penitentiary, 812, 2365, 2519, 2959, 4484-4504, 4512.
Militia parades, 2178.
Naval service, 5166.
O'Brien, A. H., superannuation of, 1950.
Ottawa as the Capital, 1884.
Pilotage, 3631.
Potatoes, tariff on, 3078.
Printing Bureau, 4370.
Reciprocity with the United States, 1686.
Transportation, 2979.
Unemployment, 4159.

Eganville post office, 353, 2545, 5219.

Election Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 478.

Election laws committee, 1118.

Elections and Government officials. *See* Government Officials.

Elections, general, résumé of, 2995.

Electoral corruption, 344, 900.

Elevators, grain, 473, 572, 1216, 1646-1666.

Elliott, Mr. George A. (North Middlesex)
Farmers Bank, 4919.

Elmira post office, 702.

Embroideries, tariff on, 3157.

Emmerson, Hon. H. R. (Westmorland)
Basic slag, 444, 511, 630, 2677; proposed amendment, 638.
Battlefields, preservation of, 3198.
Brantford public building, 878.
Budget, 2673
Tariff, 2674.
Basic slag, 2677.
Cut stone, 2679.
Protection, 2681.
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, 795.
Canadian Northern Railway terminals, 699, 2262.
Colpitts, G. A., case of, 446, 455.
Dorchester penitentiary, 441.
Franking privilege, 3224.
Fredericton and Grand Lake Coal and Railway Company, 3205.
Governor General, new, 3454.
Herring fishing, 2437.
Hudson, patrol boat, 2687.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 353.
Canadian Pacific Railway, traffic agreement with, 567, 596, 1534, 1691.
Dismissals, 1017, 2962, 3508.
District No. 3, 1114.
Dorchester water supply, 1015.
Engineers, appointment of, 2176.
French river bridge, 362.
Halifax terminals, 1782.
Hampton station, 1691.
Harris, F., employment of, 2176.
Hay shipments, 922.
Killam, A. E., retirement of, 1724.
Management, 3256; proposed amendment, 3264.
Moncton residence purchase, 893.
Provident fund, 469.
Skeffington, detective, 921.
Suburban train receipts, 1015.
Survey staff, 2261.
Train service, 167, 258.
Wooden cars, 355.
Judges' salaries, 1929.
Maps, incorrect, 2902.
Maritime mail service, 166, 202.
Militia poster, 1536, 2082.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 1329, 2331.
Richibucto life-saving crew, 668.

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—Con.
St. John and Quebec Railway, 2546, 2789, 3030.
Sackville public wharf, 568.
Stone, tariff on, 878, 3125.
Tariff, 3125.
Transatlantic mail service, 376.
Trent Valley Woollen Company, 2177.
Trust companies, 2907.
Volunteer bounty, 1398.
Westmorland harbours, 443.

Empress of Ireland
Loss of, 4433, 4552, 4555, 4628, 4716, 4879, 4894, 4954. *See also* 5069, 5230.
Court of investigation, 4887.

Esquimalt dry dock, 812, 1433.

Estimates. *See titles of departments and subjects.*

Ethier, Mr. Joseph A. C. (Two Mountains)
Canning factories, 1605.
Intercolonial Railway, 4949.
Railway subsidies, 4971.
Ste. Scholastique postmaster dismissal, 3634, 3854.

Exhibitions, 359, 1684.
San Francisco, 359, 1686, 3254.

Experimental farms, 1135. 1140, 1148, 2372, 3487.

Explosives Regulation Bill. Res., 3587. 1r., 3588. 2r., 3861. Com., 3862. 3r., 3895. *See also* 1810, 1815.

Export Act Amendment Bill. Res., 971. 1r., 975. 2r., 1758. Com., 1758, 3463. 3r., 3717.

Express franking privilege, 1018.

External Affairs, Department of, 355.

Extradition cases. *See* Kelly.

Falardeau case, 455, 699.

Falmouth dyke, 1780.

False Creek Indian reserve. *See* Kitsilano.

Farmers Bank Relief Bill. Res., 3517. 1r., 3531. 2r., 4675, 4718, 4806. Com., 4894. 3r., 4929.
Amendment proposed: Mr. A. K. Maclean, 4703; div., 4806.
See also 723, 1117, 3197, 3453.

Farnham camp, 1033, 1125, 1435.

Fatsari, G., release of, 464, 1911.

Federal Life Assurance Company, 2435.

Fenian raid veterans, 284, 338, 349, 369, 440, 445, 473, 571, 925, 1022, 1604, 1693, 1783, 2080, 2085, 2787, 2962, 3362-3396, 3509, 3894, 4339.

Ferguson, G. H., commissioner, 1915.

Ferrona-Sunny Brae Railway, 669.

Fielding, P., employment of, 365.

Finance Department estimates, 722.

Financial conditions, 18, 56, 62, 129, 169, 189.

Financial Statement. *See* Budget.

Firearms, carrying of, 467.

Fish and fisheries
Advisory board, 348, 702, 2398.
Boundary regulations, 1214.
Curing expert, 571.
Exhibits, 2430.
Hatcheries, 2431.
Herring, 2437.
Industry, 5275.
Lobster
Licenses, 815.
Regulations, 344, 5186.
Seed, 816.
Medical aid, 416.
Modus vivendi
Licenses, 1692.
Violations, 1603.
New Brunswick claims, 2374.
Ontario jurisdiction, 1916.
Pickled fish. *See that title*; *also*, Fisheries Act Amendment Bills.
Protection service, 2429.
Reduction works, 1693, 2080, 2177.
Shellfish commission, 667,1361, 2418, 4022, 4294.
Smelt licenses, 2178, 2402.
Statistics, 1020, 1361, 2402, 5191.
Transportation, 376, 894, 1114, 1215, 2403, 2937, 5069.

Fisheries Act Amendment Bills
Consolidation. 1r., 793. 2r., 1164. Ref. to select com., 1164. Com., 1793, 1820. 3r., 2384.
Inspection of pickled fish. Res., 3455. 1r., 3460. 2r., 3460. Com., 4435. 3r., 4437.

Fisher, Mr. J. H. (Brant)
Auto-Wheels, Limited, 1668.
Privilege, 3113.

Fletcher, Joshua, employment of, 351.

Food products, inspection of, 1672, 1678, 2370.

Forest reserves. *See* Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks.

Fortier, Mr. Edmond (Lotbinière).
French translation, 2436.

Foster, Mr. Arthur DeWitt (Kings, N.S.)
Canadian Northern Railway, 3983.
Cold storage, 3563, 5185.
Dismissals, 1182.
Immigration, 1152.
Natural resources, conservation of, 1811.
St. John Valley Railway, 3033.

Foster, Hon. George E. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Atlantic mail service, 5066.
Binder twine, 1608, 2913.
British postal rates, 3232.

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—Con.
Budget, 2849.
Trade conditions, 2852.
Flour industry, 2853.
Trade policies, 2856.
Free wheat, 2858.
Capital punishment, 490.
Census, 954.
China and Japan steamship subsidy, 5034.
Commissioner of Commerce, 316.
Cost of living, 5377.
Fish transportation, 5069.
Grain
Act, administration of, 1646.
Bill, 3161, 3574.
Commission 1646.
Laboratory, 315.
High Commissioner's office, 5378.
Imperial Trade Commission, 927.
Mail subsidies, 2913.
National Transcontinental Railway, 4859.
Ocean freight rates, 2926, 5043.
Parliamentary procedure—Committee of Supply without question put, 521.
St. Lawrence rates, 977.
Seeds inspection Bill, 4167.
Steamship subventions, 2913, 2923-2947, 5034.
Strathcona, Lord, death of, 164.
Titles of honour, 480.
Trade and Commerce estimates, 315, 881, 927, 1646, 2913, 2923, 5034.
West Indies
Cables, 955.
Steamship service, 956.
Trade Commissioner, 882.

Foundation Company, Ltd., 1876.

Fowler, Mr. George W. (Kings and Albert)
Canadian Northern Railway, 4643.
Civil Service, 4449, 4451.
Fenian raid veterans, 3374.
Fisheries protection, 1795.
Hampton public building, 4189.
Judges' salaries, 1928, 3606.
Militia camp grounds, 5017.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2284.
St. John Valley Railway, 3884.
Yukon territory judge, 4022.

Franking privilege, 971, 1018, 3223.

Fraser, J. McL., fishery officer, 5030.

Fraser, W. E., fishery officer, 2405-2418.

Fraserville
Battery, 1021.
Drill hall. 360.
Harbour, 358, 441, 1604.

Fraudulent advertising. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bill.

Fredericton
Experimental farm, 1135.
Mails, 2014.
Public works, 705.

Free wheat, 42, 133. 238, 260, 267, 271, 279, 282, 285, 288, 295, 297, 299, 301, 304, 2873, 2825, 2858. 2833, 2723, 2796 2746, 2889, 2816, 2810, 2804.
Amendment proposed: Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 2846, 2849; div., 2897.

Freight rates, 1914, 2196, 2687, 2971-2986, 4327-4331, 4416-4425. *See also* Ocean.

French
Translation, 1912, 2436.
Official documents in, 4434, 4523.

French river
Dam, 1604.
Improvements, 2081.
Wharf, 1434.

French Canadian Senator for Ontario, 367.

Fripp, Mr. Alfred E. (Ottawa)
Civil Service, 4443, 5373.
Divorce bills, 4881.
Foundation Company, Ltd., 1879.
Goldschmidt, R., patent of, 2918.
House of Commons representation, 5311.
Labrador, Quebec and Southern Railway Company, 2922.
Ottawa water supply, 1886.
Willson, T. L., patent of, 2918.

Frontenac rural mail, 813.

Fruit inspection, 1672, 1674.

Fuller, Mrs. M. E., pension of, 4998.

Fundy, Bay of, navigation, 165.

Garland, Mr. W. F. (Carleton, Ont.)
Budget, 2783.

Gaspé
Public buildings, 4191.
Steamer service, 1433, 3058, 2437, 2939.

Gauthier, Mr. Louis J. (St. Hyacinthe)
Dismissals, 1392.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2264.

Gauvreau, Mr. Chas. A. (Temiscouata)
L'Assurance de Rimouski, 3894.
Cimon, E. H., payments to, 664.
Fraserville
Battery, 1021.
Drill hall, 360.
Harbour, 358, 441, 1604.
Excise officer, 1402.
Public building, 4196.
French Canadian senators, 367.
Government officials in politics, 1402, 2262.
Inland Revenue officers, 1402.
Intercolonial Railway
Dismissals, 370.
Ice contracts, 364, 2016.
Riviere du Loup facilities, 4970.
Investigations into political partisanship, 2262.
Isle Verte wharf, 360, 1604, 2264, 4712.
Judges' salaries, 3621.
Liberator magazine, 3236.
National Transcontinental Railway, 4461, 4463.

Gauvreau, Mr. Chas. A.—Con.

Quebec
Harbour Commission,, 1604, 2263.
Judges, 4807.
Rimouski
Customs, 2015.
Engineers, 2079.
Harbour, 2079, 2310.
Medical service, 2015.
20th Battery, 1361, 2263.

Gelinas, P. and R. Lajoie, employment of, 2688.

Geological Survey estimates, 1815.

Georgian Bay Canal, 352, 567, 1020, 1033, 1732, 2965-2987, 5231.

German, Mr. William M. (Welland)
Bounties on steel, 1523.
Brantford public building, 872.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3896, 4011, 4025, 4039, 4072.
Farmers Bank, 4895.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2118.
Naturalization, 4814.
Senate representation, 1493.
Union Life Insurance Company, 2374.
Welland ship canal, 2965.

Giasson post office, 2177, 2688, 3848.

Gimli lake patent, 1359.

Girard, Mr. Joseph (Chicoutimi and Saguenay)
Agriculture, encouragement of, 1158.
Quebec- Blanc Sablon steamship service, 2946.

Glass, Mr. S. Francis (East Middlesex)
Immigration, 1636.

Glencurrie post office, 4561.

Gold and silver leaf, tariff on, 3133.

Government officials in politics, 423, 621, 706, 741, 1195, 1836-1870, 2308, 2405-2427.

Government Railways Claims Bill. 1r., 1910. 2r., 2392. Com., 2392. 3r., 3058.

Government steamers
Canada, 3113.
Construction in Canada, 3878.
Gulnare, 668.
Gunhilde, 2688.
Hudson, patrol boat, 2687.
Repairs, 1332.
Winter service, 3055.

Governor General
Appointment of, 3454.
Departure of—address, 5275.

Graham, Hon. Geo. P. (South Renfrew)
Calgary and Edmonton Railway, 801.
Canada Temperance Act, 1760.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3252, 3800, 4010, 4038.

Graham, Hon. Geo. P.—Con.

Canadian Pacific Railway—Toronto-Sudbury line, 1113.
Capital punishment, 493.
Chesley public building, 5231.
Conservation Commission, 721.
Eganville post office, 353, 2545, 5219.
Farmers Bank, 4894.
Georgian Bay canal, 2969.
Good Roads Association, 2989.
Government officials in politics, 1836.
Grand Trunk Pacific
Arbitration, 360.
Bond guarantee, 4936.
Cost per mile, 923, 1328.
Harbour commissioners, Montreal and Quebec, 1434.
High Commissioner's office, 311, 1764.
House of Commons
Debates, distribution of, 1775.
Representation, 857.
Hudson Bay Railway, 692, 3112.
Intercolonial Railway, management of, 3295.
Labrador, Quebec and Southern Railway Company, 2952.
Lancaster, Mr., indisposition of, 3204.
Loan flotations, 5032.
Matches, white phosphorus, 1538, 1756.
Mines Department, appointments to, 1801.
Morrisburg
Mails, 1692.
Tin plate manufactory, 3130.
National Transcontinental Railway, 1970, 1982, 2021, 2036 (amdt.), 4840.
Coaling plants, 3113.
Contracts drawbacks, 1329.
Eastern division, 1018.
Grade changes, 921.
Investigating commission, 879, 895, 1328, 1915.
Little Mistongo bridge, 573.
St. Malo
Shops, 360, 701, 1817.
Tunnel, 891.
Shops, 1018.
Transcona shops, 664.
Naturalization, uniform British, 1763.
Naval service, 1914, 5159.
Old age pensions, 1353.
Ottawa and New York Railway Company, claim of, 2991.
Pas Mission bridge, 365.
Pembroke armoury, 5193
Petawawa camp lumber claim, 5022.
Pilotage, 815.
Pollution of navigable waters, 1742.
Post office employees' salaries, 3220.
Printing Bureau, 728, 734, 1774.
Quebec land purchases, 1434.
Radium ores, 1692, 1814.
Railway Act Amendment, 2947.
Railway crossings, 360.

Graham, Hon. Geo. P.—Con.
Railways and Canals estimates, 2970-2944, 4160-4167.
Rainy River Radial Railway Company, 2950.
St. John harbour, 1693.
Spirits and tobacco, 1392.
Steel barrels, manufacture of, 1534.
Tariff, 3157.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 3204, 3270.
Transportation, 2971.
Trent Canal, 1817, 2789, 4162, 4945, 4996.
Welland Canal, 2970, 2988, 5108.

Graham wharf, 443.

Grain
Act, administration of, 1646.
Commissioners, 1646, 2376.
Elevators, 473, 572, 1216, 1646-1666.
Inspection, 1117.
Laboratory, 315.
Sample markets, 2787.
Shipments, 472.
Transportation, 2975-2987.
See also Canadian grain.

Granby postal matters, 363, 697.

Grand Falls-St. John Railway, 365.

Grand Mère building, 2688.

Grand Rapids of the Athabaska, 1361.

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway
Cost per mile, 923, 1328.
Estimates, 4161.
Winnipeg terminals. *See* Winnpeg Terminals Bill.

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bills
Completion of prairie section, time extension. 1r., 201. 2r. and 3r., 749.
Guarantee of bonds. Res., 4831. 1r., 4838. 2r., 4929. Com., 4929. 3r., 5034.

Grand Trunk Railway. *See* Toronto Terminals.

Granton and Abercrombie mails, 2686.

Grazing. *See* Homesteading.

Green, Mr. Robt. F. (Kootenay)
Divorce bills, procedure on, 4883.
Labour conditions on Vancouver Island, 1299.

Grigg, trade commissioner, 2435.

Grosse Isle quarantine station, 5028.

Guthrie, Mr. Hugh (South Wellington)
Agricultural implement duties, 1566.
Armouries, 4576-4582.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4419, 4528.
Farmers Bank, 3520.
Militia, 4576-4582.

Guthrie, Mr Hugh.—Con.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2312.
Post Office Act Amendment, 3242.
Prudential Life of Canada, 3478.
Railway level crossings, 3958.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 3204, 3271.
Trent canal investigation, 4975.

Guysborough
Branch railway, 4481.
Public wharfs, 355.

Guysborough-Heatherton mails, 1914.

Hagersville postmaster, 2686.

Halifax
Armouries, 704.
Dennis building, 5031.
Fortifications, 345.
Lightship, 3057.
Militia contracts, 3714.
Post office, 345.
Terminals, 1332. *See also* Intercolonial.

Halifax county mail contracts, 925.

Hanna, Mr. A. E. (South Lanark)
Tariff, 3144.

Hansard. *See* House of Commons Debates.

Hants county electoral lists, 817.

Hantsport
Public building, 1023.
Wharf, 4713.

Harbour Commissioners, 1434.

Harbours, federal control of, 2390.

Harbourville lightkeeper, 1434.

Hartt, Mr. Thomas A. (Charlotte, N.B.)
Dismissals, 2427.

Haultain, Chief Justice, judgments of, 1265.

Hay shipments, 922.

Hazen, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
Atlantic mail service, 5048.
Biological Board, 2434.
Boundary fisheries, 1214.
Canada shipping, 1540, 3053, 3621. *See also* Shipping Act Amendments.
Collision an dsalvage at sea. *See* Shipping.
Colpitts, Mr., case of, 451.
Dismissals, 762, 775, 1173.
Dry docks subsidies, 3964, 4097.
Empress of Ireland investigation, 4552, 4631, 4716, 4887.
Fish and fisheries
Act amendment, 793, 1164, 1793. 1820.

Hazen, Hon J. D.—Con.
Bulletin, 5189.
Lobster regulations, 5186.
Pickled, inspection of, 3455, 4635-4436.
Protection service, 5176.
Transportation, 392, 401, 1215, 5185.
Fishing disaster—appeal for government aid, 5182, 5195.
Fredericton experimental farm, 1138, 3487, 3491.
French, official documents in, 4434, 4523.
Fundy, Bay of, navigation, 165.
Government officials in politics, 1839.
Hudson Bay terminals, 1207.
Hydrographic surveys, 5183.
Intercolonial Railway
Management, 3298, 5048.
Suburban trains, 1065.
Karluk, steamer, 4524, 4629.
Kelly, Wm. J., case of, 1711.
Lake Erie buoy service, 2519.
Leblanc, seaman, burial of, 5179.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 324-328, 402-421, 749-762, 775-787, 1164-1214, 2398-2434.
Merchant shipping. *See* Shipping.
Montreal Harbour
Commission, 3636, 3871, 4523, 4830.
Harbourmaster. 5188.
Steamer berths, 5188.
Naval service, 326-336, 5146.
North Sydney Harbour Commission, 1539, 1791.
Pelagic sealing, 2372.
Pilotage, 985, 3625.
Pollution of navigable waters, 1740, 1748.
Quebec
Harbour Commission, 3876.
Marine agency, 2996.
St. John, port of, 5048.
St. John Valley railway, 3011.
St. Lawrence route, accidents on, 3253, 3398. *See also* Shipping Casualties.
St. Lawrence ship channel, 976-991.
Safety of Life at Sea Convention, 787.
Shipping Act amendments, 94, 743, 1786. *See also* Canada Shipping.
Shipping Casualties investigations, 4552-4555, 4631. *See also* St. Lawrence route.
Vancouver Harbour Commission 2175, 2388.

Heatherton Indian reserve, 573.

Hebb, L. J., amounts paid to, 2178.

Henderson, Mr. David (Halton)
Brantford public building, 876.
Farmers Bank, 4778.
Federal Life Assurance Company, 2435.
House of Commons blue books, 1776.
Naturalization, 1763.
Public buildings, 4196, 4199.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 3276.

Hepburn, Mr. B. R. (Prince Edward, Ont.)
Prince Edward and Hastings Railway Company, 2950.

High Commissioner's office, 311, 352, 1765, 3716, 5378.

Highways Improvement, 15, 23, 36, 48, 52, 55, 101, 116, 129, 147 152, 164, 177, 221, 259, 293.

Home Rule for Ireland
Carson, Sir Edward
Alleged cablegrams to, 2082, 2178.
Presentation to, Mr. Cochrane's presence at, 1785.
Meeting at Toronto, 3573.
Picked men leaving Canada, 1903.
Vancouver Orange Lodge resolutions, 2592, 2785.

Homesteads and Homesteading
Burns grazing lease, 2591.
Entries, 352, 570, 4368.
Land patents, 3113.
Payments, interest on, 1434.
Pre-emptions, Alberta, 357.
Regulations, 2311.
See also Dominion Lands.

Horse breeding, 472, 3493.

Horseflesh abattoirs, alleged, 3487.

House of Commons
Accommodation, need of increased, 4197.
Ascension Day adjournment, 3895.
Ash Wedesday adjournment, 1061.
Business of the House, 1606, 3197.
Committees, select standing, 253.
Debates
Distribution, 1775.
Lengthy answers to questions, insertion of, 1061.
Omissions, 477, 4887.
Translators, chief of, 1818, 5267, 5271.
Deputy Speaker, office of. *See that title.*
Easter adjournment, 2311.
Government business, precedence of, 1606.
Indemnity to members, 817.
Library and reading room, hours of closing, 4214.
Loucks, H. H., employment of, 2439.
Messengers, 568, 704.
Morning sittings, 2788, 3210, 3319.
Officials
Appointments, 94, 399, 2686, 2947, 4954.
Investigation, report of, 442.
Salary increases, 2481.
Parliamentary Guide, 2373.
Post office, 399, 477.
Returns, questions regarding, 476, 878, 1607, 2364, 2377, 3860, 3893, 5956.
Rooms, use of, 2080.
Saturday sittings, 3784.

House of Commons.—Con.

Stationery, 1370.
Voters lists, 1774.
Wednesday sittings, 1264.

House of Commons Representation Bill. 1r., 611. 2r., 842, 927. Ref. to select com., 927. Rep., 1013. Com, 5230, 5306, 6364. 3r., 6364. *See also* 5, 35, 112, 123, 203, 707.

Hudson Bay
Fisheries, 347, 5186.
Railway, 364, 924, 4464-4470, 4474-4878.
Contracts, 5030.
Mileage, 364.
Pas Misssion bridge, 365.
Right of way, 1434.
Terminals, 346, 568, 671, 3112, 1207.

Hughes, Hon. Sam. (Minister of Militia and Defence)
Armouries, 4583-4586, 5007.
Bands at political demonstrations, 5011.
Canadians at Bisley, 514, 518, 1215.
Dorval military site, 1033.
Drill halls, 4583-4586, 5007.
Farnham camp, 1033, 1125.
Fenian raid veterans, 3363-3396, 4340-4367, 5000.
Militia
Annual drill, 4999.
Camp grounds, 5017.
Clothing, 5004.
Estimates, 336, 2363, 2370, 3399-3452, 4571-4620, 4990-5025.
Rifle ranges, 5008.
Militia poster, 1607, 2082.
Petawawa camp lumber claim, 5022.
Privilege, 2083.
Religious processions and the Militia, 5003.
Royal Military College, 5015.
Souris rifle range, 4571, 4594.
Trent canal investigation, 4990.
Volunteer bounty, 3363-3396, 4340-4367.

Hughes, Mr. James J. (Kings, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Naval defence, 99.
Highways improvement, 101.
Cost of living, 102.
Tariff, the, 103.
Militia expenditure, 104.
Agricultural Gazette, 1102, 1671.
Agricultural implements, duties on, 1582.
Basic slag, 638.
Carleton Head breakwater, 2178.
Charlottetown-Crapaud mails, 3058.
Dismissals, 1118.
Elmira post office, 702.
Fenian raid veterans, 440, 2085, 3363, 4360.
Fish, pickled, inspection of, 4436.
French river wharf, 1434.

Hughes, Mr. James J.—Con.

Honorary colonels, 1605.
House of Commons
Debates, official report of: lengthy answers, 1061.
Library and reading room, closing of, 4214.
Representation, 707, 853.
Stationery, 1370.
Hudson Bay terminals, 691.
Intercolonial Railway
Engineers, appointment of, 2176.
Freight cars, 568.
Little Sands breakwater, 445, 1605.
Magdalen islands steamship service, 403.
Militia officer commanding 6th Division, 1783.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2214.
Naval service, 332.
Potatoes, tariff on, 3059, 3084.
Prince Edward Island
Banks, 1781, 2543.
Dredges, 3058.
Freight rates, 1018.
Judges, 4887.
Public works, 4211.
Steam service, 2944.
Transportation, 399.
Railway, 308, 926, 4483.
Representation in House of Commons, 707, 853.
Railway land grants, 5027.
Returns
Alleged incomplete, 476.
Inquiry for, 4296.
Rocky Point wharf, 3113, 3318.
Shellfish commission, 4022, 4294.
Souris rifle range, 1435, 1694, 1783, 4567.
Strong, Heath, payments to, 1116.

Hull
Customs office, 568.
Inland Revenue receipts, 473.

Humboldt homestead inspector, 569.

Hydro-Electric lines, 3474 4716.

Ice-breaking, 402, 2962.

Immigration, 10, 139, 291, 299, 1152.
Asiatic, 350, 351, 808, 1220, 2639, 5026, 5037.
Austrian, 896.
British Columbia, 2264.
Bulgarian and Russian, 4560.
Chinese Act, administration of, 5212.
Deportations, 891, 1636.
Estimates, 1611, 4155.
European, 572.
Hindu, 4022, 4214, 4295, 4524, 4556, 4562, 4717, 4954, 5026.
Inspection, 1437, 1638.

Immigration.—Con.

Regulations, 350.
Statistics, 351.
United States, 697.

Immigration Act (Asiatic exclusion) Amendment Bill. 1r., 5026.

Imperial Trade Commission, 927.

Indian Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1817. 2r., 2394. Com., 2394, 3481, 3532. 3r., 3553, 3554. Senate amdts., 4830.

Indian Harbour Lakes postmaster, 3055.

Indians
British Columbia, 2477, 5209.
Caughnawaga
Hospital, 422.
Petition, 2394, 3481, 3533, 3537.
Estimates, 422, 2471, 2481, 5209.
Generally, 422, 2480.
Liquor selling to, 3207.
Medical attendants, Nova Scotia, 2474, 2840, 3208.
Northwest provinces and territories, 2478, 5209.
Nova Scotia, 2474-2477, 5209.
Ontario and Quebec, 2472-2474.

Industrial Disputes Act, 1022.

Inland Revenue estimates, 339, 1370-1395, 1400-1432, 2364.

Inspection and Sale Act Amendment Bills
Binder twine. Res., 1608. 1r., 1611. 2r., 2913. Com., and 3r., 2913.
Foods. 1r., 2261. 2r., 4167. Com., 4167. 3r., 4171.

Insurance, 1751, 3199.

Insurance Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1688.

Intercolonial Railway
Amos, R., dismissal of, 2962.
Antigonish bridge, 1016.
Appointments, 1113.
Responsibility for, 2956.
Block signals, 3318.
Branch lines, 353, 1736, 3181, 4938, 5110.
Canadian Pacific Railway agreement, 567, 585-610, 1534, 1691, 3256-3316, 4099-4111, 5048-5062.
Car charges, 352.
Chatham Junction-Blackville branch, 4477.
Claims, fire, 2959.
Coal tenders, 924, 1332, 1645, 1786, 1911, 2956, 3194, 3280.
Dean Settlement branch, 3318.
Dismissals, 5122.
District No. 3, loss on, 1114.
Dorchester water supply, 1015.
Double tracking, 4558.
Earnings, 2308.

Intercolonial Railway.—Con.

Employees' wages, 1016.
Estimates, 1959, 3178, 4165, 4860, 4938, 4947.
Ferry employees, 1016.
Fish, rates on, 894, 1017.
Flour, rates on, 1021.
Freight cars, 568.
Freight rates, 921. *See also* Management.
French River bridge, 362.
Grade reduction, 668.
Guysborough branch, 4481.
Halifax terminals, 1782, 4861.
Hampton station, 1691.
Harris, F., employment of, 2176.
Ice contracts, 364, 2016.
Killam, A. E., retirement of, 1724.
King, S., employment of, 895.
Labourers' wages, 471.
Land valuators, 345.
Lévis, fire at, 5029.
Lumber purchase, 894.
Management, 1957, 3256, 3278.
Amendment proposed: Mr. Emmerson, 3264; div., 3316.
Minimum rates, 1434, 1690, 2016.
Ministerial statement, 1959.
Moncton residence, purchase of, 893. 2786.
News bulletin service, 1266.
Ocean Limited, 4630, 4888.
Oxford-Pictou train service, 895.
Pension fund, 469, 572, 5362.
Point Tupper ferry, 894, 3195.
Private cars, 1018.
Refrigerator cars, 1360, 1604.
Repair shops, 2957.
Ste. Louise improvements, 2013.
Sackville dismissals, 1017, 3508.
'Safety First' engineer, 2262.
Sectionmen, 1015.
Skeffington, Detective, 921.
Smith, R. H., employment of, 1690.
Standard rules, 1693, 2957.
Station improvements, 2544.
Suburban trains, 1015, 1062, 4868.
Sunny Brae branch, 894.
Survey staff, 2261.
Tie contracts, 1331.
Tonnage, 3110.
Traffic agreement with Canadian Pacific Railway, 567. *See also* Canadian Pacific.
Train service, 167, 258.
Water service, 2544.
Williams, T., employment of, 895.
Wireless system, 1782.
Wooden cars, 355.

Interior Department estimates, 338, 1836, 2363, 2372, 4151.

International Expositions. *See* Exhibitions.

International Horse Show, 2439.

International Purity Congress, 359, 3859.

International Waterways, 164, 4962.

International Waterways Commission Bill. 1r., 1163. 2r., 1395. Com., 1396. 1483. 3r., 1483.

Inverness
Fruit inspector, 1672.
Harbour, 1818.
Postal service, 815.
Public works, 354.

Investigations into political partisanship, 2262, 2308.

Iron and steel industry, 665, 1498, 1802, 3040.
Ores, treatment of, 1802.
Products, value of, 665.
Tariff, 3040.
Bands, 3153.
Bars, 3159.
Pigs, etc., 3133.
Structural, 3135, 3160.
Tubing, 3145.
See also Pig Iron.

Ironworkers, 1115.

Irrigation Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2261. 2r., 3485. Com., 3485, 3596. 3r, 3717.
See also 4153.

Isle Verte wharf, 360, 1604, 2264, 4712.

Jallet, N., widow of, 1066.

Jameson, Mr. Clarence (Digby)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
By-elections, 95.
Cost of living, 96.
Naval defence, 98.
Dog-fish works, 2177.
House of Commons representation, 5322.

Joliette buildings, 1023.

Joynson, Mrs. Alice, pension Bill. Res., 3460. 1r., 3461. 2r., 3531. Com., 3531. 3r., 3532.

Judges Act Amendment Bills
Mr. Doherty: Res., 3602. 1r., 3621. 2r., 3886. Com., 3886. 3r., 3956.
Mr. Lanctot: 1r., 841.

Judges' salaries, 697, 1925-1944, 3602-3621, 3886-3890, 4807.

Judicial Committee of Privy Council. *See* Privy Council.

Justice Department estimates, 342, 2365, 4521.

Jute, tariff on, 3153.

Juvenile Delinquents Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 3251. 2r., 3516. Com., 3516. 3r, 3517.

Kamloops
Drill hall, 1331.
Public buildings, 1021.

Karluk, steamer, 352, 811, 2264, 4524, 4629.

Kay, Mr. William F. (Missisquoi)
Bedford public building, 2545.
Brome rural mails, 703.
Farnham camp, 1435.
St. Armand mails, 3208.

Kelly, W. J., case of, 1696.

Kentville
Experimental farm, 1152.
Tuberculous cattle at, 4559.

Kingston
Causeway, 3509.
Penitentiary investigation, 571, 812, 2365, 2959, 4484-4522.

Kitsilano Indian reserve, 664, 922, 3547.

Knowles, Mr. William E. (Moosejaw)
Advertising, fraudulent, 3470.
Agricultural implements
Duties on, 1548; amendment proposed, 1558; div., 1602.
Rebates, 1360.
Asiatic immigration, 1244.
Aurora Menace, 2310, 3236.
Butter, manufacture of, 3165.
Canada Temperance Act, 3589.
Customs duties, 5193.
Dominion lands, 3330, 3341, 3511.
Inspectors, 1845
Franking privilege, 3223.
Government officials in politics, 1378, 1401, 1841.
Grain Bill, 3576.
Grain elevators, 1666.
Homestead
Pre-emption payments, 1434.
Regulations, 2311.
Hudson Bay
Railway, 1434.
Terminals, 685.
Imports and exports, 1332.
Indian Act Amendment, 3484.
Inland Revenue estimates, 1378, 1404.
Interior Department estimates, 1841-1870.
Irrigation, 3486.
Lands unpatented, taxation of, 1923.
McVeigh homestead entry, 2841.
Militia estimates, 3405.
Natural resources, provincial control of, 1094.
Petroleum, export of, 974.
Pre-emption payments, 1434.
Ranching and grazing commission, 2543.
Volunteer bounty, 1398.
Williams, Colonel, 3405, 3454.

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Richmond, N.S.)
Agricultural Gazette, 1099, 1101, 1671.
Bear River
Public building, 1893.
Wharf, 2013.
Bishop, A., employment of, 3208.
Cameron, A. J., employment of, 2960.
Cheese weighing, 1678.
Civil Service Commission, 697.
Coasting privileges, 5196.
Commutation of death sentence, 3252.
Customs
Appointments, 473.
Estimates, 963.
Dismissals, 763, 770, 963, 1009, 1179, 1190, 1376.
Divorce, 4884.
Dredge George McKenzie, 1780.
Farmers Bank, 5285.
Fenian raid veterans, 445, 3383, 4367.
Fish and Fisheries
Act Amendment, 1797, 1820.
Bulletin, 2402, 5192.
Lobster culture, 2432.
Transportation, 382, 2937.
Government officials in politics, 435, 1178.
House of Commons
Loucks, H. H., employment of, 2439.
Messengers, 568.
Officials, 442.
Representation, 5324, 5344, 5359.
Hudson Bay terminals, 689.
Indians, Nova Scotia, 3208.
Intercolonial Railway
Estimates, 3180.
Mines Road station, 2377.
Judges' salaries, 1929, 3620, 3887.
Letter boxes, 353.
Life-saving rewards, 419.
Marine estimates, 762, 770, 1164, 2402, 2432.
Militia, 4605.
Militia, the Minister of, and Irish Home Rule, 1911, 3443.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2138.
O'Brien, A. H., superannuation of, 1946.
Old age pensions, 1333.
Ottawa
Building leases, 2439.
Public works, 1878.
Postal service, 5266.
Public buildings, 1878, 1893.
Richmond county works, 571, 5229.
Royal Canadian Regiment Band, 3111, 3210, 3440.
St. Esprit lightkeeper, 473, 1170.
St. Peter's canal, 1020, 2903, 2963, 2995, 4480-4481.
St. Peter's and Sydney Railway, 4090, 4295, 4369.
Senate and the Farmers Bank, 5285.
Shelburne fishery guardians, 2961.
Vincent, J. U., appointment of, 1410, 1427.

Labour
Employment bureaus, 1818, 3892.
Estimates of Department, 339, 523-566, 649-663, 5202.
Fair wages schedule, 357, 5202.
Hours on Public Works Bill. 1r., 4.
Immigration notices, 1617.
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 5206.
Unemployment, 4156-4160.
Circular from Trades and Labour Council, 5032.
Montreal, in, 3716.
Vancouver Island troubles, 345, 523, 572, 649, 699, 4664-4674.
Amendment proposed: Mr. Verville, 1267; div., 1327.
Prisoner's death, 699.

Labrador coast, jurisdiction on, 2954-2956.

Lachance, Mr. Arthur (Quebec Centre)
House of Commons representation, 5313.
Lortie, Mr., appointment of, 5029.
National Transcontinental Railway
Investigation, 2227.
Quebec terminals, 4846, 5096.
Privilege, 1784.
Quebec
Arsenal, 5028.
Harbourmaster, 5029.

Lachine canal, 2989.
Industries, 1913.
Works, 1782.

Lachine rapids dam, 2377, 2438.

Lafortune, Mr. David A. (Montcalm)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Highways improvement, 164, 167.
Naval defence, 168.
Financial conditions, 169.
Tariff, 171.
Transportation, 171.
Agriculture, aid to, 171.
Redistribution of representation, 173.
Manitoba schools, 175.
Agriculture, encouragement of, 1156.
Capital punishment, 4519.
Civil Service superannuation, 5373.
Des Prairies river dredging, 1733.
French translation, 5274.
House of Commons representation, 5319.
Inland Revenue officials, 1391, 1394.
Naval service, 334, 5169.
Postal service in Montcalm, 5256.
Public buildings in Montcalm, 5388.

La Have Islands mail service, 704.

Lake Erie buoy service, 2519.

Lalor, Mr. Frances R. (Haldimand)
Budget, 2826.
Tariff, 2827.
Free trade, 2829.

Lalor, Mr. Francis R.—Con.

Free food, 2831.
Free wheat, 2833.
Fenian raid veterans, 4341.
Fishery regulations, 1827.

Lamarche, Mr. Paul E. (Nicolet)
Explosives, regulation of, 3868.
Farmers Bank, 4798.
Georgian Bay canal, 1036, 1732.
Militia, 4616.

Lancaster, Mr. Edward A. (Lincoln and Niagara)
Alberta Central Railway Company, 1891.
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company, 764.
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, 765.
Calgary and Fernie Railway Company, 1667.
Canadian Northern Railway Company, 1760.
Central Ontario Railway, 1892.
Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 769.
Central Railway Company of Canada, 996.
Central Western Canada Railway Company, 767.
Erie, London and Tillsonburg Railway Company, 995.
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, 995.
Grand Trunk Railway Company, 767.
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company, 994.
Kettle Valley Railway Company, 1892.
Labrador, Quebec and Southern Railway Company, 2951.
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company, 767.
Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company, 1188.
London and Lake Erie Railway Company, 1891.
Manitoba and North Western Railway Company, 1891.
Norfolk and Elgin Railway Company, 1667.
Ottawa and Ungava Railway Company, 992.
Ottawa Northern and Western Railway Company, 764.
Pacific, Peace River and Athabaska Railway Company, 992.
Pacific, Trans-Canada and Hudson Bay Railway Company, 2948.
Peace River Tramway and Navigation Company, 995.
Prince Edward and Hastings Railway Company, 2949.
Rainy River Radial Railway Company, 2950.
Rio de Janeiro and San Paulo Telephone Company, 1892.
Saskatchewan Central Railway Company, 2956.

Lancaster, Mr. Edward A.—Con.

Thessalon and Northern Railway Company, 993.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 3200.

Lanctot, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Agricultural implement duties, 1582.
Banks and banking, 3894.
Budget, 2777.
Tariff, 2778.
Naval defence, 2780.
Highways Bill, 2781.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3988.
Farmers Bank, 723, 4774.
Judges Act Amendment, 841.
Judges' salaries, 1936, 3614.
Lachine bridge, 3111.
Laprairie
Protecting wall, 920, 2688, 3055, 3715.
Public buildings, 4712.
Naval service, 5174.
Pelletier, Hon. L. P., expenses of, 1117.

Land grants to railways, 1916, 5027.

Lands unpatented, taxation of, 1918.

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Kamouraska)
Agriculture, aid to, 358, 2956.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3970.
Dorchester County employees, 3638.
Giasson post office, 2177.
Intercolonial Railway
Ste. Louise improvements, 2013.
Train service, 4939.
Kamouraska postal service, 347.
National Transcontinental Railway, 569, 4853.
Ste. Perpetué station, 1913.
Naval service, 5165.
Ste. Anne
Experimental station, 360.
Wharf, 2078.
St. Perpetué food inspector, 359.
St. Roch des Aulnaies excise officer, 360.
Tremblay, A., employment of, 5194.

Lapointe, Mr. Louis A. (Montreal, St. James)
Judges' salaries, 1940.

Laprairie
Protecting wall, 920, 2688, 3055, 3715.
Public buildings, 4712.

Larry's river harbourmaster, 2961.

L'Assomption
Revenue from tobacco, 2958.
Wharf, 2263.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (East Quebec)
Address to H.R.H. the Governor General, 5276.
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Delay in meeting of Parliament, 12.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid.—Con.

Solicitor Generalship, 13.
National Transcontinental Railway, 14.
Highways improvement, 15.
Naval defence, 16.
Financial conditions, 18.
Cost of living, 21; proposed amendment, 22.
Asiatic trade, 5035.
British Columbia, claims of, 359.
Budget, 2841.
Resources of Canada, 2843.
Tariff, 2845.
Free wheat, 2846; proposed amendment, 2849.
Canadian Northern Railway, 1264, 3672, 4010, 4026, 4056, 4225-4282, 4298-4331, 4378, 4526-4528, 4631.
Capital planning commission, 5197.
Cavalry remounts, 2546, 2789.
Civil Service, competitive examinations for, 1370.
Colpitts, G. A., case of, 453.
Confederation, semi-centennial of, 1444.
Cost of living, 5377.
Customs officials, 401.
Deputy Speaker, office of, 1362, 1368.
Divorce, 840.
Divorce bills, procedure on, 4881.
Electoral corruption, 915.
Empress of Ireland investigation, 4553, 4716.
Falardeau case, 462.
Farmers Bank, 3524.
Freight rates, 944.
Georgian Bay canal, 1033.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway bond guarantee, 4834.
High Commissioner's office, 313, 5378.
House of Commons
Business of the House, 3198.
Debates, French translators of, 5271.
Morning sittings, 2788, 3210, 3319.
Representation, 843, 927, 5308, 5313.
Saturday sittings, 3784.
Immigration, Hindu, 4565.
Imperial Trade Commission, 929, 944.
International Purity Congress, 359.
Labour conditions on Vancouver Island, 1300.
Labrador coast, jurisdiction on, 2954.
Matches, white phosphorus, 1538.
Militia and religious processions, 5375.
Monk, Hon. F. D., death of, 3786.
Mounted police, 708, 4964.
National Transcontinental Railway
Completion, 4456.
Investigation, 2340.
Management, 5084.
Quebec terminals, 4839, 4969.
Naturalization, 4127, 4144, 4174, 4827.
Natural resources, provincial control of, 1077.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid.—Con.

Naval service, 328, 5146, 5160.
Navigable waters, pollution of, 1744.
Newfoundland shipping disaster, 2995.
Parliamentary procedure
Answers of length, 1062.
Privilege, basing on newspaper statements, 1119.
Returns, private papers in, 4959.
Supply, Committee of, without question put, 307, 512, 521.
Thursday sittings, Government precedence in, 696.
Petroleum, export of, 973, 3464.
Pig iron, drawback on, 3213.
Pollution of navigable waters, 1744.
Quebec Battlefields Commission, 3890, 4114.
Railway level crossings, 3957.
St. John Valley Railway bridges, 3959.
Safety of Life at Sea Convention, 792.
Senate Employees Bill, 4711.
Senate representation, 1483, 3515, 5280, 5297.
Shipping casualties investigations, 4553, 4716.
Strathcona, Lord, death of, 92.
Tariff, 4431.
Titles of honour, 481.
Transportation, 2978.
Trust companies, 1128, 2905.
Volunteer bounty, 1398.

Lauzon, postmaster, 5029.

Lavallée, Mr. J. O. (Bellechasse)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Agriculture, encouragement of, 8.
Reciprocity with the United States, 9.
Immigration, 10.

Law, Mr. Bowman B. (Yarmouth)
Arcadia rural mails, 701.
Bear River public building, 1894.
Canada, dredge, 811.
Cobequid, wreck of the, 358, 403, 1166.
Fenian raid veterans, 284, 1693, 1783, 3371.
Fish and fisheries
Bulletins, 2403.
Protection, 1798.
Transportation, 383.
Fruit inspection, 1675.
Government steamers, headquarters of, 403.
Gulnare, steamer, 668.
Lurcher, lightship, 368.
Marine supplies, purchase of, 1203.
Military works, expenditure on, 816.
Port Maitland and Lower Argyle post offices, 1913.
Privilege, 343.
Seed lobsters, 816, 2431.
Shelburne county works, 1330.

Law, Mr. Bowman B.—Con.

Submarine bell floats, 668.
West Indies trade, 962.
Yarmouth
Customs officers, 968.
Harbour, 1015, 2309.
Light, 1166.
Live stock purchases, 665, 2308.
North post office, 816.
Public buildings, need of, 1894, 1908.
Rural mail, 570.

Le Blanc, Seaman, 667, 815.

Lemieux, Hon. R., trips of, 698.

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Rouville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Trade conditions, 183.
Transportation, 185.
Civil Service reform, 186.
Redistribution of representation, 187.
Cost of living, 188, 190.
Unemployment, 189.
Financial conditions, 189.
United Shoe Machinery Company, 193.
Naval defence, 195.
By-elections, 199.
Advertising, fraudulent, 3466.
Agriculture
Disbursement of funds in Quebec, 1162.
Estimates, 1107, 1133, 1162, 1683.
Gazette, 1107.
Apple growing, 1133.
Archives, 720, 727, 740, 1769.
Armstrong, J. H., 2179.
Atlantic mail service, 94, 1645, 5030, 5063.
Baie St. Paul mails, 1819, 1914, 3059, 4368.
Bank failures, 3208, 3199, 3522.
Boy scouts, 4131.
Budget, 2574.
Fiscal policies, 2575.
Imperial conferences, 2578.
Cost of living, 2580.
Militia expenditures, 2582.
Tariff, 2585.
Naval defence, 2587.
Free trade, 2588.
Peace centenary, 2590.
Cable rates, 5246.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3991, 4015, 4325, 4525, 4526.
Canadian Pacific Railway office in Austria, 896.
Canals, 5109.
Cap aux Corbeaux wharf, 4293.
Cattle inspection, 759.
Cheese industry, 1683.
Civil Service, 4441, 4448, 4449..
Insurance, 1872.
Superannuation, 5372.
Coal royalties, 1809.
Cold storage, 1752.
Confederation, semi-centennial of, 1444, 4961.

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe.—Con.

Criminal Code revision, 3058.
Dentistry congress, 2957.
Dismissals
Faucher, E., painter, 1784.
Leslie, W. C., 369.
Divorce, 828, 1118.
Dry docks subsidies, 3962.
Dubé, Phileas, employment of, 2010.
Electoral corruption, 344.
Exhibitions, international, 359, 1684.
Explosives, regulation of, 3587, 3862.
Fabre, Madame Hector, case of, 4965.
Falardeau case, 455, 463, 699.
Farmers Bank, 3522, 4748.
Fatsari case, 464, 1911.
Fishing disaster—appeal for Government aid, 5195, 5182.
Franking privilege, 971.
French, official documents in, 401, 427, 4434.
Gaspé
Fishermen, loss of, 5181.
Public building, 4191.
Railway communication, 3181, 5121.
Georgian Bay canal, 352, 1020, 2965.
Giasson post office, 2688.
Hagersville postmaster, 2686.
Halifax lightship, 3057.
Heron Island dam, 2377, 2438.
High Commissioner's office, 352, 1766.
House of Commons
Debates, 1778.
French translation, 732, 5267, 5271.
Post office, 399.
Representation, 5321.
Voters' lists, 1774,5267.
Immigration, 4156, 4214.
Bulgarian and Russian, 4560.
French, 1630.
Oriental, 808, 1225.
United States, 697.
Indians
Caughnawaga
Hospital, 422.
Petition, 2394, 3481, 3533, 3537.
Liquor sold to, 3207.
Intercolonial Railway wireless system, 1782.
James Bay harbour, 1208.
Judges' salaries, 697, 1925, 1933.
Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, 1952.
Juvenile delinquents, 3517.
King's Printer, appointment of, 727, 737.
Lapointe, E., and Post Office Department, 900.
Lévis quarantine station, 1108.
Little River East breakwater, 354.
Lobster fishing, 344.
Lumley post office, 1818.
Magdalen Islands steamer service, 408, 757.
Mail bag locks, 473.

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe.—Con.

Marine
Estimates, 405-421, 753-762.
Tenders for supplies, 412.
Matches, white phosphorus, 1538.
Metric system, 1753.
Militia, 4588-4592.
Land purchase, 1025.
Processions, 5002.
Monk, Hon. F. D., death of, 3787.
Montreal
Carslake Hotel purchase, 1871, 2079, 2436, 2962, 3318, 4192.
Harbour
Berths, 2546.
Commission, 3869.
Postal station. *See* Carslake Hotel.
Unemployment in, 3716, 4156.
National Transcontinental Railway
Expropriation cases, 699.
Montreal connection, 816, 5127.
Quebec terminals, 4845, 4973.
St. Malo shops, 1535, 4845.
Train service, 1691, 2437.
Naturalization, 4176, 4533.
Naval service, 5152.
Navigation
Great Lakes, 349.
Schools of, 753.
Oka postmistress, 3460, 3505, 3532.
Ontario Equipment Company, 699.
Ottawa
Elevators in Government buildings, 4198.
Federal district, proposed, 1889.
Perley, Hon. G. H., trip to London of, 4631.
Petroleum, export of, 1759.
Pilotage, 3621.
Post office
Employees' salaries, 2379, 3222.
Estimates, 2364, 3639.
Mail bag locks, 354.
Money by mail, 3222.
Parcel post, 350, 5246.
Postage on English magazines, 2312, 3226.
Railway mail clerks, 2381, 5360.
Rural mail service, 376, 5245.
Savings banks, 5199.
Transatlantic mail service, 94, 1645, 5030, 5063.
Poulsen wireless, 2687.
Printing Bureau, 727-737.
Prison reform, 4518.
Privilege, 704.
Privy Council, Judicial Committee of, 1952.
Public buildings, 1882, 4191, 5213.
Quebec
Battlefields Commission, 720, 3891, 4117.
Bridge strike, 5030.
Harbour Commission, 3877.
Harbour plant, 2788, 3055, 3398.
Quarantine officials, 354.
Terminals, 4845, 4973.
Quebec and Saguenay Railway, 4557.

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe.—Con.

Quebec-Lévis mails, 2263.
Railway freight rates, 2687.
Royal Society of Canada, 350, 720, 5267.
Ste. Adelaide de Pabos breakwater, 5213.
Ste. Anne des Monts wharf, 2687.
St. Jerome wharf, 3113.
St. Lawrence route, accidents on, 3253.
St. Lawrence ship channel, 976.
Slack, W. F., dismissal of, 921.
Tadousac wharf, 2309.
Telescope for observatory, 344.
Tobacco culture, 5200.
Unemployment in Montreal, 3716, 4156.
Valcartier artillery camp, 924.
Vancouver Island labour troubles, 699.
Victoria Memorial Museum, 1882.
Vineberg, Helen, divorce bill, 4880.
Wireless telegraphy, 349, 5183.

Lennoxville experimental farm, 1534, 2015.

Le Present printing contracts, 1534.

Lespérance, Mr. David O. (Montmagny)
Naval service, 201.
Privilege, 126.

Lévis
Carrier machine shops, 1819, 2961.
Quarantine station, 1108, 1218.

Lévis county
Experimental farm, 369.
Rural mail.

Lewis, Mr. E. N. (West Huron)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Shipping disasters, 136.
Transportation, 137.
Banks and banking, 138.
Naval defence, 139.
Immigration, 139.

Liberator magazine, 3236.

Library of Parliament, 1780.

Little River East breakwater, 354.

Little Sands breakwater, 445, 1605.

Live stock
Industry, 3487, 3493, 3501.
Purchases, 470, 665, 2308.
Pure-bred, distribution of, 701.
See also Animals *and* Cattle Inspection.

Loan Companies Bill. 1r., 970. 2r., 1128. Com., 2913. 3r., 2963. Senate amdts., 4717.

Loan flotations, 5032, 5106.

Lobsters. *See* Fish.

Loggie, Mr. W. S. (Northumberland, N.B.)
Chain, tariff on, 3138.

Loggie, Mr. W. S.—Con.

Dressed stone, tariff on, 3119.
Fish
Commission, 2413.
Markets for, 2404.
Intercolonial Railway, branch lines, 4478, 4877, 5111.
Nails, tariff on, 3145, 4335.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2256.
Potatoes, tariff on, 3044, 3052 (amdt.)

Longhurst, G., payments to, 925.

Lortie, Mr., weights inspector, 5029.

Lotteries, 2911, 3467.

Lower Argyle post office, 1913.

Lumley post office, 1818.

Lunenburg
Breakwater, 3509.
Fishery guardians, 3715.
Mails, 2788.

Lurcher, lightship, 368.

Macdonald, Mr. Edward M. (Pictou)
Alert, steamer, 425, 474, 669.
Brantford public building, 874.
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, 796, 800.
Canadian Northern Railway, 1361, 3508, 3818, 3828 (amdt.), 3833, 4009, 4026, 4032, 4050, 4230-4291, 4307-4334, 4384, 4660.
Canadians at Bisley, 512, 1215.
Currie, R., witness, 1005, 1361, 1603.
Dismissals, 783.
Dredges, 5363.
Canada, 1218.
East River improvements, 811.
Falmouth dyke, 1780.
Fenian raid veterans, 440, 1022, 3365, 4344.
Ferrona-Sunny Brae Railway, 669.
Fisheries protection, 1820.
Granton rural mails, 2686.
Hants county electoral lists, 817.
Hantsport
Building, 1023.
Wharf, 4713.
Horse breeding, 3498.
House of Commons representation, 619, 848, 5307, 5324, 5356, 5359 (amdt.)
Hudson Bay terminals, 4878.
Ice-breaker, contract for, 2962.
Intercolonial Railway
Coal contracts, 438, 924, 1332, 1645, 1786, 2956, 3192.
Earnings, 2308.
Fire claims, 2959.
Management, 438, 3269, 3278.

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—Con.

New Glasgow and Sydney connections, 3192.
Oxford-Pictou line, 895, 3192.
Pictou bridge, 3193.
Provident fund, 572, 5362.
Refrigerator cars, 1604.
Repair shops, 2957.
Right of way, 3192.
Traffic agreement with Canadian Pacific Railway, 608.
Judges' salaries, 3615, 3888.
Labour conditions on Vancouver Island, 552, 1318.
Labrador coast line, 2953.
Labrador, Quebec and Southern Railway Company, 2922, 2953.
Lightkeepers, age limit, 1177.
Meadowville-Toney Mills mails, 1603.
Militia camp supplies, 2840.
Musquodoboit mails, 1817.
National Transcontinental Railway
Coaling plants, 2787.
Commission Act Amendment, 4856.
Investigation, 2268.
Naturalization, 2312, 4128, 4808.
Naval College, Halifax, 3254.
New Glasgow armoury, 702.
Newfoundland
Fishing disaster, 2916.
Steamship service, 2916.
Niobe crew, 1023.
Nova Scotia water lots, 1022.
Old age pensions, 1347.
Ottawa
Building leases, 2519.
Capital, as the, 1882, 1888.
Water supply, 1331.
Pictou
Bridge, 3193, 5363.
Mails, 572, 1699, 1819, 1913.
Post offices, 1022.
Public building, 809.
Rural mail, 924. 1023.
Pig iron, drawback on, 3212.
Preventive officers' reports, 1423.
Prince Edward Island winter service, 701.
Private Bill legislation, 993.
Pure-bred stock, 701.
Returns, alleged incomplete, 2364.
Royal Canadian Regimental Band, 3317.
Senate representation, 5303.
Skinner's Cove public works, 809.
Smelt fishing licenses, 2178.
Steel industry, 665, 1530.
Tatamagouche rural mails, 3208.
Technical education, 3054. 4888.
Thorburn railway communication, 701.
Transportation, 2985.
Vancouver leased buildings, 2957.
Vincent, J. U., appointment of, 1406.
Vineberg, Helen, diverce bill, 4670.
Weir's Mill fishway, 1820.
West Branch mail service, 924.

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—Con.

Windsor fish hatchery, 1535.
Young, Angus, customs officer, 669.

Macdonell, Mr. A. C. (Toronto South)
Privilege, 3160.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 3270, 3476.

Maclean, Mr. Alexander K. (Halifax)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Naval defence, 50.
Highways improvement, 52, 55.
Tariff, 53.
Senate reform, 54.
Election laws, 54.
Financial conditions, 56
Aldershot camp, 1435.
Annapolis county mails, 345.
Basic slag, 647.
Boar's Head fog alarm, 2787.
British Columbia claims, 559.
Budget, 2471, 2482.
Revenue and expenditure, 2482.
Trade, 2485.
Fenian raid bounties, 2487.
Election promises, 2489.
Agricultural implements, 2491.
Free wheat, 2492.
Tariff on food products, 2497.
Canadian Northern Railway, 345, 4025, 4333.
Canadian Pacific Railway labour award, 2961.
Canning public building, 1899, 4183.
Capital expenditure, 1914.
Civil Service, 4447.
Coke, tariff on, 3137.
Coldbrook postmaster, 1690.
Dismissals, 965, 1435.
East Jeddore dredging, 925.
Electoral corruption, 900.
Farmers Bank, 3520, 4693 (amdt.), 4703, 4902.
Fenian raid veterans, 446, 4342.
Fielding, P., employment of,
Fisheries
Advisory board, 348, 2413.
Salt fish shipments to Portugal, 889.
Government officials in politics, 434.
Government steamers
Maintenance and repairs, 405, 411.
Winter service, 3055.
Halifax
Armouries, 704.
County mails, 925.
Dennis building, 5031.
Fortifications, 345.
Militia contracts, 3714.
Post office, 345.
Harbourville light, 1434.
Hebb, L. J., expenses of, 2178.
High Commissioner's office, 313.

Maclean, Mr. A. K.—Con.

House of Commons, accommodation in, 4198.
Hudson Bay
Fisheries, 347.
Terminals, 346, 671, 4466.
Indians, Nova Scotia, 2840.
Intercolonial Railway
Block signals, 3318.
Dartmouth-Dean branch, 4860.
Land valuators, 345.
Suburban trains, 1062.
Kentville, tuberculous cattle at 4559.
La Have Islands mails, 704.
Longhurst, G., payments to, 925.
Lunenburg
Breakwaters, 3509.
Fishery guardians, 3715.
Mails, 2788.
Mortgage Corporation of Nova Scotia, 1416.
Naval service, 326, 346.
Navigation, schools of, 751.
North Shore mail service, 573.
Patronage system, 415.
Public buildings, 1906, 4196.
Senate representation, 1489.
Shelburne county fisheries, 349.
Steamship subsidies, 5041.
Tariff, 3042, 4335; proposed amendment, 4426.
Transatlantic mail service, 577, 5042, 5043.
West Indies
Flour trade, 885.
Steamship service, 439, 957.
Trade commissioner, 440, 882.

Maclean, Mr. William F. (South York, O.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Parcel post, 237.
Free wheat, 238, 297.
Railway conditions, 241.
Banks and banking, 243.
Cost of living, 245.
Naval defence, 247.
Immigration, 299.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3974, 4304, 4404, 4421.
Cigarettes, prohibition of, 1482.
Confederation, semi-centennial of, 1454.
Federal laws, enforcement of, 1482.
Freight rates, 1608. *See also* Ocean.
High Commissioner's office, 1768.
House of Commons representation, 856, 5310.
Intercolonial Railway-Canadian Pacific Railway traffic agreement, 602.
Ocean freight rates, 931, 945.
Ottawa as the Capital, 1883.
Pollution of navigable waters, 1746.
Senate, 1495, 5282, 5291, 5298.
Suburban train services, 1066.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 3274.

MacNutt, Mr. Thos. (Saltcoats)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech—free wheat, 285.
Agricultural implement duties, 1578.
Homestead entry, 4368.
Melville post office, 3111, 3398, 3638, 5240.
Wishart, A., sentence of, 4367.

McCoig, Mr. Archibald B. (West Kent, O.)
Budget, 2597.
Agricultural implements, 2597.
Tobacco culture, 2600.
Free wheat, 2602.
Cavalry remounts, 2602.
Railway subsidies, 2603.
Hydro-electric lines, 4716.
Tariff, 3142.
Tobacco culture, 1374, 2600.

McCraney, Mr. Geo. E. (Saskatoon)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech—free wheat, 279.
Agricultural implement duties, 1581.
Grain markets, 1661.
House of Commons representation, 5309.
Lands unpatented, 1918.
National monuments and land marks, 720.
Natural resources, provincial control of, 1084.
Naval service, 335.
Pollution of navigable waters, 1606.
Rosthern
Customs collector, 573.
Lands agent, 573.
Trade and Commerce bulletin, 474.
Volunteer bounty, 1400.

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Canadian Northern Railway, 3972.
Farmers Bank, 4925.
Freight rates, 953.
Militia, 3422.
National Transcontinental Railway, 4454.
Sherbrooke
Agriculture, 5027, 5201.
Automobiles, 5130, 5262.
Buildings leased, 3317, 3894.
Drill hall and post office, 2959, 3111, 3509, 4368.

McCurdy, Mr. F. B. (Shelburne and Queens)
Advertising, fraudulent, 4215.
Fast Atlantic service, 5046, 5057.
Fenian raid veterans, 4345.
Fish transportation, 389, 5069.
Hudson Bay Railway, 4467.
Judges' salaries, 3611.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2243.

McFadden, D. H., employment of, 663.

McKay, Mr. James (Prince Albert)
Advertising, fraudulent, 3472.
Dismissals, 1004.

McKay, Mr. James.—Con.
Dominion lands, 3351.
Forest reserves, 3557.
House of Commons representation, 5360.
Northern Territorial Railway Company, 2175.
University of Emmanuel College, 2398.

McKenzie, Mr. D. D. (North Cape Breton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Trade policies, 216.
Solicitor-Generalship, 219.
Highways improvement, 221.
Agriculture, aid to, 225.
Tariff, 226.
Transportation, 227.
Advertising, fraudulent, 3471.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4278, 4546.
Cap Rouge wharf, 5243.
Civil Service, 1874, 4441.
Dismissals, 1186.
Drill halls, 4183, 4204.
Duchemin, Mr., legal expenses of, 5238.
Excise officers, 1400.
Farmers Bank, 4706, 4790.
Fenian raid veterans, 1022, 1399, 3394, 4363.
Fish and fisheries
Bulletin, 5192.
Lobster regulations, 5188.
Overseers, 2405, 2416.
Pickled, inspection of, 4435.
Protection, 1798, 1820, 1829.
Fort Cumberland restoration, 1901.
Government Railways Claims Act, 2394.
Harbours, federal control of, 2392.
Hudson Bay Railway, 4468, 4474, 4879.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 1736.
Cape Breton improvements, 3195, 5122.
Dismissals, 5122.
Judges' salaries, 1931, 1944, 3609, 3889.
Legal expenses, 4160.
Matches, manufacture of, 1757.
Metric system, 1754.
Militia bands, 5011.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2292.
Naturalization, 4145, 4544, 4811.
North Sydney
Harbour commission, 1540, 1791.
Public buildings, 1907.
Pig iron industry, 3219.
Pilotage, 3630.
St. John Valley Railway bridges, 3882.
St. Peter's canal, 2963, 4481.
Shipping Act Amendment, 1788.
Sydney Mines public building, 1707.
Technical education, 5206.
Telegraph service in Victoria county, 1359, 4185, 5237.
Trust companies, 1129.
Victoria county steamship service, 5071.

McLean, Mr. Angus A. (Queens, P.E.I.)
Cold storage, 3563.
Confederation, semi-centennial of, 1451.
Fenian raid veterans, 3365, 4357.
Fish transportation, 385.
House of Commons representation, 859, 5359.
Judges' salaries, 3607.
Newfoundland, steamship service to, 2924.
Potatoes, tariff on, 3087.
Senate representation, 5285, 5299, 5306.
Shipping casualties, 4554.
Southport fish hatchery, 3112.
Stone, tariff on, 3128.

McLean, Mr. H. H. (Sunbury and Queens)
North Sydney Harbour Commission, 1793.
Shipping Act Amendment, 1787.

McLeod, Mr. Harry F. (York, N.B.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Prosperity of Canada, 5.
Redistribution of representation, 5.
Agriculture, encouragement of, 6.
Naval defence, 7.
Divorce, 4886.
St. John Valley Railway, 3022.
Southampton Railway Company, 1471.

McMillan, Mr. John A. (Glengarry)
Fenian raid veterans, 3373.

McPherson, C., postmaster, 2787.

McVeigh, H. B., homestead entry of, 2841.

Madoc bank failure, 3199.

Magdalen Islands mail service, 344.

Mail Bag Locks. *See* Post Office.

Mail Clerks. *See* Civil Service.

Maisonneuve postal station, 441.

Manitoba
School lands, 2786.
Schools, 367.

Map, Interior Department, error in, 2902.

Maple Leaf steamship line, 4294.

Marble, tariff on, 3115.

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Agriculture, 1676, 1683, 3487.
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway, 892.
Avignon post office, 818.
Baie des Chaleurs Railway, 358.
Black Cape post office, 703, 2178.
Bonaventure
Agriculture in, 1676.
Experimental farm, 357.
Indians, 2471, 2544, 3534, 3541.
Inland revenue officers, 1424.
Mails, 1692.

Marcil, Hon. Charles.—Con.
Public works, 892, 1360.
Budget, 2755.
Cost of living, 2756, 2764.
Development of Canada, 2757.
Transportation, 2758.
Intercolonial Railway branch lines, 2761.
Gaspé peninsula, 2765.
Good roads, 2767.
Fishing industry, 2769.
Butter, manufacture of, 3171.
Carleton Centre mails, 1818, 4021.
Dismissals, 1171, 1202, 4435.
Duthie Point lighthouse, 703.
Elections, resumé of, 2995.
Fenian raid veterans, 4344, 4370.
French
Official documents in, 732, 4434.
Translators, 1912.
Gaspé
Agriculture, 1677.
Petroleum deposit, 3465.
Steamer service, 1433, 2437, 2939, 3058.
Horseflesh abattoirs, alleged, 3487.
Intercolonial Railway
Appointments, 2956.
Branch lines, 353, 2761, 5120.
News service, 1266.
Station improvements, 2544.
Water service, 2544.
Jallet, N., widow of, 1066.
Judges' salaries, 3619.
Lotteries, 2911, 3467.
Manitoba schools, 367.
Militia and religious processions, 5375.
Navigation, schools of, 750.
New Richmond
Freght shed, 2437.
Lightkeeper, dismissal of, 2439.
Mails, 1692, 2178, 3058.
News service on Government railways, 1266.
Petroleum deposits, 3465.
Port Daniel lobster hatchery, 2519, 3318.
Printing Bureau, 732.
Quebec assistant weights and measures inspector, 3318.
Robitaille postmaster, 3058.
Ste. Anne de Restigouche dredging, 3112.
Saturnia, accident to, 3399.
Senate representation, 1497.
Shigawake rural mails, 1692.
Sorel shipyard, 986.
Tide Head salmon pound, 1692.

Marcile, Mr. Joseph E. (Bagot)
Acton Vale mails, 700.
Bagot county rural mails, 1694.

Margaree Harbour, 354.

Marine and Fisheries Estimates, 324, 402-421, 749-764, 967-991, 1164-1214, 2398-2434.

Marine hospitals, 1213.

Marion Bridge-Woodbine mails, 1116.

Maritime provinces mail service, 166, 202.

Marline twine duty, 344.

Marriage laws, 444

Martin, Mr. Mederic (Montreal, St. Marys)
Estimates, printing of, in French, 403.
Unemployment in Montreal, 4156.

Martin, Mr. William M. (Regina)
Judges' salaries, 3613.
Maple Leaf Steamship Line, 4294.
Naturalization, 4129.

Matches, White Phosphorus, Prohibition Bill. Res., 1536. 1r., 1539. 2r., 1756. Com., 1756., 1756. 3r., 1758.

Meadowville-Toney Mills mails, 1603.

Meat inspection, 2370. *See also* Food.

Megantic public building, 2960.

Meighen, Hon. Arthur (Solicitor General)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Free food, 152.
Highways Bill and the Senate, 152.
Agricultural implement duties, 1589.
Campbell, Glen, 1863.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3682, 4009-4019-4079, 4217-4292, 4297-4334, 4381, 4526-4529, 4546-4551, 4649.
Co-operative Credit Societies, 3637.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2085.
Privilege, question of, basing on newspaper statements, 1121.
Prudential Life of Canada, 2901.

Melville post office, 3111, 3398, 3638, 5240.

Menace newspaper. *See* Aurora Menace.

Menard, G., dismissal of, 2689.

Merchants and Employers Accident Guarantee Company Bill. 1r., 1870. 2r., 3512. Com., 3512. 3r., 3513.

Merchant Shipping Amendment Bill. 1r., 94. 2r., 743. Com., 1786. 3r., 1819. *See also* Canada Shipping.

Merner, Mr. J. J. (South Huron)
Farmers Bank, 4800.

Metcalfe drill hall, 667.

Metric system. *See* Weights and Measures.

Mica schist, tariff on, 3110.

Michaud, Mr. Pius. (Victoria, N.B.)
Edmundston
Immigration office, 704, 1619.
Public building, need of, 1898.
Fenian raid veterans, 440, 473, 1693.
Government officials in politics, 1841.
Grand Falls-St. John Railway, 365.
Imports from United States, 1117.
Intercolonial Railway private car, 1018.
National Transcontinental Railway, 2161, 4455.
New Brunswick schools, 955.
Quebec and Saguenay Railway, 4022.
St. John Valley Railway, 3020, 3881, 4023.
St. Leonards immigration agent, 569.
Tobique Indian reserve, 1218.

Middlebro, Mr. William S. (North Grey)
Debt of Canada, 1116.
Dry docks, 4093.
National Transcontinental Railway
Cost, 1536.
Investigation, 2036.

Militia
Armouries, 2786, 4576, 5007.
Automobiles, 813, 2081.
Bands in political demonstrations, 2178, 3111, 3210, 3317, 4340, 5002, 5010.
Boat contracts, 2591.
Camp areas, 5017.
Camp supplies, 2840.
Canteens, 2734.
Cavalry remounts, 2546, 2602, 2789.
Dorval camp, 1025.
Drill halls, 2786, 4576, 5007.
Employees in department, 813.
Estimates, 336, 2363, 2370, 3199, 3399-3452, 4567, 4999, 5269.
Amendment proposed: Mr. Proulx, 5270.
Expenditures, 2309.
Honorary colonels, 1605.
Minister of, and Sir Ian Hamilton, 441.
Minister of, and Ulster, 1903.
Minister of, in Europe, 444.
Motor boats, 705.
Officer commanding 6th division, 1783.
Pembroke Lumber Company, claim of, 5022.
Petawawa Camp, detective service, 815.
Poster, 1536, 1607, 2082.
Private car repairs, 813.
Queenston Heights picnic, 441.
Religious processions, Militia in, 2178, 5002, 5375.
Rifle ranges, 5008.
Sham battles, 814.
Special train, 814.
Works, expenditure on, 816.

Mines Department estimates, 1801.

Molloy, Mr. John P. (Provencher)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech—free wheat, 283.

Molloy, Mr. John P.—Con.

Canham, J. E., land agent, 1867.
McFadden, Dr. D. H., 663.
Members of provincial legislature, employment of, 3510.
Morris, public building for, need of, 4199.

Mondou, Mr. A. A. (Yamaska)

Intercolonial Railway branch lines, 1739.

Money Lenders Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 201.

Monk, Hon. F. D.
Death of, 3785.
Resignation of, 1264.

Montcalm, revenue from tobacco in, 2958.

Montcalm, steamer, 666.

Montreal
Carslake hotel purchase, 1871, 2079, 2436, 2962, 3318, 4023, 4192.
Circuit court judges, 697.
Colonization Society, 472.
Harbour
Master, 4022, 5188.
Steamer berths, 2546.
Public Works
Resident engineer, 1117, 2439, 5241.
Staff, 1435.

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Bills
Loan. Res., 3631. 1r., 3636. 2r., 3869. Com., 3869. 3r., 3876.
Taxes, exemption from. 1r., 4523. 2r. and Com., 4830. 3r., 4831. Senate amdts. 5361.

Morphy, Mr. H. B. (North Perth)
Budget, 2770.
Cost of living, 2771.
Wheat production, 2776.
Technical education, 2777.
Butter, manufacture of, 3168.
Experimental farms, 1154.
Farmers Bank, 4703, 4718.
Fenian raid veterans, 3370.
Judges' salaries, 3612.
Naturalization, 4175-4815.
Newfoundland, trade with, 2934.
Pacific, Trans-Canada and Hudson Bay Railway Company, 2921.
Rural mail boxes, 5134.
Tye, W. P., gratuity to widow of, 3634.
Vancouver Island labour troubles, 1270.

Morrisburg mails, 1692.

Morris, Mr. James (Chateauguay)
Budget, 2684.
Naval service, 5175.
St. Lawrence river dams, 3317.
Valleyfield excise, 2958.

Morrison, Colonel, expenses of, 1915.

Moulin Dubois post office, 1019.

Mounted police, 310, 708, 1119

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Canadian Northern Railway, 3253, 4013, 4280.
Civil Service, 666.
Civil Service superannuation, 1691.
Cost of Living Commission, 356.
External Affairs, Department of, 355.
French river improvements, 1604, 2081.
Governor General's warrants, 2370.
Halifax terminals, 1332.
High Commissioner's office, 314.
House of Commons representation, 5311.
Hudson Bay Railway, 924.
Intercolonial Railway grade reduction, 668.
Metcalfe drill hall, 667.
National Art Gallery, 811.
National Transcontinental Railway
Contracts, 1115.
Drawbacks on, 1330.
Investigating Commission, 1782.
Naval service, 332.
New Westminster postmastership, 355.
Ottawa
Custom House, 811.
Drill hall, 667.
Property purchases, 666.
Rifle range, 668.
Water supply, 1744.
Peat experiments, 1806.
Port Arthur elevator, 809.
Post Office—temporary appointments, 3239.
Prescott shipyard, 426.
Printing Bureau estimates, 724-740.
Privilege, 257.
Safety at Sea Convention, 358.
Secretary of State's estimates, 724.
Technical education, 355.
Trust companies, 1128, 1130.
Welland Canal, 925.

Murray Bay winter service, 1915.

Nails, tariff on, 3145.

Nantel, Hon. Wilfrid B. (Minister of Inland Revenue)
Adulteration Act Amendment, 1433, 2388, 3362.
Dismissals, 1377-1394, 1401-1406, 1424.
Excise, 1370, 1417, 5266.
Inland Revenue estimates, 339, 1370-1395, 1400-1432, 2364, 5266.
Scales, regulation of, 1419.
Tobacco, stamps for, 1373, 1418.
Vincent, J. U., appointment of, 340, 1406, 1427.
Weights and Measures Act Amendment, 1359, 1753.

Napadogan military camp, 5017.

National Art Gallery, 811.

National Battlefields at Quebec Bill. 1r., 3636. 2r., 3890. Com., 3890, 4112. 3r., 4119.

National Transcontinental Railway, 14, 29, 115.
Coaling plants, 2787, 3113.
Contracts, 1115.
Drawbacks on, 1329.
Cost, 1536.
Deficit, 1780.
Eastern division
Construction, 4877.
Expenditure, 1018.
Operation, 5033.
Rates, 569.
Estimates, 2371, 4453-4462, 5106.
Expropriation cases, 699.
Grade changes, 921.
Investigating Commission, 1328, 1782, 1915, 1970.
Expenses of, 895.
Report of, 879.
Land purchases, 1781.
Little Mistongo river bridge, 573.
Management, 5072.
Amendment proposed: Mr. Pugsley, 5072.
Ministerial statement, 1964, 1982, 2021, 2085, 2132, 2155, 2180, 2218, 2264, 2312.
Amendment proposed: Mr. Graham, 2036; div., 2363.
Montreal connection, 816, 5127.
Payments to contractors, 1781.
Quebec terminals, 1913, 2177, 4839-4857, 4968, 5085-5106.
St. Malo
Shops, 360, 701, 1535, 1817.
Tunnel, 891.
Ste. Perpetué station, 1913.
Shops, estimate of, 1018.
Sillery lands, 1534.
Stations, contracts for, 1604.
Train service, 1691, 2437.
Transcona shops, 360, 664.

National Transcontinental Railway Bills
Extension of time. 1r., 201. 2r., and 3r., 749.
Operation. 1r., 4711. 2r., 4838. Com., 4838. 3r., 4894.
See also Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Naturalization, British Nationality, Bill. 1r., 3249. 2r., 4119, 4133. Com., 4142, 4173, 4529, 4807. 3r., 4823, 4830. *See also* 1763, 2312.

Natural resources, provincial control of, 1067, 1084.

Naval Affairs
College at Halifax, 329, 3208, 3254.
Defence, 7, 16, 25, 46, 50, 61, 79, 89, 98, 99, 111, 120, 127, 139, 145, 177, 247.
Enlistment, 346.

Naval Affairs.—Con.
Naval Service Act Repeal Bill. 1r., 201.
Naval Volunteers, 1914.
Regulations, 976.

Naval service, department of, 5146.
Estimates, 326-336.

Navigable waters
Pollution of. *See that title.*
Protection of, Bill. 1r., 343.

Navigation
Great Lakes, on, 349.
Schools of, 749.

Neely, Mr. D. B. (Humboldt)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Highways improvement, 259.
Free wheat, 260; proposed amdt, 267.
Agricultural implements
Duties on, 1570.
Industry, 572.
Budget, 2718.
Taxation, 2720.
Free wheat, 2723.
Agricultural implements, 2727.
Steel industry, 2729.
Freight rates, 2730.
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, 803.
Campbell, Glen, complaint against, 621, 1853.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4000, 4071.
Central Western Canada Railway Company, 768, 806.
Dismissals, 1003, 1200.
Dominion lands, 3355.
Dominion lands agent, removal of, 1851.
Elevators, terminal, 1216.
Express franking privilege, 1018.
Freight rates, 937.
Government officials in politics, 621, 1200, 1853.
Grain
Bill, 3577.
Inspection, 1117.
Sample markets, 2787.
Homestead entries, 570.
Humboldt homestead inspector, 569.
Intercolonial Railway: Smith, R. H., employment of, 1690.
Labour conditions on Vancouver Island, 561.
Labour Department, employees of, 660.
Manitoba school lands, 2786.
Militia, 337, 3444.
Naturalization, 4173.
Natural resources, provincial control of, 1087.
Public buildings in Saskatchewan, need of, 4200.
School lands, 3638.
Volunteer bounty, 1399.

Neely, Mr. D. B.—Con.

Watrous postmaster, 3715.
Windsor immigration office, 5028.

Nesbitt, Mr. Edward W. (North Oxford)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Naval defence, 127.
Highways improvement, 129.
Financial conditions, 129.
Tariff, 131.
Cost of living, 132.
Free wheat, 133.
Transportation, 135.
Agricultural estimates, 1104, 1142, 1674.
Agricultural implements, tariff on, 3140.
Armouries, 1890.
Brantford public building, 817, 871, 5218.
Budget, 2789.
Expenditures, 2790.
Tariff, 2792.
Agricultural implements, 2795.
Free wheat, 2796.
Transportation, 2799.
Butter manufacture, 2387, 3163.
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, 799.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3833, 4327, 4411.
Cow testing, 1674.
Farmers Bank, 4786.
Immigration, 1635.
King's Printer, appointment of, 738.
Loan companies, 4717.
McClary Manufacturing Company, 1216.
Mail delivery, 2014.
Militia, 3449.
Peat experiments, 1804.
Railway mail clerks, 2384.
Rural mails, 5132.
Tariff, 3105, 3149.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 3476.
Trust companies, 1127.

Newfoundland
Shipping disaster, 2517, 2995.
Trade with, 2916, 2923.

New Glasgow
Armoury, 702.
Intercolonial Railway
Surveys, 3193.
Train service, 895.

New Harbour breakwater, 365, 2787.

Newmarket canal, 4368.

Newport customs employees, 890, 1021, 1332.

New Richmond
Freight shed, 2437.
Lightkeeper, dismissal of, 2439.
Rural mails, 1692, 2178, 3058.

Newspapers
Advertising, 1781, 2438.
Postage rates, 2312, 3225.
Tariff on, 3107.

New Westminster postmastership, 355.

Niagara Falls mails, 2014.

Nickle, Mr. William F. (Kingston)
Canadian Northern Railway, 3696.
Capital punishment, 496.
Farmers Bank, 3528.
Kingston penitentiary, 4504-4512, 4513.
Prudential Life of Canada, 2898, 3478.

Nicholson, Mr. Donald (Queens, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Cost of living, 121.
Reciprocity, 122.
Redistribution of representation, 123.

Niobe crew, 1023.

North Riverside postmaster, 2686, 3209, 3509, 4022.

Northrup, Mr. William B. (East Hastings)
Divorce reform, 821, 4884.

North Shore-Hubbard's mail service, 573.

North Sydney Harbour Commissioners Bill.
Res., 1539. 1r., 1540. 2r., 1791. Com., 1791. 3r., 1820.

Northwest Mounted Police, 2544.

Norton Creek, deepening of, 5028.

Nova Scotia
Coal, Ontario market for, 365.
Immigration agents, 1691.
Water lots, 1022.

O'Brien, A. H., superannuation of, 1945.

Ocean freight rates, 931, 2927. *See also* Freight Rates.

Officials in politics. *See* Government officials.

Oil, export of. *See* Petroleum.

Oka postmistress, 3460, 3505, 3532.

Old age pensions, 1333.

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Agriculture, 81, 84.
Transportation, 85.
Labour conditions, 83.
Cost of living, 87.
Banks and banking, 88.
Naval defence, 89.
Free wheat, 267.

Oliver, Hon. Frank.—Con.

Advertising, fraudulent, 3469.
Agricultural implement duties, 1595
Asiatic trade, 888, 5037.
Athabasca Landing-Fort McMurray telegraph, 354.
Atlantic mail service, 5065.
Atlin Railway Company, 2397.
Bad Throat river water powers, 1913.
Binder twine, 1609.
Butter, manufacture of, 3162.
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, 800.
Canada Temperance Act, 1761, 3590.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3319, 3773, 4083, 4233-4290, 4299-4334, 4415 (amdt), 4545, 4548, 4550.
Capital punishment, 508.
Caterpillar pest, 1132.
Central Western Canada Railway Company, 768, 805.
Cigarettes, prohibition of, 1481.
Civil Service insurance, 1871.
Coal for dredges, 2078.
Cold storage, 3562, 4172.
Conservation Commission, 719.
Customs officials, 423.
Dismissals, 370, 1182, 1644.
Dominion lands, 3326, 3511, 4821, 4889.
  Orders in council, 4714.
Dunvegan telegraph, 816.
Edmonton and Fort George mail service, 891.
Edmonton drill hall, 354.
Edson-Grand Prairie mails, 369.
Exhibitions, 1685.
Fenian raid veterans, 571, 4340.
Fletcher, J., employment of, 351.
Forest reserves, 3512, 3554, 4151.
Freight rates, 938, 947, 2196, 2980.
Gimli land patent, 1359.
Government officials in politics, 626, 706, 741, 1865.
Grain
  Bill, 3161, 3575.
  Elevators, 1646-1666.
Grand Rapids water lease, 1361.
High Commissioner's office, 312.
Hog cholera, 3174.
House of Commons distribution office, 1775.
Hudson Bay terminals, 680, 1209.
Immigration, 1613, 4155.
  Asiatic, 350, 1220, 5213.
  Deportations, 891, 1613, 1640.
  European, 572, 1642, 4159.
  Hindu, 4022, 4130, 4214, 4295, 4369, 4524, 4556, 4562, 4717, 4954.
  Regulations, 350, 351, 4155.
  Statistics, 351.
  Unemployed, 4157, 5211.
  United States, 1616, 1640.
Indians
  British Columbia reserves, 5209.
  Kitsilano reserve, 350, 664, 922.
  Schools, 2397, 3481, 3532.
Irrigation, 3485, 3601.
Kamloops
  Drill hall, 1331.
  Public building, 1021.
Karluk, steamer, 811, 2264.
Land patents, 3113.
Lands unpatented, taxation of, 1921.
Lesser Slave Lake, dredging in, 5236.
Metric system, 1754.
Militia, 5006.
Mounted police, 710, 4964.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2189.
Naturalization, 4130, 4144, 4808.
Natural resources, provincial control of, 1091.
Naval service, 329-336.
Navigable waters, pollution of, 1746.
Pacific, Trans-Canada and Hudson Bay Railway Company, 2949.
Parks, Dominion, 4154.
Patents, renewal of, 1668, 2918.
Petroleum, export of, 972, 1759, 3463.
Pollution of navigable waters, 1746.
Post Office
  Britain to Canada rates, 3232.
  Western service, 3633.
Prince Edward and Hastings Railway Company, 2921.
Public Works estimates, 4201, 5235.
Railway bridges and highway traffic, 3886.
Railway charters, 2950, 2953.
Railway from British Columbia to Alaska, 1870.
Railway level crossings, 3958.
Rainy River Radial Railway Company, 2950.
Rebellion claims, 4967.
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 354, 475, 571, 891.
San Francisco exhibition, 1685.
Seeds Inspection Bill, 4169.
Senate representation, 1492, 5293.
Steffansson expedition, 352.
Tariff, 3038, 3128, 4338, 5363.
Tar sand deposits, 1810.
Telegraph lines, 5242.
Transportation, 2980.
W. C. Edwards Company, 3475.
Western freight rates, 1914.
White Water lake, 1331.
Yukon Placer Mining Act, 3967.

Ontario Equipment Company, 699.

Ontario Fire Insurance Company, 4295, 4713.

Orange Lodges and the French language, 2081.

Ores, treatment of, 1803.

Oriental industrial competition, 4558.

Ottawa
Building leases, 2439, 2519, 2544.
Capital, as the, 1882-1889.
Capital Planning Commission, 2373, 5196.
Coal contracts, 4206.
Custom House, 811, 2079.
Drill hall, 667.
Fire alarm system, 1332.
Improvement Commission, 697.
Property purchases, 666.
Public buildings, 1533, 1875-1890, 4197, 4205.
Rifle range, 668.
Water supply, 314, 1331, 1744, 1882, 4206.

Ottawa river lightkeepers, 574.

Owen Sound mails, 2014.

Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T. (Megantic)
Canadian Northern Railway, 3979.
Dismissals, 1390.

Pacific defence forces, 1751.

Panama canal, 2915.
Effect on Canadian rates, 3509.

Papineau, Mr. Louis J. (Beauharnois)
Valleyfield dredging, 2992.

Paquet, Mr. Eugene (L'Islet)
Agriculture, 1143.
Immigration, 1437, 1639.
Postal service, 3853.

Paradis, L., fumigation station inspector, 2840.

Parcel post, 215, 257, 350, 1360, 5246.
Franking privilege, 621.

Pardee, Mr. Frederick F. (West Lambton)
Brantford public building, 877.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3953, 4036, 4068.
Drill halls, 1890.
Farmers Bank, 4917.
Ferguson, G. H., appointment of, 1915.
Grain Commission, 2376.
Lake Erie buoy service, 2519.
Militia, 702, 2309, 3428.
Minister of Militia and Ulster, 1902.
Newmarket canal, 4368.
Parcel post, 1360.
Petroleum, export of, 3465.
Tariff, 3115.
Toronto harbour, 812.
Trade Commissioners, 886.

Parent, engineer, dismissal of, 5241.

Paris Government office, 4965.

Parliamentary documents, distribution of, 1775.

Parliamentary procedure
See also Speaker.
Answers to questions, lengthy, 1061.
Divorce Bills—printing of evidence in French, 4880.
Estimates not printed in French, consideration of, 403.
Ex-members, statements affecting, as questions of privilege, 1119-1125.
Improper motives, imputation of, to Government, 2009.
Privilege, questions of, 343, 705, 1119, 2016, 2083, 3455.
Question ruled out as improper and frivolous; appeal, 2017; div., 2019.
Questions without notice, 285, 475, 477, 511.
Reply, right of, on adjournment motion, 519.
Senate amendments
Amendment of, 5034.
Discussion of, 4893.
Shipping Bill not preceded by resolution, 743.
Supply, Committee of, without question put, 306, 512, 707.
Supply resolutions, concurrence in *en bloc*, 2376.
Thursdays, Government business on, 696.

Parliamentary representation. *See* House of Commons *and* Senate.

Patents
Office, 5200.
Record, 1098.
Renewal of, 1668, 2918, 2948, 3205.

Payne, Steven, employment of, 1605.

Peace Centenary. *See* Canadian Peace Centenary Association.

Peat, experiments with, 1804.

Pedley, F., case of, 817.

Pelagic sealing claims, 2372.

Pelee Island steamer subsidy, 5039.

Pelletier, Hon. L. P., expenses of, 1117.

Pelletier, Hon. Louis P. (Postmaster General)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Dismissals, 203.
Redistribution of representation, 203.
Transportation, 206, 209.
United Shoe Machinery Company, 207.
By-elections, 209.
Free food, 212.
Naval defence, 213.
Parcel post, 215.
Atlantic mail service, 94, 5056.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4634.
Civil Service appointments, 1164.
Divorce bills, 4882.

Pelletier, Hon. Louis P.—Con.

Empress of Ireland, loss of, 4556.
Exhibitions, 1685.
Farmers Bank, 4741.
Georgian Bay canal, 2966.
High Commissioner's office, 1767.
House of Commons
French translation, 733, 736, 1779.
Post office, 399.
Representation, 854, 5315.
Intercolonial Railway—Rivière du Loup facilities, 4970.
Lafontaine, Mr., Canada's exhibition representative, 1685.
Lemieux, Hon. R., Asiatic trip of, 705.
Lévis quarantine station, 1108.
Monk, Hon. F. D., death of, 3786.
National Transcontinental Railway, 4462.
Quebec terminals, 4845, 4852, 4974.
Naval service, 432, 5161.
Oka postmistress, 3505.
Pilotage, 3629.
Post Office Act Amendment, 2380, 3222, 5033, 5071, 5360.
Post Office
Automobiles, 5130, 5146, 5262, 5361.
British magazines, postage on, 3227.
Eastern Townships, dismissals in, 3640, 5261.
Employees and salaries, 341, 2378, 3220.
Estimates, 341, 2364, 3572, 3632, 3638, 3843, 5129, 5249.
Franking privilege, 971, 3223.
Indecent publications, 3236.
Letter carriers on electric railways, 3217.
Letters, registration of, 3222.
Newspapers, rates on, 3234, 3244, 5033, 5071.
Parcel post, 215, 5250.
Railway mail clerks, 2380, 3239, 3572, 5360.
Returns, alleged incomplete, 3632, 5145.
Rural mail
Boxes, 5133.
Service, 2364, 3852, 5249, 5361.
Quebec
Battlefields Commission, 4113.
Quarantine station, 1108.
Returns, alleged incomplete, 2364.
Senate representation, 5299.
Transatlantic mail service, 589, 1645.
Truro post office, 1909.
Vincent, J. U., appointment of, 1429.
Voters' lists, 2373.

Pembroke armoury, 5193.

Penitentiary investigation. *See* **Kingston.**

Perley, Hon. G. H., trip to London of, 4631.

Perley, Hon. Geo. H. (Argenteuil)
Finance Department estimates, 722.
Loan companies, 970.

Perley, Hon. G. H.—Con.

Ottawa Improvement Commission, 1889.
Trust companies, 793.
Union Life Insurance Company, 723, 926.

Petroleum, export of. *See* Export Act Amendment Bill.

Pickled Fish. *See* Fish.

Pictou
Bank, 1696.
Mail carrier, 572.
Mail contracts, 1690, 1819, 1913.
Post offices, 1022.
Public building, 809.
Rural mail, 924, 1023.

Pig iron drawback. *See* Customs Act Amendment Bill.

Pilotage
Agent, 1219.
Montreal, 1117.
St. Lawrence river, 815, 984, 3621.
See Canada Shipping Act Amendment Bill.

Pilots, superintendents of, 666.

Pioneer settlers, Lord Selkirk's, 3207.

Plainfield post office, 2016.

Plantaganet rural mails, 2840.

Point Fortune wharf, 3398.

Political partisanship, investigations into, 2262, 2308.

Pollution of Navigable Waters Bill. 1r., 4. 2r., 1750. Ref. to Select Com., 1751. *See also* 1740, 1910, 2013.

Port Arthur government elevator, 809.

Port Colborne elevator, 2990.

Port Daniel lobster hatchery, 2519, 3318.

Port Hood public wharf, 355.

Port Maitland post office, 1913.

Portneuf
Lightkeeper, 1219, 3510.
County post offices, 1690.

Post Office Act Amendment Bill. Res., 2380. 1r., 2384. 2r., 3173. Com., 3222. 3r., 3249. Senate amendments, 5033, 5071, 5360, 5376.

Post Office
Automobiles, 3113, 5130, 5262.
Country post offices and libraries, 892.
English magazines, postage on, 2312.

Post Office.—Con.

Employees' Salaries. *See* Civil Service Act Amendment Bill.
Estimates, 341, 2364, 3571, 3632, 3638, 3840, 5129.
Letter carriers on electric cars, 3247.
Mail bag locks, 354, 473, 701.
Mail boxes, 2364.
Mail contracts cancelled, 703.
Rural mail service. *See that title.*
Salaries. *See* Civil Service Act Amendment Bill.
Savings banks interest, 5199.
Transatlantic mail service. *See that title.*

Potato embargo by United States, 744.

Potatoes, tariff on, 3044, 3059.

Poulsen wireless, 2687, 5246, 5249.

Power, Mr. William (West Quebec)
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2248.

Prescott county mails, 2962.

Press Conference, Imperial, 4961.

Prince Edward Island
Banks, 1781, 2543.
Freight rates, 308, 926, 1018.
Railway, 4483.
Representation, 123, 707, 849, 853, 859, 863, 5285, 5299, 5306, 5359.
Transportation, 399.
Winter service, 701, 757.

Printing and Stationery Department estimates, 724, 1774.

Printing Bureau building, 4370.

Prison reform, 4511, 4522.

Prisons and Reformatories Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 3397. 2r., 3466. Com., 3466. 3r., 3466.

Private Bill legislation, responsibility for, 994.

Private Bills discussed
Acadia Loan Corporation, 1416.
Alberta Central Railway Company, 1891.
Arnoldi, J., Patent of, 2948.
Atlin Railway Company, 2397.
Auto Wheels, Limited, patent of, 1668.
Barcelona Light and Power Company, 1911, 1981.
Boy Scouts Association, 4131. *See also* 5002.
Brazilian Light and Power Company, 1982.
British American Nickel Corporation, 1982.

Private Bills.—Con.

British Trust Company, 1416.
Burrard Tunnel and Bridge Company, 764.
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, 765, 795, 992.
Calgary and Fernie Railway Company, 1667.
Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company 4470.
Canadian Northern Railway Company, 1760, 4470, 4670.
Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 769.
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association, 4474.
Central Ontario Railway, 1892.
Central Railway Company of Canada, 996.
Central Western Canada Railway Company, 767, 804.
Continental Fire Insurance Company of Canada, 1666.
Erie, London and Tillsonburg Railway Company, 995.
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, 994.
Farnham and Granby Railway Company, 3505.
Fredericton and Grand Lake Coal and Railway Company, 3205.
Goldschmidt, R., patent of, 2918, 3205.
Grand Trunk and Canada Atlantic Railway Companies, 2922.
Grand Trunk Railway Company, 767.
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company, 994.
Kettle Valley Railway Company, 1892.
Labrador, Quebec and Southern Railway Company, 2922, 2951, 4473.
Lachine, Jacques Cartier, and Maisonneuve Railway Company, 767.
Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company, 1188.
London and Lake Erie Railway Company, 1891.
London and Port Stanley Railway Company, 1416.
McClary Manufacturing Company, 1216.
Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company, 1891.
Mortgage Corporation of Nova Scotia, 1416.
National Council of Women of Canada, 2948.
National Wood Distilling Company, patent of, 1668.
Norfolk and Elgin Railway Company, 1667.
Northern Territorial Railway Company, 2175.
North Shore Power, Railway, and Navigation Company, 4471.
Ottawa and Ungava Railway Company, 992.
Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company, 764.
Pacific, Peace River and Athabaska Railway Company, 992.

Private Bills—Con.

Pacific, Trans-Canada and Hudson Bay Railway Company, 2921, 2948.
Peace River Tramway and Navigation Company, 995.
Prince Edward and Hastings Railway Company, 2921, 2949.
Prudential Life of Canada, 2899, 3478, 3506.
Queen's University, 770.
Rainy River Radial Railway Company, 2950.
Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo Telephone Company, 1892.
Saskatchewan Central Railway Company, 2956.
Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Railway Company, 3827.
Les Soeurs de la Charité de l'Hopital Saint Antoine de Le Pas, 1669.
Sterling Trusts Corporation, 1417.
Thessalon and Northern Railway Company, 993.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 3199, 3270, 3476.
University of Emmanuel College, 2397.
Vineberg, Helen, divorce bill, 4670, 4880.
W. C. Edwards Company, 3474.
Western Dominion Railway Company, 3473.
West Ontario Pacific Railway Company, 769.
Willson, T. L., patent of, 2918.

Privilege, questions of
Aikins, Mr., 3892.
Armstrong, Mr. J. A. M., 3114.
Best, Mr., 3114.
Burnham, Mr., 3058.
Chisholm, Mr. W., 2085, 5955.
Crothers, Mr., 707.
Devlin, Mr., 1119.
Fisher, Mr., 3113.
Hughes, Mr. Sam., 2083.
Knowles, Mr., 3454.
Lachance, Mr., 1784.
Law, Mr., 343.
Lemieux, Mr., 704.
Lesperance, Mr., 126.
Macdonald, Mr., 3160.
Murphy, Mr., 257.
Pardee, Mr., 2084.
Rhodes, Mr., 3114.
Smith, Mr., 3114.
Sutherland, Mr., 3114.
Turriff, Mr., 2546.
Walker, Mr., 3114.
Wilson, Mr. C. A., 2016.

Privy Council, Judicial Committee of, appointment of Law Lords to, 1952.

Proportional Representation, 613, 619, 848, 856, 5285.

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)
Canadian Northern Railway, 4053.
Capital punishment, 505.

Proulx, Mr. Edmond.—Con.

Carson, Sir Edward, alleged cablegram to, 2082, 2178.
Civil Service, 4446.
Farmers Bank, 4800.
French translators, 5274.
Hay contracts, 1020.
Healey, Mr., dismissal of, 5270.
Judges' salaries, 1939, 3881.
Marriage laws, 444.
Menace newspaper, 3056.
Militia
Automobiles, 813, 2081.
Canteens, 2437.
Employees, 813.
Estimates, 3415, 3419, 5269 (amdt).
Gift of horse, 814.
Private car repairs, 813.
Sham battle, 814.
Special train, 814.
Minister of Militia in Europe, 444.
Ministers' travelling expenses, 610.
Montreal Colonization Society, 472.
O'Brien, A. H., superannuation of, 1952.
Plantaganet rural mails, 2840.
Potts, A., payments to, 369.
Prescott county mails, 2962.
Printing and advertising, Government, 729.
Public buildings, rentals of, 1906.
Queenston Heights picnic, 441.
Royal Military College, 3207.
St. Antoine de Le Pas Sisters of Charity, 1669.
Selkirk's, Lord, pioneer settlers, 3207.
Senate representation, 5298.
Vancouver drill hall, 362, 892, 1021, 1117.
Vancouver Orange Lodge, Irish Home Rule resolution of, 2785.

Provincial members, employment of, 3510.

Prudential Life of Canada, 2898. *See also* Private Bills discussed.

Public Works Estimates
Buildings, 1533, 1875, 1893, 5218, 5231.
Dredging, 5224, 5236.
Harbours and rivers, 5214, 5231, 5233.
Salaries, etc., 342.
Slides and booms, 5231.
Telegraph lines, 2375, 5234-5245.

Pugsley, Hon. William (St. John city)
Asiatic trade, development of, 5036.
Atlantic mail service, 5050.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4028, 4042, 4058, 4216-4274, 4297-4331, 4391, 4639.
Civil Service superannuation, 5370.
Cost of living, 5376.
Dry docks subsidies, 4090.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, 4835.
Hampton public building site, 4189.
House of Commons representation, 5306.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 5112.
Estimates, 4864.

Pugsley, Hon. Wm.—Con.

Ocean Limited, 4630, 4888.
Militia, 5019.
National Transcontinental Railway, 4457, 4459, 4461, 4854, 5033, 5072 (amdt.), 5090.
Naturalization, 4823.
Pelee Island steamer service, 5039.
St. John
Dredging, 5224.
Railway and steamship service, 5050.
St. John Valley Railway bridges, 4023.
Senate representation, 5290, 5299, 5305.
Tariff, 4336.

Quebec (city)
Arsenal, 5028.
Battlefields Commission, 1783, 1784. *See also* National Battlefields at Quebec Bill.
Bridge, 4559, 4463, 5030, 5108.
Harbour Commission attorney, 1604, 2263.
Harbourmaster, 5029.
Harbour plant, 2788, 3055, 3398.
Land purchases, 1434.
Marine agency, 2996.
Quarantine officials, 354.
Union station, 1913.
Weights and Measures, assistant inspector of, 3318.

Quebec Harbour Commissioners Bill. Res., 3632. 1r., 3636. 2r., 3876. Com., 3876. 3r., 3895.

Quebec-Lévis mails, 2263.

Quebec (Province) Seigniories, 568.

Quebec and Saguenay Railway, 4022, 4053, 4557.

Queenston Heights picnic, 441.

Radium ores, 1692, 1814.

Railway Act Amendment Bills.
Armstrong, Mr. J. E. 1r., 1013.
Borden, Mr. Joint Com., 2947.
Demers, Mr. 1r., 610, 793.

Railway Commission, Dominion, 574, 2372, 2437, 4160.

Railway Employees House of Service Bill. 1r., 2175.

Railway Level Crossings Bill. Res., 3896. 1r., 3896. 2r., 3957. Com., 3957. 3r., 4023.

Railway Mail Clerks. *See* Civil Service Act (P.O.) Amendment Bill.

Railways
Charters, granting of, 2953.

Railways.—Con.

Crossings, level, 360, 3200, 3270, 4166. *See also* Railway Level Crossings Bill.
Government ownership of, 3974-3979, 4391-4413.
Land grants to, 5027.
Suburban trains, 1062.
See also names of railways.

Railways and Canals estimates, 438, 1956, 2963-2995, 4160-4167, 4939-4953, 5106-5129.
Ministerial statement, 1957.
Canals, 1957.
Government Railways, 1959.
Hudson Bay Railway, 1962.
National Transcontinental Railway, 1964.
Salaries, etc., 438.

Rainville, Mr. Joseph H. (Chambly and Verchères)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Free wheat, 288.
Immigration, 291.
Agriculture, aid to, 292.
Highways improvement, 293.
Cold storage, 294.
Cost of living, 294.
Civil Service, 1384.

Ranching and Grazing Commission, 574, 2543.

Real estate advertisements. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bill.

Reciprocity with the United States, 9, 117, 122, 297.

Records, Departmental, Commission, 4963.

Red Head harbour, 891.

Redistribution of representation. *See* House of Commons.

Reid, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Customs)
Alert, steamer, 343, 474.
Basic slag, 639.
Canals, 1957, 2963-2995, 4162, 5109.
Colpitts, G. A., case of, 452.
Customs estimates, 400, 413, 422-439, 963-969, 998-1011, 2374.
Government Railways claims, 1910, 2392.
House of Commons representation, 5307, 5360.
Hudson Bay Railway, 1962, 4464-4466, 4468, 4476.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 5119.
Estimates, 3178, 4165, 4860.
Killaim, A. E., retirement of, 1728.
Management, 3264.
Ocean Limited train, 4888.
Pension fund, 5362.

Reid, Hon. J. D.—Con.
Labrador, Quebec and Southern Railway Company, 2952.
National Transcontinental Railway
Eastern section, 5033.
Estimates, 4453-4462, 4968, 5106.
Ministerial statement, 1964.
Montreal, connection with, 5127.
Petroleum, export of, 971.
Prince Edward Island Railway, 1962, 4483.
Quebec bridge, 5108.
Railway level crossings, 3896, 3957, 4023, 4166.
Railways and Canals estimates, 438, 1957, 2963-2995, 4160-4167, 4939-4953, 5106.
Returns, alleged incomplete, 4959.
St. John Valley Railway, 3036.
Bridges, 3880, 3959, 4023.
St. Peter's canal, 2963, 2995, 4480.
Southampton Railway Company, 1469.
Toronto terminals, 3784.
Trent canal
Construction, 4163.
Investigation, 4991.
Welland canal, 2963, 2987.
Winnipeg terminals, 3454, 3558.

Reid Mr. Jas. (Restigouche)
Intercolonial Railway car charges, 352.

Reindeer herd, 4155.

Rhodes, Mr. Edgar N. (Cumberland)
Battlefields, preservation of, 4116.
Customs service, appointments to, 969.
Dismissals, 1007.
Fenian raid veterans, 4354.
Fort Cumberland, restoration of, 4183.
Government officials in politics, 435.
House of Commons representation, 5324, 5335.
Privilege, 3114.
Senate representation, 5304.

Richibucto life-saving crew, 668.

Richmond county public works, 571.

Richmond and Wolfe public buildings, 1694, 4294.

Reindeau, S., employment of, 1114.

Rigaud
Post office, 442, 3638, 4021.
Wharf, 442, 574.

Rimouski
Customs, 2015.
Engineers, 2079, 4021.
Harbour, 2079, 2310.
Insurance Company, 4713, 4807.
Land purchase, 1695.
Medical service, 2015.

Robb, Mr. James A. (Huntingdon)
Brome experimental dairy station, 1110.
Budget, 2639.
Agriculture, 2640.
Tariff, 2641.
Dairy products, 2643.
Dismissals, 432.
Explosives, manufacture of, 1810.
Grain Bill, 3584.
Horse breeding, 472.
Live stock purchases, 470.
Naval service, 5164.
Norton creek, 5028.
Transportation, 2987.
Valleyfield
Dredging, 2992.
Wharf, 5234.

Robidoux, Mr. Ferdinand J. (Kent, N.B.)
Fisheries advisory board, 2413.

Robitaille postmaster, 3058.

Roche, Hon. W. J. (Minister of the Interior)
Alpine Club of Canada, 4155.
Astronomical surveys, 4155.
Buffalo herd, 4155.
Campbell, Glen, charges against, 624, 1857.
Dominion Lands Act Amendment, 3249, 3335-3360, 3511.
Dominion Lands and Parks, 1836-1870, 2372, 4151.
Orders in Council approved, 4713.
Forest reserves, 3512, 3554, 4151.
Government officials in politics, 624, 1836.
Immigration
Agencies, 1628.
Asiatic, 1253, 4214.
Bulgarian, 4560.
Chinese, 5212.
Estimates, 1612-1644, 4155, 5210.
Hindu, 4524, 4557, 4564, 4954 5212.
Homestead entries by continental immigrants, 1625, 4158.
Inspection, 1441.
Italian, 1634.
Maritime provinces, to, 5211.
Results of policy, 1612, 1625.
Russian, 4560.
United States, 1625.
Indian Act Amendment, 1817, 2395, 3481, 3532, 4830.
Indians
British Columbia, 2477, 5209.
Generally, 422, 2480.
Northwest Provinces and Territories, 2478, 5209.
Nova Scotia, 2474-2477, 5209.
Ontario and Quebec, 2472-2474.
Interior Department estimates, 338, 1836, 2363, 2372, 4151.
Irrigation, 3599, 4153.
Lands unpatented, taxation of, 1920.
Natural resources, provincial control of, 1079.
Petroleum rights, 975.
Reindeer herd, 4155.

Roche, Hon. W. J.—Con.

St. Peter's Indian reserve, 475.
Seed grain, 5210.
Volunteer bounty, 1396, 1611.
Water-power surveys, 4153.
Yukon, Government of, 1835.
Yukon Placer Mining Act, 3859, 3965.

Rocky Point wharf, 3113, 3318.

Rogers, Hon. Robt. (Minister of Public Works)
Brantford public building, 872.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4416, 4550.
Canning public building, 5226.
Carslake Hotel property, 4023.
Dry Docks subsidy, 3961, 4090.
Ewart, D., chief architect, 5230.
Georgian Bay canal, 1050, 1733.
Government officials in politics, 628, 741, 1846.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway mechanics' strike, 5034.
House of Commons representation, 5230.
National Transcontinental Railway, 5078.
Public Works estimates
Buildings, 1533, 1875, 1893, 4182-4207, 5218-5231.
Dredging, 5224, 5236.
Harbours and rivers, 4207-4213, 5214, 5231, 5233.
Miscellaneous, 5230.
Salaries, etc., 342.
Slides and booms, 5231.
Telegraph lines, 2375, 5234-5245.

Ross, Mr. Duncan C. (West Middlesex)
Canadian Northern Railway, 4370.
Farmers Bank, 3527, 4921.
Muncey Indians, 2475.
Shipbuilding in Canada, 418.

Ross rifle, 513.

Rosthern
Customs collector, 573, 997.
Lands agent, 573.

Roy, J. N., employment of, 698.

Royal assent, 2376, 2383, 4292 4321.

Royal Military College, 3207, 5015.

Royal Society of Canada, 350, 5267.

Rural mail service, 376, 5132, 5245, 5361.

Ste. Anne de la Pocatière
Experimental station, 360.
Wharf, 2078.

Ste. Anne des Monts wharf, 2687.

Ste. Anne de Restigouche dredging, 3112.

St. Armand mails, 3208.

Ste. Brigide mails, 893.

St. Casimir post office, 360, 667.

St. David de Lévis postmaster, 4369.

St. Esprit lightkeeper, 473.

St. Hyacinthe mails, 2014.

St. Jerome wharf, 3113.

St. John, N.B.
Custom house, 1330.
Harbour, 1331, 1693, 4090-4112.
Marine employees, 1913.

St. John and Quebec Railway, 2546, 2789, 2997.

St. John and Quebec Railway Bridges Bill. Res., 3880. 1r., 3886. 2r., 3959. Com., 3959, 4023. 3r., 4090.

St. Johns and Iberville
Bridge, 2689.
Rural mail, 366.

St. Johns and Iberville rural mail, 366.

St. Johns, Que.
Customs collector, 893.
Inland Revenue collector, 1021.

St. Joseph de Sorel
Post office, 572.
Trempe, L. E., employment of, 1434, 1695.

St. Lawrence
Accidents, 3253, 3398, 3622. *See also* Empress of Ireland.
Dams, 3317.
Ice breakers, 987.
Rates, 976, 982.
Ship channel 976-991.
Tug boilers, 1361.

St. Leonards immigration agent, 569.

Ste. Perpetue food inspector, 359.

St. Peter's
Canal, 1020, 2903, 2963, 2995, 4480.
Indian Reserve, 354, 475, 571, 891.

St. Roch des Aulnaies excise officer, 360.

St. Romuald post office, 809, 4021.

St. Theodore D'Acton rural mail, 700.

Sackville public wharf, 568.

Safety of Life at Sea Convention, 358, 787.

San Francisco Exposition. *See* Exhibitions.

Sault Ste. Marie mails, 2014.

Scales inspection, 1419.

Schaffner, Mr. F. L. (Souris)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Farmers' delegation, 106.
By-elections, 106.
Manitoba boundaries, 107.
Transportation, 107.
Agriculture, 109.
Cost of living, 110.
Naval defence, 111.
Dismissals, 1180.
Freight rates, 940.
Naturalization, 4534.
Natural resources, provincial control of, 1085.
Terminal elevators, 1657.

School lands, 3638.

Secretary of State's estimates, 724, 1760-1780.

Secret Commissions Bill, 4555, 4712.

Seed grain, distribution of, 369.

Seeds, inspection of. *See* Inspection and Sales Act Amendment Bill.

Séguin, Mr. Paul A. (L'Assomption)
Dorion, dredging at, 443.
House of Commons representation, 5318.
Hudson Bay Railway, 5030.
Joliette building, 1023.
L'Assomption wharf, 2263.
Soulanges canal, 2179, 2263.
Terrebonne postmaster, 1019.
Tobacco revenues, 2957.

Senate Employees Bill. 1r., 4711.

Senate reform, 1495, 5282.

Senate representation—Address to the King. Res., 5277. Com., 5290. Senate amdts., 5376, 5378.

Senate Representation Bills
Alberta. Res., 1498. 1r., 1498.
British Columbia. Res., 3513. 1r., 3516.
Manitoba. Res., 1483. 1r., 1497. *See also* 1911.
Saskatchewan. Res., 1498. 1r., 1498.

Sévigny, Mr. Albert (Dorchester)
Experimental farms, 1149.
National Transcontinental Railway
Investigation, 2218.
Payments to contractors, 1781.
Sillery lands, 1534.
Portneuf county post offices, 1690.
Quebec Battlefields Commission, 1783.
St. Johns Inland Revenue collector, 1378.

Sexsmith, Mr. John A. (East Peterborough)
Butter, manufacture of, 3166.
Lemieux, Hon. R., trips of, 698.
Trent canal, 4997.

Sharpe, Mr. Samuel (North Ontario)
Divorce bills, 4883.
Farmers Bank, 4764.
Fenian raid veterans, 3373.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2202.
Ross rifle, 517.
Queen's University, 770.
Senate reform, 5284.
Trust companies, 2908.
Unemployment, 4157.

Sharpe, Mr. William H. (Lisgar)
Hudson Bay terminals, 688, 4464.

Shefford county rural mail, 363.

Shelburne
Fisheries, 349.
Fishery guardians, 2961.
Public works, 1330.

Shepherd, Mr. F. H. (Nanaimo)
Duncan's Station public building, 4203.
Explosives, regulation of, 3865.
Labour conditions on Vancouver Island, 539, 1283.

Sherbrooke (city)
Automobiles for officials, 2959, 5130, 5262.
Drill hall, 2959, 3111.
Leased buildings, 3317, 3894.
Militia quarters, 3422-3428.
Post office, 3509, 3715, 4368.

Sherbrooke (county)
Agriculture in, 5027.
Postal inspection, 2959, 3645.

Shigawake rural mails, 1692.

Shipping, registration of, 754. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amendment Bill.

Shubenacadie-Deans mails, 1817.

Silk, tariff on, 3159.

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Fishing industry, 142.
Naval defence, 145.
Highways improvement, 147.
Mail bag locks, 150.
Amherst armoury, 3714, 4293.
Armouries, 666, 2786. *See also* Amherst
Banque Internationale, 4712.
Boilers for tugs, 1361.
Budget, 2734.
Election issues, 2735.
Fishing industry, 2738.
Agricultural implements, 2739.
Fishing twine, 2740.
Expenditures, 2741.
Canada shipping, 90.

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—Con

Canning public building, 5224.
Canso letter boxes, 703.
Cattle inspection, 759.
Civil Service, appointments to, 1192.
Coal contracts for Government dredges, 923.
Coasting privileges, 90, 754, 2435, 2915. *See also* Shipping.
Cobequid, wreck of, 1167.
Cold storage, 700.
Cole Harbour wharf, 1693.
Cost of Living Commission, 2436.
Cranberry Island light, 1175, 1193.
Dean Settlement Railway, 3318.
Dismissals
Fish hatchery employees, 370.
Generally, 1192.
Laing, J. R., postmaster, 370.
Drill halls. *See* Armouries.
Duchemin, H. P., payments to, 353, 697, 779, 893, 926, 1111,
Electoral corruption, 344.
Esquimalt dock, 813, 1433.
Experimental farms, 1160.
Farmers Bank, 723, 4804, 4895, 4903 (amdt.) 4912.
Fenian raid veterans, 349, 440, 925, 1604, 2416, 2787, 2962, 3368, 3894, 4348.
Fish and fisheries
Advisory board, 2399, 2415.
Curing expert, 571.
Lobster fishing, 815, 5187.
Modus vivendi licenses, 1603.
Pickled fish, inspection of, 4437.
Reduction works, 1693, 2080.
Statistics, 1020, 1361, 2400, 5191.
Transportation, 376, 894, 1017, 1114-1215, 2401, 2937, 3412, 5070, 5184.
Twine, duty on, 344, 3153.
Violations of Act, 1603.
Fraser, J. McL., fishery officer, 5030.
Government railways claims, 2394.
Government steamers
Alert, 326, 343.
Canada, 3113.
Repairs to, 404, 1204, 1332, 2430.
Gunhilde, steam yacht, 2688.
Guysborough public wharf, 355.
House of Commons
Post office, 477.
Representation, 5350.
Hudson Bay Railway mileage, 364.
Indian Harbour Lakes postmaster, 3055.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 353.
Employees on Ferry Scotia, 1016.
Estimates, 3183, 4865.
Freight rates, 894, 921, 1017, 1021, 1434, 1690, 2016.
Guysborough branch, 4481.
Ice contracts, 364.
Management, 3305.
Point Tupper ferry, 894.
Refrigerator cars, 1360.

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—Con.

Standard rules, 1693.
Sunny Brae branch, 894.
Tonnage, 3110.
Labour strikes at Nanaimo, 345.
Larry's River harbourmaster, 2961.
Le Blanc, seaman, burial of, 667, 815, 5177.
Life-saving rewards, 420, 5176.
McPherson C., employment of, 2787.
Matches, white phosphorus, 1538.
Militia
Armouries. *See that title.*
Boot contract, 2591.
Generally, 4617.
Political demonstrations, 5010.
Training areas, 5020.
Montreal harbour, 3875.
Mounted police, 2544.
Naturalization, 4817.
Naval College, Halifax, 3208.
Navigation, schools of, 750.
New Harbour breakwater, 365.
Newspaper advertising, 2438.
Newspapers, postal rates on, 3245.
North Riverside postmaster, 2686, 3209. 3509, 3845, 4022.
Petawawa camp, 815.
Provincial subsidies, 344.
Prudential Life of Canada, 3479, 3506.
Railway mail clerks, 2382.
Railway subsidies, 355.
Red Head harbour, 891.
Returns, alleged incomplete, 4960, 5361.
Sand Point wharf, 5229.
Shellfish Commission, 667, 1361.
Shipping Act Amendment, 746.
Shipping
Insurance, 982.
Registry, 754.
Spanish Ship Bay wharf, 3055, 3111.
Steamer subsidies, 2935.
Steam trawling, 471.
Sunny Brae mails, 2309.
Tariff, 3153.
Trade agents, 319, 884.
United States fishermen, 1692.
Vancouver Harbour Commission, 2390.
Vancouver Island public works engineer, 3399.
Victoria rifle range, 3398.
Weights and measures inspection, 2591.

Skinner's Cove works, 809.

Slack, W. F., dismissal of, 921.

Slag. *See* Basic.

Smith, H. T., emploment of, 812.

Smith, Mr. Wm. (South Ontario)
Budget, 2698.
Free wheat, 2699.
Mixed farming, 2700.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3838.
Horse breeding, 3502.
Privilege, 3114.

Smuggling, alleged, 1782.

Sorel. *See* St. Joseph de Sorel.

Soulanges Canal, 2989, 2994.
Employees, 2179, 2263.

Souris rifle range, 1435, 1694, 1783, 4567.

South African hay contracts, 1020.

South America trade development association, 1693.

Southampton Railway Company, 1455, 3009.

South Bruce letter boxes, 353.

Southport fish hatchery, 3112.

Spanish Ship Bay wharf, 3055, 3111.

Speaker (Hon. T. S. Sproule), rulings and statements of. *See also* Parliamentary Procedure.
Adjournment motion on question of privilege, 4958.
Amendment increasing money grant ruled out, 3956.
Amendments, allegations of fact in, 4671.
Answer of minister must be accepted, 705.
Answers to questions
Discussion of, 871.
Lengthy, 1062.
Anticipating notice on Order Paper, 879.
Bills
Certain amendments irregular, 5034.
Divorce bills, right of Commons to hear evidence on, 4880.
On motion to refer back report, evidence not debatable, 4885.
Extraneous matter not debatable on third reading, 4903.
Limit of debate on second reading, 1130.
Must be read a second time before reference to select committee, 1750.
No debate on motion for first reading, 619.
On amendment, discussion must be limited to same, 4646.
On introduction, may be explained, but not debated, 3054.
On Senate amendments, general discussion not admissable, 4893.
Shipping bill to be introduced by resolution, 743.
Ex-member, statement affecting, not a question of privilege, 1119.
Extracts unread not to be reported, 2698.
Government business on Thursdays, 706.
House of Commons
Post Office, 3236.
Library and reading room, closing of, 4215.
Staff, appointments to, 94, 399, 2686, 4954, 5268, 5271.
Stationery, 1370.

Speaker, The.—Con.
Improper motives, imputation of, to Government unparliamentary, 2009.
Incorrect report not a question of privilege, 3455.
Jallet, N., widow of, 1067.
Newspaper articles, irregular to base charges on, 705.
Notices of motion must be taken in regular order, 1362.
Order in the House, 4370, 4411, 4415.
Orders of the Day, debatable questions inadmissable on, 477, 511, 4215.
Petition rejected, 2840.
Privilege, questions of, 343, 705, 1119, 2016, 2085, 3455.
Questions
Irregular, 2017, 2082, 2592.
Statements of fact in, 4561.
Without notice, 285, 475, 477, 511.
Quoting evidence not reported to House irregular, 1344.
Senate, the, to speak disrespectfully of, not allowable, 2596.
Substantive motions, closing of debate on, 464, 1368.
Supply, Committee of, without question put; interpretation of rule, 306, 512, 521, 522.
Unparliamentary expression: 'Boozarium,' 2084.
Voting, member abstaining from, 2021.

Steamship subsidies, 956, 2913, 2923. *See also* Post Office.

Steel. *See* Iron and Steel.

Steel barrels, manufacture of, 1534.

Steele, Mr. M. (South Perth)
Budget, 2743.
Prosperity of Canada, 2743.
Taxation, 2744.
Agricultural implements, 2745.
Free wheat, 2746.
Cost of living, 2750.
Milling industry, 2752.
Ocean freight rates, 2930.
Pollution of navigable waters, 1746.

Steffansson expedition. *See* Karluk.

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver)
Alaska-Yukon Railway, 1433.
Budget, 2879.
Fiscal policies, 2881.
Free trade vs. protection, 2883.
Taxation, 2886.
Free wheat, 2889.
Burrard Tunnel and Bridge Company, 765.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4668.
Immigration, Asiatic, 1232, 2639, 5026.
Indian Act Amendment, 3547.
Labour conditions on Vancouver Island, 546.

Stevens, Mr. H. H.—Con.

Money Lenders Act Amendment, 201.
Naturalization, 4150.

Stewart, Mr. Thos. J. (West Hamilton)
Conferences, expenses of, 570.

Stone, tariff on, 3115. *See also* Brantford Public Building.

Strathcona, Lord, death of, 91, 165.

Strong, Heath, payments to, 1116.

Submarine bell floats, 668.

Subsidies
Mail and steamship, 2913, 2923.
Provincial, 344.
Railway, 355.

Sunny Brae mails, 2309.

Supply Bills
For $52,253,007.71. Res., 2378. 1r., 2r., com. and 3r., 2378.
For $127,831,037.86. Res., 1r., 2r., com. and 3r., 5271.
For details see titles of departments and subjects.

Supreme Court Act (appeals) Amendment Bill. 1r., 3251. 2r., 3462. Com., 3462. 3r., 3462.

Sussex public building, 1694.

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Budget, 2815.
Free wheat, 2816.
Agricultural implements, 2819.
Fiscal policies, 2821.
Experimental farms, 1105.
Farmers Bank, 4788, 4911.
Fenian raid veterans, 4362.
Grain Bill, 3575.
Privilege, question of, 3114.

Sydney as an ocean port, 4081.

Tadousac wharf, 2309.

Tariff (Customs) Bill. Res., 3037, 3058, 3114. 1r., 3160. 2r., 4335. Com., 4335. 3r., 4426, 4433.
Amendments proposed
Mr. Loggie, 3052; div., 3106.
Mr. A. K. Maclean, 4426.
See also Budget.

Tariff questions, 1358, 1511.

Tar sand deposits, 1811.

Tatamagouche and Brulé mails, 3208.

Tate, William, compensation to, 4967

Technical education, 355, 568, 3054, 4888, 5206.

Telephone system authorized, 804.

Telescope for observatory, 344.

Terminal elevators, 1646-1666, 3161, 3575-3587.

Terrebonne postmaster, 1019.

Thoburn, Mr. William (North Lanark)
Haultain, Chief Justice, judgment of, on Saskatchewan Companies Act, 1265.
Vineberg, Helen, divorce bill, 4671, 4881.

Thompson, Mr. Alfred (Yukon)
Budget, 2801.
Tariff, 2802.
Yukon, the, 2804.
Free wheat, 2804.
Free trade, 2807.
Government of the Yukon, 1833.
House of Commons rooms, 2080.
Mines Department estimates, 1811, 1814.
Radium-bearing ores, 1814.
Tar sand deposits, 1811.
Telegraph service, 5237.
Yukon Placer Mining Act, 3966.

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Free wheat, 271.
Agricultural implement duties, 1560.
Budget, 2809.
Tariff Commission, 2809.
Free wheat, 2810.
Agricultural implements, 2814.
Butter, manufacture of, 3165.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4407.
Capital punishment, 499.
Farmers Bank, 4926.
Government officials in politics, 1839.
Naturalization, 4140.

Thorburn railway communication, 701.

Thornton, Mr. Chas. J. (Durham)
Cigarettes, prohibition of, 1476.

Three Rivers
Mails, 2014.
Military camp, 3509.
Post office, 2688.
Preventive officer, 473.
Public buildings, 569.

Tide Head salmon pound, 1692.

Tips Bill. *See* Secret Commissions.

Titles of Honour Bill. 1r., 4. M. for 2r., 479; negatived, 482.

Tobacco culture, 1147, 1373, 2958, 5200.

Tobin, Mr. Edmund W. (Richmond-Wolfe)
Bury drill hall, 2960.
Cookshire public building, 2960.
Denison, J. R., dismissal of, 3209, 3640, 5259.
Desmarais, A., dismissal of, 1389.
Disraeli wharf, 1435.
Girard, Mr., employment of, 4559.
Land grants, 1916.
Megantic public building, 2960.
Post Office estimates, 3633, 3640.
Richmond and Wolfe
Experimental farm, 1534, 1694, 2015.
Public buildings, 1694, 4294.
St. George's Club, Sherbrooke, 3425.
Weedon public building, 5214.

Tobique Indian reserve, 816, 1218, 1359, 1535, 1915, 2590, 3534.

Toronto Harbour Commissioners. *See* Toronto Terminals Bill.

Toronto harbour works, 812.

Toronto Terminals Bill. 1r., 3784. 2r., 3880. Com., 3880. 3r., 3880.

Townsend, N. T., resignation of, 2436.

Trade, balance of, adjustment of, 2016.

Trade and Commerce
Bulletins, 474.
Department estimates, 315, 881, 927, 2376, 2913, 2923.

Transatlantic mail service, 94, 376, 577, 1645, 2915, 3226, 5030, 5043.

Transportation, 2971-2986, 3871-3880, 4090-4112, 5082-5106. *See also* Ocean.

Travelling expenses of ministers, 610.

Trawling, steam, 471.

Trent Canal
Construction, 1958, 4163, 5109.
Investigation, 1817, 4940-4947, 4975-4997.
Water-powers, 2177, 2789, 4162.

Trent Valley Woollen Manufacturing Company, 2177.

Truax, Mr. R. E. (South Bruce)
Chesley post office, 664.
Customs undervaluation, 3318.

Trust Companies Bill. 1r., 793. 2r., 1125. Com., 2903. 3r., 2963. Senate amdts, 4891.

Tubing, brass-covered, tariff on, 3152

Turgeon, Mr. Onesiphore (Gloucester)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Redistribution of representation, 112.
National Transcontinental Railway, 115.

Turgeon, Mr. O.—Con.
Highways improvements, 116.
Reciprocity, 117.
Naval defence, 120.
Bathurst harbour, 348, 4212.
Budget, 2690.
Militia expenditures, 2691.
Free trade, 2693.
Agricultural implements, 2694.
Steel industry, 2697.
Dismissals, 430, 785, 1181.
Fishing disaster: proposed Government aid, 5194.
Fishing industry, 2402, 2415.
Government officials in politics, 348.
House of Commons representation, 862.
Intercolonial Railway
Aird, Wm., employment of, 895.
Canadian Pacific Railway traffic agreement, 605.
King, Samuel, employment of, 895.
Management, 3309.
Moncton property purchase, 2786.
Williams, T., employment of, 895.
Library of Parliament, 1780.
National Transcontinental Railway investigation, 2164.
Navigation, schools of, 752.
Quebec bridge, 4559.
St. John Valley Railway, 3034.
Senate representation, 5295.
Steel industry, 1532, 3034.

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)
Agricultural implements, Customs valuation of, 2958.
Budget, 2510.
Trade conditions, 2510.
Wheat markets, 2512.
Agricultural implements, 2516, 2520.
Cut stone duty, 2525.
Reciprocity with the United States, 2526.
Freight rates, 2528.
Privilege, 2546.
Stone, dressed, tariff on, 3119, 3124.
Trust companies, 2904.

20th Battery, 1361, 2263.

Twine, tariff on, 3157.

Typhoid. *See* Pollution of navigable waters.

Ulster. *See* Home Rule.

Union Life Insurance Company, 723, 926, 2374.

Valcartier artillery camp, 924.

Valleyfield
Dam, 2992.
Dredging, 2992.
Excise revenues, 2958.
Wharf, 5234.

Vancouver
Drill hall, 362, 892, 1021, 1117.
Orange Lodge Home Rule resolution, 2785.
Rented buildings, 2957.

Vancouver Harbour Commissioners Bill. 1r., 2175. 2r., 2388. Com., 2388. 3r., 2392.

Vancouver Island
Colliery strke. *See* Labour.
Engineer, 3399.

Vaudreuil wharfs, 574.

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (Maisonneuve)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Cost of living, 249.
Unemployment, 249.
Canadian Northern Railway, 3981.
Capital punishment, 508.
Chambly canal, 4558.
Civil Service, 4444.
Criminal Code amendment (firearms and detectaphone), 467.
Dismissals, 1375.
Employment bureaus, 1818.
Industrial Disputes Act, 1022.
Great West Saddlery Company and labour, 4594.
Iron workers and fair wages, 1115.
Labour
Department and Minister, 649.
Fair wage officers, 5202, 3709.
Hours on public works, 4.
Importation of workmen, 357.
Montreal harbour, on, 5203.
Wages on public works, 357.
Lachine canal, 1782, 1913.
Militia, 4594.
Montreal
Pilots, 1117.
Public works staff, 1435, 5241.
Resident engineer, 1117, 2439.
Rules of the House, 706.
Smith, H. T., employment of, 812.
South America Trade Association, 1693.
Technical education, 5206.
Unemployment, 249, 1617.
Vancouver Island strike, 572, 1267.

Victoria county, N.S., Government telegraph service, 1359.

Victoria Day, 1916.

Victoria Memorial Museum, 1882.

Victoria
Naval volunteers, 1914.
Rifle range, 3398.

Vincent, J. U., appointment of, 340, 1406, 1427.

Volunteer Bounty Bills
Mr. Sam. Hughes: Res., 3363. 1r., 3396. 2r., 4339. Com., 4339. 3r., 4367.
Mr. Roche: Res., 1396. 1r., 1400. 2r., 1611. Com., 1611. 3r., 1611.

Walker, Mr. Henry J. (East Northumberland, Ont.)
Privilege, 3114.

Wallace, Mr. Thomas G. (Centre York)
Victoria Day, 1916.

Warnock, Mr. David (Macleod)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Free wheat, 301.
Aid to agriculture, 303.
Animals, health of, 3177.
Budget, 2701.
Grazing leases, 2702.
Cattle quarantine, 2704.
Agricultural implements, 2706.
Steel duties, 2708.
Mixed farming, 2709.
Forest reserves, 3557.
Grazing areas, 4152.
Horse breeding, 3495.
Western Dominion Railway, 3473.

Water powers, 3323, 4153. *See also* Trent Canal.

Waterways. *See* International.

Watrous postmaster, 3715.

Webster, Mr. John (Brockville)
Budget, 2668.
Dairying industry, 2670.
Reciprocity, 2672.
Butter, manufacture of, 3164.

Weedon public building, 5214.

Weichel, Mr. William G. (North Waterloo)
Budget, 2709.
Wire fencing, 2710.
Trade of Germany, 2711.
Agricultural implements, 2714.
Free food, 2716.
Canadian Peace Centenary Association, 970.
San Francisco exposition, 3254.

Weights and Measures Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1359. 2r., 1753. Com., 1753. 3r., 1756.

Weights and Measures, inspection of, 2591.

Welland canal, 925, 2963, 5108.

West Branch mail service, 924.

West Indies
Cable, 955.
Steamship service, 439, 956.
Trade, 882, 927, 2015.
Trade commissioner, 440.

Westmorland harbours, 443.

Wharfs, revenue from, 368.

Wheat. *See* Free Wheat.

White, Mr. Gerald V. (North Renfrew)
Eganville post office, 5222.
Georgian Bay canal, 1055, 2983.
Petawawa camp, 3448.
Railway mail clerks, 3241.

White, Hon. W. T. (Minister of Finance)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Naval defence, 61, 79.
Financial conditions, 62.
Cost of living, 69, 79.
Tariff, 74, 77.
Aid to agriculture, 76.
Agricultural implements, tariff on, 3140.
Bank rates of interest, 5199.
Bounties, 2464. *See also* Pig Iron *and* Iron and steel industry.
British Trust Company, 1416.
Budget, 2440.
Revenue and expenditure, 2441.
Special subsidies to railways, 2443.
Loans maturing, 2444.
Net debt, 2446.
Financial conditions, 2446.
Trade conditions, 2447.
Immigration, 2450.
Tariff, 2451.
Wheat and flour, 2452.
Iron and steel, 2453.
Agricultural implements, 2459.
Caustic soda, 2463.
Brass, 2464.
Bounties, 2464.
Flax industry, 2464.
Surtax, 2465.
Canadian Government loan flotations, 5106.
Canadian Northern Railway, 1265, 3929, 4045, 4525, 4526.
Capital Planning Commission, 2373, 5196.
Civil Service, 4437, 4448, 4450.
Civil Service insurance, 1751, 1871.
Civil Service superannuation, 5365.
Correction of press report, 1433.
Farmers Bank, 3518, 4675, 4894, 4913.
Insurance Bill, 1688, 3199.
Iron and steel industry, 1524, 2453, 2464, 3160.
Loan companies, 1128, 4717.
Old age pensions, 1354.
Pig iron drawback, 3210, 3511.
Post Office saving banks, 5199.
Potatoes, tariff on, 3052, 3095.
Prudential Life of Canada, 3478, 3506.
Quebec Battlefields Commission, 3636, 3890.
Sterling Trusts Corporation, 1417.
Tariff, 74, 77, 2451, 3037, 3095, 3115-3147, 4335, 4426.
Trust companies, 1125, 4891.
Union Life Insurance Company, 2374.

White, Mr. William H. (Victoria, Alta.)
Agricultural implement duties, 1599.
Government officials in politics, 1837.
Homestead regulations, 3356.
Militia, 5010.

White slave traffic, 1632, 4523.

White Water lake, 1331.

Wilcox, Mr. Oliver J. (North Essex)
Budget, 2557.
Surpluses, 2558.
Protection, 2559.
Transportation, 2560.
Development of Canada, 2562.
Free trade and protection, 2566.
Rural mails, 2572.
Pledges redeemed, 2573.
Dismissals, 1002.
Dressed stone tariff, 3123.
Technical education, 568.

Wilson, Mr. Charles A. (Laval)
Archives Department, 1773.
Capital punishment, 503, 1731.
Dredging, Des Prairies and Rivière Jesus, 1731, 1735, 5234.
House of Commons representation, 5317.
Italian immigration, 1633.
Judges' salaries, 1939.
Orange Lodges and the French language, 2081.
Penitentiaries inquiry, 571.
Privilege, 2016.
Roy, Dr. J. N., mission of, 698.

Windsor
Fish hatchery, 1535.
Immigration office, 5028.

Winnipeg Joint Railway Terminals Bill. 1r., 3454. 2r., 3558. Com., 3558. 3r., 3621.

Winter, Lt.-Col., C. F., employment of, 2840.

Wireless Telegraphy, 349, 1207, 5183. *See also* Poulsen.

Wishart, A., commutation of sentence of, 4367.

Woodstock Dominion building coal supplies, 569.

Wrecking plants, 761.

Wright county post offices, 445.

Wright, Mr. William (Muskoka)
Canada Temperance Act, 1761.
Tariff, 3063.

Yarmouth
Harbour, 1015, 2309.
Live stock purchases, 665, 2308.
Rural mail, 570.

Yarmouth North post office, 816.

Young, Angus, customs officer, 669.

Yukon
Government of, 1833.
Judgeship, 4022.

Yukon Placer Mining Bill. 1r., 3859. 2r., 3965. Com., 3965. 3r., 3967.